

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1954—55

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

4th January, 1955.

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

PRESENT:

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

Prayers were read.

Mr. Barrow and Mrs. Bourne entered the House and took their seats.

MINUTES

The Minutes of the Meetings which were held on the 23rd and 30th November, 1954, which were printed and circulated, were taken as read and confirmed.

DOCUMENTS

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

Statement of Revenue and Expenditure for the half year ended 30th September, 1954, from the Commissioners of Highways of the Parish of St. John.

Statement of Revenue and Expenditure for the half year ended 30th September, 1954, from the Commissioners of Highways of the Parish of Christ Church.

Statement of Revenue and Expenditure for the half year ended 30th September, 1954, in connection with Tenantry Roads from the Commissioners of Highways of the Parish of St. George.

Mr. Vaughan entered the House and took his seat.

PAPERS LAID

The following papers were laid by command of His Excellency the Governor:—

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: (For Hon. G. H. ADAMS:—Statement showing Gross Customs and Excise Receipts for eight months ended 30th November, 1954.

The Public Officers Loan and Travelling Allowances (Scheduled Officers) Regulations, 1954.

The Public Officers Loan and Travelling Allowances Regulations, 1954.

Statement showing the amounts advanced by the Government of Barbados and the amounts received from Her Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom under the provisions of the Colonial Development and Welfare Act for the period ended 30th June, 1954, in respect of the several schemes sanctioned by the Legislature.

REPLY LAID

Reply to Question No. 5 asked by Mr. L. E. Smith regarding the West St. Joseph Secondary Modern School.

PETITION

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a Petition from Mary Sonia Carter of 'Pine House' in the parish of St. Michael praying the House to pass a Bill to exempt her from certain provisions of the Solicitors Act 1896. The Petition is respectfully worded, and I ask that it be taken as read.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Government Notices were given as follows:—

Hon. C. E. TALMA — Resolution to approve the lease of approximately 1,200 sq. ft. of land at Hastings Rocks to Mr. A. M. Taylor, lessee of the Hotel Royal.

Resolution to place the sum of \$24,760 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1954—55, Part I, Current as shown in Supplementary Estimate 1954—55 No. 32 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Mr. Speaker, as far as the second Resolution of which I have given notice, I would like to ask the permission of the House to deal with it at a later stage at today's sitting. Copies of it will be circulated in another few minutes.

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS (For Hon. G. H. ADAMS): Resolution to place the sum of \$23,750 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1954—55, Part I, Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1954—55 No. 33 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. M. E. COX: Resolution to place the sum of \$448 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1954—55, Part II, Capital, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1954—55, No. 34 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: Notice of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply at its next meeting to deal with the money Resolutions of which notice has been given.

Hon. G. H. Adams and Mr. Allder entered the House and took their seats.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Bill to amend the Immigration Act, 1952.

PRIVATE MEMBER'S BUSINESS

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Bill to exempt Mary Sonia Carter from certain provisions of the Solicitors Act 1896.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

On motion of Hon. G. H. Adams, seconded by Hon. Dr. Cummins the Bill to amend the Immigration Act 1952 was read a first time.

On motion of Mr. Goddard seconded by Mr. Haynes the Bill to exempt Mary Sonia Carter from certain provisions of the Solicitors' Act 1896 was read a first time.

SUSPENSION OF RULES 88 & 89

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Rules 88 and 89 be now suspended in order to deal with the money Resolution of which notice has just been given.

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

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I want to voice my disapproval as to the method proposed to deal with this Resolution. The new year has just begun, and Government has seen fit to start the undesirable practice of dealing with Resolutions on the same day as the Resolutions have been given notice of. I think I can say that I mentioned to you in a private capacity on the adjournment of the House on the last occasion, that I was sure that on the resumption of the House you were going to find that Government would present you with a Resolution to be dealt with on the same day. I am sure the Hon. Ministers will object to matters like this being pushed into their hands at Executive meetings on the same morning, and asking them to deal with it. It is a lack of courtesy; and speaking of this matter, it is not a question of whether you have already approved of a principle. I do not care who is pleased or vexed. You either do things according to proper practice or you do not do them at all. What is wrong in giving consideration to this Resolution next Tuesday? I say again, this is an undesirable practice and I am not going to agree to it for the sake of peace. I have no apologies to make about it. Although criticisms have been made from time to time against this undesirable practice, you go on doing it all the time.

Mr. Tudor entered the House and took his seat.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Probably, Mr. Speaker, I should have made this point to clarify the matter for the benefit of honourable members. Let me say

that there is no new principle involved in this Resolution. It is really a continuation of the Pig Subsidy Scheme which was agreed to by this House some months ago. What really has happened is that the money has been exhausted, and in order to avoid any grievance or to cause any distress and inconvenience, we are asking the House to deal with this matter today.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Speaker, I too must register my disapproval of dealing with this Resolution today. When the Marshal was handing me a copy of this Resolution the honourable senior member for Christ Church was asking the permission of the House to deal with the same Resolution. That should not be so. I personally feel that a principle is a principle no matter what the item might be. Sir, to ask us to consider this Resolution for \$24,000 at so short a notice is really taking advantage of the fact, that because the preponderance of members are members of the Government's Party and they would support the Government in whatever it introduces, is the reason why we are treated in this way. I again appeal to the Government to use its discretion in matters such as this. Government should always bear in mind that each one of us is expected to give judgment on everything brought down to this House in a sensible way. We should see that nothing goes wrong.

Mr. GODDARD: I must object to this method of dealing with this Resolution. This sort of thing has already happened in this session; and because of objection of the House to it, other Ministers of the Government have seen fit to get Your Honour's permission to send out beforehand Resolutions which they proposed to deal with on the same day the Resolutions are introduced. I think it is quite wrong to get up here and ask that this Resolution be dealt with today. I have not read it yet. You may say that it will not be dealt with until later on today, but that is not all to it. The whole fact is that you are introducing something and we have come here unprepared to deal with it.

We are really unprepared to deal with this matter today. Personally, I do not think it is so urgent that we should deal with it today. The Department of Agriculture should have been well aware many weeks ago that this money for which this Resolution seeks to make provision was running out, and should have notified your Ministry earlier. I know of instances where people who were to get this subsidy had to wait for four, five or six weeks before they received it. Surely if the Department of Agriculture and the Ministry concerned were running smoothly they ought to have known well in advance that this money was running out. It is wrong in principle to come today to ask us to deal with this Resolution; and that is the reason why I object to it along with the other honourable members who have objected. I do think that the Honourable Minister must have received word from the department that the money was running out, and he could have given some intimation to the House even if he did not have the time to send out a Resolution. As I have said, other Honourable Ministers when they found themselves placed in a similar position, took the opportunity to ask your Honour's permission to send out the Resolution to honourable members beforehand so that they should know what was going to take place. We had no such courtesy today and this is absolutely wrong. I therefore must protest.

The question that Rules No. 88 and 89 be now suspended was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:—

Ayes: Mr. SMITH, Hon. G. H. ADAMS, Hon. Dr. CUMMINS, Hon. M. E. COX, Hon. C. E. TALMA, Hon.

R. G. MAPP, Mrs. BOURNE, Mr. BARROW and Mr. VAUGHN. — 9

Noes: Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY, Mr. J. C. TUDOR, Mr. ALLDER, Mr. HAYNES and Mr. GODDARD — 6.

3.35 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that although nine honourable members have voted "Aye" and six honourable members have voted "No" I must draw attention to Rule 93 which says:—

"No rule made and established by this House shall be discharged, suspended or in any way altered, but by the consent of 12 members at least."

Therefore, I do not think the House can proceed to deal with this Resolution to-day.

RESOLUTION OF SYMPATHY

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, in the interim between our last meeting and to-day, death has removed from this scene the mother of the honourable junior member for St. Peter; and in accordance with the ancient custom, I am moving that this House place on record its sympathy with the honourable member at the loss which he has sustained through the passing of his mother and that a copy of this Resolution be forwarded to the honourable member. It was my privilege to have known the old lady for a number of years, and she was one for whom I had some esteem. She was always cheerful. I had the honour of attending her in her last moments and even then, she showed that cheerfulness of spirit which could only come from one who was in possession of peace with her Almighty.

As I have said, Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House place on record sympathy with the honourable member and that a copy of this Resolution be sent to the honourable member.

Mr. GODDARD: In seconding the motion for the passing of this Resolution I wish to express from this side, sympathy with the honourable junior member for St. Peter at the passing of his mother. It is a sad moment in our lives when we receive a shock at the loss of our loved ones. I had that experience and I well remember the feeling which I had at that time. It is a sad moment to all of us and again, I express the deep feeling of sympathy from this side of the House to the honourable junior member for St. Peter.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to associate myself with all the words which have fallen from the two honourable members on both sides of this House in their expression of sympathy with my colleague in his bereavement. I too happened to have known this lady very intimately for many years, and I very sincerely desire to have myself associated with all that has been said about her. I shall now ask honourable members to give assent to the passing of this Resolution by standing in their places for one minute.

The Resolution was passed, honourable members standing in their places as requested by Mr. Speaker.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I should like to express my sincere appreciation to you and to the two honourable members who have made remarks in connection with the passing of my mother: and I wish to say how much I appreciate the sentiments which they have expressed.

CONGRATULATIONS TO HON. DR. CUMMINS

Mr. GODDARD: This is a more pleasant task. I am now moving a Resolution of congratulations to the honourable junior member for St. Thomas the Minister of Social Services, on the honour which Her Majesty the Queen has been pleased to bestow on the

Hon. Minister in the New Year's Honours List. This Resolution reads as follows:—

"Resolved that this House place on record its congratulations to the Hon. Dr. H. G. H. Cummins, C.B.E., M.D., C.M., M.C.P. & S., Minister of Social Services, for the deserved honour conferred on him by Her Most Gracious Majesty the Queen, and that a copy of this Resolution be forwarded to the honourable member."

3.45 p.m.

In doing so, sir, I am expressing the feelings of all honourable members of this House who know how pleased they were that Hon. Dr. Cummins was honoured on this occasion. He is of the most amiable character and disposition, and that has helped him considerably in his duties both in this House and outside of it. The co-operation which he has given to the Opposition and to members on this side of the House is only too well known to us, and we have got on extremely well together.

The Hon. Dr. Cummins has a wide circle of friends and I know that they have offered him their congratulations privately and personally; but it is a pleasure and privilege of mine today to move the passing of this Resolution of congratulations to him.

Mr. E. D. Mottley entered the House and took his seat.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to me to second the motion for the passing of this Resolution, although it is possible that some may feel that what I am going to say I would have said anyhow, because the hon. member and myself are so close together. But I do feel that the hon. junior member for Christ Church in speaking of the amiable disposition possessed by Hon. Dr. Cummins, is not merely doing something outstanding as a politician. It is a welcomed change from the type of things you expect from politicians with whom you differ.

The amiability of the honourable member is such that even with the greatest provocation he is capable of smiling and bearing, if not with joy, with no visible sign of discomfort, the attacks of his critics. Anyone who has had his experience at a most difficult time in the democratic awakening of Barbados, (his experience of continuing in spite of failure on several occasions to gain a seat in this House) must be a person who can put his country and the consideration of doing something for his country before personal ambition. How many people, if defeated two, three or four times in the same constituency, would have ran again; and would have been such a shining light in the democratic movement of this colony?

When I said that, (perhaps what I am saying would have come with greater force from someone other than myself) I was perhaps mindful of another thing. It is sometimes through sheer undiluted ignorance and sometimes through pure malice, that the critics of politicians in the colonies consider that the acceptance of such an honour is the selling of the soul of a politician. I do not know that any of us, who like the honourable member may be in a position to receive honours like these, really mind criticism of that sort. But to put it mildly, it is regrettable that added to the disadvantages of being in public life there should be this other disadvantage which as I have said, charity occasionally makes us feel is due to ignorance, and which knowledge makes us know it is often due to malice. I am referring of course to the suggestion that because a man's public services are recognized and he is given such an honour, that he has sold his soul. I have heard it suggested even of persons who have received the comparatively lowly honour of being a J.P., that they

are selling themselves to the Government or the Crown.

I feel sure that none of us will feel, as far as the honourable junior member for St. Thomas is concerned, that any recognition of his public services to this country could ever in any respect turn him from the path of duty which for thirty years or more he has followed in doing his utmost for the underprivileged of Barbados. Therefore, it is something more than personal friendship to the honourable member, that I cheerfully and joyfully second this motion on congratulating him on the honour which he so richly deserves.

Mr. VAUGHAN: I would like, Mr. Speaker, to associate myself with the remarks already expressed in congratulating the honourable member on the receipt of recognition from the Head of the Empire. I too remembered the persistence from long years ago, of the honourable member in his effort to enter public service. As was just stated, he was again and again rejected but never was daunted. Apparently he felt that his place was in public life; and that in public life he had something to offer to the community in which he was born, brought up and lived.

His experience is an example to others that when they are rejected once or twice, if their desire is deep and real enough and they persist, it is more likely than not that they will achieve public recognition for their persistence. That is a notable thing about the honourable member. He has never given up. I remember him associating himself in the old days with Dr. O'Neale. Then I think he was a member of the Public Health Board even before he became a member of the Vestry; and then again he strove with success to become one of the City Fathers. So the honour granted the honourable member this year is solely a recognition (if you may so put it) of his determination to serve the public before he passes from this scene. I heartily congratulate him on this occasion.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, nothing will ever make me reduce my stature on any occasion when a fellow Barbadian receives recognition for services to this community. I do not take umbrage, but I would like to assure the Premier that I would never be among those who feel that the receipt of an honour is an indication that one has sold his countrymen out. I do not think that any of us in Barbados accept this view except a few people with warped mentalities.

What I may say now may be an offence to some honourable members, but I make no apologies for it. I rise to associate myself with the congratulatory remarks which have been made to the Hon. Leader of the House, and I do so from my heart. I do so because his persistence has been a guide to many of us who for many years, had had political ambitions. Those of us who to-day call the honourable member genial, felt in the early days that his honesty and sincerity was above question. He was among those who pioneered; and he set an example for many of us to follow. It was obvious to those of us who were much younger in the early days that the honourable member had nothing, absolutely nothing to gain in attempting to offer his services as a representative of the people of this country. Although many of us who sit around this table to-day differ from him politically, we could not help but feeling in those days that in the honourable member there stood an honest and conscientious man, a man who was above all things proud of something which a lot of people in these days do not like to have mentioned. He was proud of his race as a Barbadian of African descent. 2.55 p.m.

We are very pleased to see to-day that Her Majesty the Queen has seen fit to bestow upon him this honour. It is true that within recent years members of the public have begun to feel, that honours such as this are bestowed on people without the people on whom they are bestowed being so singled out. I can mention several names but I shall not on this occasion. What I want to convey is, that members of the public feel that these honours are so bestowed that it leads them to wonder what are the services the recipients have rendered to the Community. If people must respect recipients of honours and the honour, (and I think we should) we must see that those who are recommended for honours have really done something to merit them; they have done something in the light of what the honourable junior member for St. Thomas has done to recommend him for this honour. We should look back and say "truly sir, that person has done something to deserve the honour he received."

In this case sir, I feel that the honourable junior member for St. Thomas has achieved this honour and has truly merited it. However, I would be lacking in my duty as a member of this House if I sat without making this remark, because it is one which pains me to my soul; it is this: on the last occasion when Her Majesty the Queen bestowed Birthday honours, it pleased her to bestow on the honourable junior member for St. Peter a most deserving honour and although honourable members on this side of the Table disagree at times with his tenacity in his urge for relationship between employer and employee, we had the courage to get up and congratulate him on this signal honour. I cannot help saying what a pity it was, that honourable members on that side of the table on that occasion did not think it fit to rise like men and pay tribute to the honourable junior member for St. Peter.

Mr. Speaker, even though it may appear as if I am blowing my own trumpet, I remember when the Hon. Premier was selected to represent the Commonwealth at the United Nations, that I stood on the floor of this House and said how proud we were that he was selected. If anyone of us is honoured for his services, whether he is a Socialist or non-Socialist, nothing will stop me from paying him a tribute.

Mr. Speaker, I associate myself with the remarks made by the other honourable members who paid tribute to the honourable genial doctor on his most deserving honour; but I cannot help remembering that only yesterday, when the honourable junior member for St. Peter had his honour bestowed upon him, members of the Government stuck to their seats and had not the courage to get up and congratulate him. I say that without any reflection on the honourable junior member for St. Thomas. Sir, there are times when we must cease to be petty. On this occasion, I publicly proclaim my pride on the honour which has been bestowed on the honourable junior member for St. Thomas. I have much pleasure in associating myself with the remarks of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition and which were so ably seconded by the Hon. Premier. There is something else that I can say of the honourable junior member for St. Thomas. I know that even if this honour were a knighthood, the honourable member would have taken it with the same humble dignity that he has taken this honour; and because of that, he should be a shining example to members of the Government and members of his party. I will only say this: take your honours with humble dignity and people will feel that it is not a sell out. Some people, when they get an honour, forget from whence they came; they feel that they are only riding on that honour; they believe it is the beginning and the end and cease to recognise the people who put them in power and in a position to

merit that honour. They cease to maintain the common touch with the man in the street. However, I am absolutely sure that this will not be the case with the honourable junior member for St. Thomas, not even if the honour bestowed was a knighthood.

4.05 p.m.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, in Barbados as in other communities there are numbers of simple-minded and uninformed people who accept the dicto of members of this House as if it were gospel truth; therefore, I regard it as my duty to rise merely to correct the misapprehension which may have been conveyed by the Secunder of this motion.

The Honourable Premier said that in this colony there are a number of people who regard either the acceptance or the bestowal on them of Imperial honours to be the result of selling one's soul or betraying one's country. The honourable member himself knows, to begin with, that even in Great Britain itself the acceptance by Trade Unionist and Socialist leaders of Imperial Honours and titles, for a long time created the utmost controversy in the Labour movement itself. He knows what took place when Sir Walter Citrine, Arthur Greenwood and others accepted Imperial honours. More latterly, much of the controversy has died down and it is more or less accepted as a common place for certain Trade Union leaders and certain leaders in Labour to be royally recognised. It is a common thing in Britain and other parts of the world and especially in the Colonial countries, that nobody would be surprised if a colonial feels that recognition by the Imperial Government was the result of services rendered more to the Imperial cause than to the colonial struggles. There is nothing strange about that. If you cast your memory back to the position in India just before it was granted independence, you would find that a number of Indian National leaders had refused on the one hand and on the other hand had given back to the Imperial Government Imperial honours and recognition, which they felt should not be accepted or retained so long as India remained a colony of Great Britain. It is impossible to think of Nehru or any other outstanding Nationalist leader being imperially recognised by the British Government; their recognition was along the line of jail, torture and what-not; and it is common knowledge that when Ghandi was offered a title by the British Government his reply was that he was most flattered by the offer but his acceptance of it in his opinion was incompatible with his self respect.

That is merely the point of view of a Colonial National leader who felt not only that the bestowal by the Imperial Government of titles and honours to a Colonial is bound to give rise to suspicion, but who was also convinced that the moment the British Government recognised his service in some way or other, his service must have been an advantage to the Imperial Government as well. Let us not think, that because one Colonial leader is singled out for honours that there are not others who have given equal if not greater service than he, and the question is bound to arise as to why Mr. So-and-So was singled out and given honours in preference to Mr. So-and-So. We can think of numbers of Barbadian leaders who have rendered yeoman service to the cause of West Indian Nationalism, and their service has not been so honoured by the Imperial Government. Are we to suggest that the present day so-called Labour leaders who have been imperially recognised have rendered greater service than men like Samuel Jackman Prescod, Charles Duncan O'Neale, "Chrissie" Brathwaite or Clennell Wickham? When we know as we do that they are outstanding West Indian leaders who have rendered equal if not greater service to the

cause of their colonies than people who have been singled out by the Imperial Government for favour and flattery, it is no cause for sacrifice and concern if the feeling is that some where along the line, Imperial recognition has been due, let us be charitable and say for services to the Imperial Government as for services to the colony concerned.

Right now in the colonies going on to self-government, all sorts of people —

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not want to interrupt the honourable member, but the motion which has been made is a motion for congratulations on the honour which has been bestowed on the Hon. Minister for Social Services. I have merely allowed the honourable member to dilate on the question of granting Imperial honours. I think the Chair has heard a lot of that for some time now, and I think the honourable member should conform to the text of the motion.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I appreciate Your Honour's latitude, but as I said, I merely rose to endeavour to correct any misapprehension which might have been conveyed in consequence of the remarks to which I have made reference.

4.15 p.m.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I think that on occasions like these when we are members of a body such as Parliament and one of our colleagues is so honoured, it is a right of any honourable member to pay tribute to the member who has been honoured. On this occasion it is not necessary for me to say all that has been said already; but everyone knows that the Hon. Minister of Social Services and honourable junior member for St. Thomas, is a member that is blessed with a temperament surpassing that of any other member in this Chamber.

I was pleased to hear the Premier talking about malice and about the hon. member's genial temperament. That is something which the honourable member will carry along down to the evening of his days. Let the Premier take that as an example, and realise that here is a man who can rise in public life without malice.

What one can most admire in the honourable member's public life is that during his long career, he has not had to make an excuse for his beginning in politics. He is today what he started out to be thirty years ago. (*Cheers*) Anyone like him must deserve tribute. And speaking of a man old enough to be my father, I say it is a pleasure for me to congratulate him on this occasion. We have had differences of opinion. Differences will arise with anyone; but this is a democracy, and the same source from which the Hon. Minister has had this honour granted to him, has given us the right to criticise each other without anyone feeling that he possesses the right of dispensation. It is that freedom which we must try to preserve; and when someone from among us has been so honoured as has been the honourable junior member for St. Thomas, I feel that we would be failing in public duty not to pay tribute to him. Those of us who still have some uses for the Bible will remember the dictum given by the Master when someone asked him a certain question. He said, "Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's."

I do not think that any of us would say that the honourable member is an Imperialist. We know that there are some members with Imperialist tendencies. But from our association with the honourable member no one could accuse him or make the slightest suggestion that he has ever shown any indications of playing up to the Imperial powers. He is not a social light; he does not believe in the frills, fancies and pomp of society, as

such. He has always lived a moderate life that has been an example for others to follow. There need be no question of anyone associating the honourable member with any imperialism or malice. I feel that I have a right to offer my congratulations to him.

I would like to say in passing if I am not overstepping my bounds, that I feel, Mr. Speaker, that when there is someone who has occupied the Chair as long as you have, as the honourable senior member for St. George said when he paid tribute to me, although we do not believe in Imperialist honours, yet if such honours are a recognition of public services I hope that the time is not far distant when members of this House will rise to pay a similar tribute and to express similar congratulations to Your Honour.

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, on an occasion of this sort I do not think that I am expected to say very much. I do thank honourable members for their kind sentiments and congratulations which they have showered upon me, and I hope always to deserve the esteem of these my colleagues. I thank you. (*Cheers*).

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to associate myself with the congratulatory remarks expressed to the Honourable Minister of Social Services.

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

NOTICE OF INTENTION TO DISCUSS EMIGRATION

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, before the business of the day is proceeded with, I would like to give notice of my intention to discuss the question of emigration later in the day's sitting. I am doing that for this reason: a few weeks ago I asked some Questions through Your Honour and immediately after that, the Premier issued a public statement which has since been followed by a statement by the Minister of Trade. According to Your Honour's ruling, no statement in the House can be replied to. If therefore, this is the policy of the Government in answering Questions, I am giving notice of my intention to move the adjournment of the House for five minutes later this evening to discuss the statement made by the Minister of Trade.

Mr. Lewis entered the House and took his seat

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

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

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second the motion.

The question was put and agreed to without division and Mr. Speaker left the Chair and the House went into Committee of Supply Mr. Smith being in the Chair.

Supplementary Estimates 1954-55 (Current) No. 31—General Hospital and Glendairy Prison

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, the first Resolution is one to place the sum of \$1,830 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1954-55, Part I, Current, as shown in Supplementary Estimates, 1954-55 No. 31 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

This Resolution, Sir, is for the benefit of two departments, the General Hospital and Glendairy Prison. As far as the General Hospital is concerned, the Addendum sets out what the money is wanted for. The position is, that as a result of the Dos Santos Report, the Nurses at the General Hospital who were receiving \$1.20 per week as laundry al-

lowance had that allowance increased to \$1.50 per week. The Orderlies had their laundry done at the Hospital up to the 30th September, 1953; but too much laundry was being done at the Hospital and they could not properly accommodate the laundry of the patients. In order to relieve that situation the Orderlies were paid an allowance of \$1.20 per week which was thirty cents per week less than the allowance paid to the Nurses. That was a mistake, and this Resolution seeks to bring the amount paid to the Orderlies up to \$1.50 per week. In the case of the Orderlies, the increase will date from the 1st April, 1953 and in the case of Ambulance Drivers it will date from the 1st October, 1953. To carry these proposals into effect it will cost \$1,225 to the end of the present financial year.

4.25 p.m.

The other Item concerns Glendairy Prison and is for the sum of \$605.

The facts are, that members of the staff and the men at the gate have a bucket system for convenience which they now use, but this convenience causes an offensive smell at the gate; and in consultation with the new Superintendent of Prisons it has been decided that as there is a room at the back of the office, (an old bath room) which is not used, it should be converted into some suitable convenience for the men who work in the office.

I take this opportunity to tell this Committee that the whole question of sanitation services for prisoners is now being reviewed. We are trying to do away with the old bucket system which we consider to be a disgrace not only to Glendairy Prison, but to the whole island. I take this opportunity to say that something will soon come down to this Committee dealing with that.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I did not hear the honourable member in his last remarks, and if in the course of my remarks I misquote him, I hope he will correct me. As far as the Head dealing with the General Hospital is increased, I want to make one general remark. I happened to visit the General Hospital about two or three months ago, and I found an antiquated system prevailing which I think the Hon. Minister should try to remedy. It is this: ordinary visiting days for patients in the General Wards as we all know, are confined to three days per week. It is appalling if you want to enter the General Hospital during the visiting hours on such days. For some reason or the other, the authorities there close one half of the gate and the large crowd which gathers outside cannot enter. As a result an unpleasant situation is created. I am suggesting that some attempt should be made from the administrative side, for more visiting time to be granted to people who wish to visit relatives or friends who are patients in the General Wards. I feel that more time can be granted to those people, and in accordance with what is done in the Pay Wards. As hon. members know, people who have relatives or friends in Pay Wards are granted the privilege of visiting them twice a day. I am not saying that it will be possible to do this to patients in the General Wards, but we should not continue with this antiquated system of making the people gather outside of the Hospital in 1955, and of allowing only three days per week for visiting those people in the General Wards. I believe if visiting hours are extended it would spread out that flow of traffic over a wider period. I am sure it would re-

lieve the congestion which prevails at the General Hospital on visiting days.

I am pleased to see the sanitary arrangements which are made for the officers and clerical staff at Glendairy Prison. This is where I did not hear everything which the Hon. Minister said on this subject. I do not know if there is any intention of making better sanitary arrangements for the prisoners there. I do feel that better sanitary arrangements should be provided for them; and when you do that, you are not providing a prisoner with any luxury. Although a man is in prison he still should have the necessary things to life provided for him. I do feel we should elevate our sanitary services at Glendairy to a higher stage and in the interest of the health of the community as a whole, we should remove what I regard as a most primitive way of the disposal of night soil. I would like to hear if any provision is made in the Estimates that are now being drafted for the removal of such a primitive way of disposing of night soil at the Prison.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: It is a long time since I have offered criticisms on the General Hospital, but I have refrained from doing so because of the coming into operation of Ministerial system, and because it can be said that the Hon. Minister or Social Services has been paying some attention to this department. I do hope however, that he will pay more attention to the criticisms which I will offer on this occasion. I will ask the Hon. Minister one question; when you have completed your proposed laundry system, would this practice of giving nurses and orderlies \$1.50 weekly laundry allowance be continued, or would you have in your laundry system your department to wash the uniform of these people? As I have said, I have refrained from criticising this department because I think it is fair to give the Hon. Minister a chance. However, I will ask the Hon. Minister to note that all is not well at the General Hospital. We are paying a lot of money at the General Hospital to juniors. I am not speaking of the general difficulties which prevail of two in a bed and things like that. I appreciate that the Government is trying to put those things right. I want the Hon. Minister of Social Services to mark this well. His first duty is to the people and not to his brother colleagues (doctors at the Hospital).

There was a case recently at the General Hospital in the Casualty Ward where the Casualty was telephoned and told that there was a difficult case which was to be brought there, because they could not get any doctor in the whole island to come and visit it. 4.35 p.m.

We got an Ambulance from St. Michael's Almshouse and we were willing to put the patient in it and take him to the Casualty so that he could see a doctor before he died; but the answer was that they could not handle that case because no doctor was on duty. In the name of God, if according to the terms of his appointment a doctor is supposed to be on duty in the Casualty all the time (because that is how I understand it,) how can it be said that there is no sense in bringing the patient to the Casualty because we cannot handle this dying case until tomorrow? If the Hon. Minister of Social Services is willing to have the name, I will give him the name immediately when I sit down; but I call upon him to investigate the matter. Within recent months several cases have been reported to me of people who went to the Casualty of the General Hospital and after remaining there for four to six hours, they had to leave and their friends had to scrape up money and carry them to the Clinic in Beckles Road.

I have refrained from making this criticism for a long time, but things are too bad now. It is common knowledge that doctors are out at Clubs gambling and getting drunk, when they should be on duty. The Ministers' first duty is to the people of this colony. Mr. Chairman, if the Hon. Minister wants chapter and verse for public information, I offer to give him chapter and verse when I sit down. Because of the attitude of the Hon. Minister of Social Services we have refrained from making criticisms, but this is something which has once been going on and it has drifted back again. There is also a feeling that if you make complaints against certain doctors, you will not get any redress, but if your complaints are against certain other doctors, matters will be redressed. I hope that the Hon. Minister is listening to all this. I am not accusing him of any of this; I am accusing his department. If statements are made against anybody at the General Hospital as far as I know the Hon. Minister has always investigated the matter and given satisfaction, so that one could be able to explain to the aggrieved person. However, on this occasion I call upon him to see that what is going on at the Hospital is wrong. We are paying good salaries to medical men and in the Casualty. That obtains everywhere except in Barbados; and when a doctor is at a Club a nurse cannot call him for fear of what might result.

I say that people are suffering as a result of the services rendered at the Casualty. At times a nurse may be good enough, but it is a question of the psychological effect and people want to see a doctor. We are drifting back to the position at which we were when someone went to the Hospital, fell off a bed and lost his life, because nobody was there to attend him. Something must be done and people brought to their senses; be you doctor or lawyer, you are just another man following a particular vocation. What would be your position, Mr. Chairman, if you did not have somebody to attend to your people—I mean the dead ones this time! (Laughter). I repeat: I want the Hon. Minister of Social Services to investigate the question of people waiting for hours to see a doctor when a doctor should be always on duty in the Casualty. There is no question of any shortage of doctors now, I am in a position to say that you have young medical practitioners coming out from England and applying at the Hospital for work, and they are told that they do not want anybody. I challenge the Hon. Minister of Social Services and the Hon. Premier to say that that is not true. There are those who would be paid for working part-time and would be glad to get on the staff and learn. I say that all is not well; why is this happening? It is not good enough for a Minister to sit down in a wheel chair and think that things are going alright. When those of us who make complaints make them, and you are satisfied that they are founded on fact, it is your solemn duty to investigate them in the name of the people of this colony, and the culprit whom you find guilty must be removed from office. He must be removed from office whether he be Englishman, Scandinavian or of any other nationality; and you should not remove Barbadians from office without giving them a fair trial.

4.45 p.m.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, I did not object to these Heads being taken together because there are only two Heads; but if both of these Items bring a lengthy debate it will be difficult for the Minister to deal with the two sets of questions concerning the two departments.

We see from Note 1 that certain allowances have been paid from the 1st April, 1953. That is not true.

There are certain people who have left the Hospital and have been denied these allowances. It was only after two or three debates of this House that they got their salary increases. When we pass money like this we should make sure that all the people entitled to it get it. If therefore, any of these Orderlies have retired or they have left the employ of the Government, the Government still owes them this allowance, or what is in this Note is not true.

I am asking on this occasion to let it be true that this allowance will be paid to all those who are entitled to it. We are not saying anything about people who happen to be in the employ of the Government when the Resolution is passed. That is dishonest. If your allowances are from the 1st of April and anyone leaves your employ on the 2nd April, you have a moral obligation to pay him what you owe. There are people who have worked for ten months in the Hospital and have not got these allowances I think that is a disgraceful example on the part of the Government for other employers to follow.

As far as the arrangement at the Prison is concerned, I am wondering if this matter has ever been drawn to the attention of the Government before. Has notice been taken now because there is a new Superintendent at the Prison? Or has notice been taken because we expect Royalty to visit the Prison soon? And in the same way that you are improving the sanitary conveniences at Government House, do you feel that you should improve them at the other Government House? When you remember that certain people have been in this House and in the Government for all these years, it is a shocking thing that they have only now discovered that there is room for improvement in the sanitary conveniences of the Prison. This is nothing to be proud about. The only thing to be proud about is that even at this late hour something is being done.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think I entirely agree that discussion about the Casualty at the Hospital comes under this Head, and so I am a bit reluctant to say anything about it. The members of this House should not wait until Resolutions for \$1,000 or \$2,000 are brought in to discuss matters of such vital importance to the health of the community. They should use their influence to cause a debate to ensue on conditions as they know them to be. The things we have heard this afternoon are so important, that they deserve the suspension of many of the things on the Order Paper so that a debate could ensue upon them. They are of sufficient importance that we should do something to get them corrected. (A MEMBER: You try and get a debate on them!) I feel that if at least an attempt is made and we do not succeed in getting the debate, you could bring an additional charge. You could bring a charge directly against the Minister of Social Services who is called the Leader of the House that not only did he refuse to remedy the situation, but he also refused to allow honourable members to air it.

When someone died in the Casualty the other day, one honourable member said he would table questions on it. I told him that would be a good way of preventing anything being said on it. Not only did the Hospital neglect someone who was dying, but the charge was so serious, that the very card which was supposed to be filed on the patient and his death was lost. Some of what the hon. senior member for the City said is true. (Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Some of it? Everything is true.) I will say at least that some of what he has said is known to me, and I have no doubt that all of it is true.

I can say sir, that there was one doctor (who fortunately for the island is not there now) for whom

you had to telephone to the club when he was supposed to be on duty. He was not only a pet of the Minister but he was a pet of the Director of Medical Services and of the Medical Superintendent, so that you could get nothing done where he was concerned. I was very sorry that the junior member for St. Michael adopted a wrong course in investigating that matter. If he had followed the right method he would have done the Hospital, the Government, and the people of Barbados a very valuable service.

Mr. VAUGHAN: Mr. Chairman, apparently sir, the complaints from the Hospital are so insistent that there is bound to be some truth in them. There are so insistent as to amount to a public scandal. I know a lady from St. Lucia, the wife of a Doctor, (she was in the General Hospital) and the first time she tasted food for the day was at three o'clock in the afternoon. Two or three nurses were changed and apparently no one told the other that the lady did not have breakfast. It was not that she was too ill to eat. Her husband, being a doctor himself, did not want to make a complaint; but I can establish that case for the Hon. Minister. I can establish it by a colleague of his, the husband of the lady. Although the Minister may not know him personally, he is his colleague, being a doctor.

I think the time has come for a public investigation of some of these complaints and to bring someone to punishment. Medical attention in the U.K. is a most serious thing. Some people seem to feel here that a doctor can do almost anything he likes and get away with it; but in the U.K. a doctor is regarded as just another citizen, and for any wilful neglect of duty on his part he is quickly brought to justice. That is so much so, that doctors in England are most particular about their patients, especially under the new health service. The idea that a doctor can do whatever he likes is a most stupid and backward idea; and it is held so by people, because it happens to be a famous profession.

We know that many private doctors do not come out at night now. It is true that sometimes people call doctors unnecessarily. But sometimes it is necessary; and the doctor very often tells the person to go to the Hospital. I feel that when a person goes to the Hospital on the advice of a doctor who cannot come out at night, the person should be seen speedily by the Hospital doctor. Sometimes a person has to wait for hours before seeing a doctor at the Hospital. There can be no excuse that such a situation cannot be remedied.

4.55 p.m.

Now sir, as regards prisoners I have mentioned before that the idea of the treatment of prisoners in this day, should not be the idea of the Middle Ages. I want to see the day come shortly when prisoners' cells are not shut out from the light of day. I have seen pictures of prisoners' cells with barred doors. I understand that at Glendairy Prison solid doors are to the Prisoners' cells. Government should spend some money in getting a new set of modern barred doors for these prison cells. Sir, to be shut up and denied of your freedom is a very great punishment. I am not saying that it is a punishment which you do not deserve if you commit an offence; but if anybody should be shut off from the light of God's day, that is a punishment beyond humanity. I am therefore asking the Hon. Minister to see to it for the sake of humanity that barred doors which do not shut out the light of God's day should be fixed to prison cells at Glendairy.

Mr. ALLDER: I am very glad to see that a few more honourable members are starting to sympathise

with the plight of men who are incarcerated at Glendairy Prison. This Resolution is for the improvement of sanitary conveniences at the Prison. I thought it was really for a general overhaul of the sanitary services there, but I noticed that it is only to improve the sanitary conveniences for the clerical staff. What I would like to draw to the attention of the junior member for St. Thomas is that the time is right not only for improvements to sanitary conveniences for the clerical staff, but that the whole system which obtains there need overhauling and brought up-to-date. We who pass Station House Hill on mornings, still see a couple of prisoners with puncheons of urine carrying somewhere. That system has been going on for over 80 years, and I am sure that with the general demand for improvement in sanitation, that it should be considered advisable that this Government stop that antiquated system.

I would also like to make an appeal to the Hon. Minister of Social Services; I would like him to make provision in the Estimates which are to be dealt with within a few months, for the introduction of a lorry system at the Prison so as to get rid of that system which has been there for too long and which has been considered by social reformers as an extremely punitive one.

I have attempted to draw the matter to the attention of the Government on several previous occasions, but no consideration seems to be given to my suggestion. I am repeating it again for humanity's sake; and I have every reason to feel that the Hon. Minister of Social Services is capable of sympathising in matters where it is necessary. The fact that his services to the colony have been recognised in high quarters shows that a small item such as this will not escape his notice.

I should like to suggest that this matter has been discussed very much by all and sundry; and I would like to strengthen my appeal by drawing to his notice that sometime ago, in my presence an accident between the Prisoner-drawn hand-cart and a motor vehicle was just averted because of the fact that the man whom they put at the helm, was incapable of controlling the cart. Sir, this vehicle is used for the purpose of bringing stones from Codrington to Glendairy. I presume that not until something happens between that hand-drawn vehicle and some other vehicle, will the Government bring a Resolution to this House for the purchase of a motor lorry to replace this cart. A motor lorry would only cost \$3,000 or \$4,000 but I presume provision will only be made for that after the Government has to compensate some owner of a vehicle for damages. I am going to appeal to the Government on behalf of those unfortunate individuals at Glendairy. I do not want to encourage crime, but I think it is my duty and the duty of honourable members of this Chamber to extend some sort of sympathy to them and make such changes up there as are necessary in this modern day.

5.05 p.m.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, one of the principles upon which all attempts at prison reform should proceed, is that the conditions which exist in an institution of punishment should not be more favourable than those which exist for the average citizen of the colony outside of the walls of the prison; but I would like to emphasize that in meeting the sanitary arrangements at Glendairy Prison, the Government would not be placing prisoners on a superior footing to the average citizen of Barbados who has not lost his freedom.

Because, I know of no single instance in which the average citizen of Barbados either voluntarily

or through the compulsion of necessity, has to sleep and eat in the same confined space as the sanitary arrangements for the disposal of soil and night soil in particular. The average size of a cell at Glendairy Prison can hardly be compared with the size of an ordinary domestic toilet, and within the confines of the four walls which serve a prisoner as his home and cage, he has to exist with a bucket which is purchased at the expense of the Government of Barbados, and all the unwholesome smells which the contents of the bucket exudes. In nearly every West Indian island that I have seen there is a water-borne system of the disposal of night soil and sewage. There are some people who feel that if you place a system with the chain which goes with it inside the cell of the prison, the prisoners might use that as a mechanism whereby they might effect their escape, or inflict some injury on the Warders who are supposed to protect them and the members from the escape of the Prison. However, years ago when "Grass Field" School was built largely through the energy and instigation of Mr. John Beckles, a system was put down at that School which I feel would be completely satisfactory in any Government institution, because it is both economical and safe; and that is, the system of having a continuous flow to a large conductor pipe which would go through all the cells in the block with an automatic system of elimination and flushing, which can be controlled outside the cells or the Prison block. Such a system is used in other Prisons in other West Indian Islands and in other Government Institutions; and there is no reason (apart from the humanitarian aspects which other members like the honourable member for St. John have dwelt upon) why the health of this community should be imperilled any longer by the present system of the disposal of night soil which is employed at Glendairy Prison.

I hope that the Hon. Minister of Social Services has paid a visit recently to that institution, because if he looks over the southern wall of the Prison he will see an intensive system of hand work of trenches and earth works, which remind one forcibly of the Siegfried Line in its more military days. The system is that these trenches are relatively shallow, and are used as a base for the disposal of the soil which comes from the Prison cells in the buckets which remain in those cells for twenty-four hours a day. If the Hon. Minister of Social Services went there in the day time he would be assailed at the entrance to the Prison not by noxious odours, but by the overwhelming smell of disinfectant odours which are struggling validly to overpower all the other smells which emanate from the precincts of Glendairy Prison. The disinfectant itself costs the Government a lot of money; and one of the reasons why I believe the present Superintendent wants to see a proper water toilet installed for the officers of the prison, is because that smell of disinfectant pervades the living quarters and the adjoining quarters of the officers who are so unfortunate as to have to live within the precincts of the prison itself. That is the first smell which assails the nostrils. If as I suggested, the Hon. Minister of Social Services proceeded to the Southern Wall, the panorama which would greet him is similar to that which exists on the eastern shores of the River Rhine, without lack of noxious odours which would be found on that river; but when the floods take place you can well imagine, Mr. Chairman, that in the passage of the storm water, nature provides its own water borne system and the inhabitants of the lower levels of Bridgetown and the merchants of the City proper are treated to the spectacle of human faeces flowing in the streets of

the capital; all that comes from behind the walls at Glendairy.

5.15 p.m.

In the interest of the health of the general public I am asking the Minister of Social Services to see that the Prisoners are given a water-borne system of sanitation for the disposal of the night soil. The cost of buckets and disinfectants over a period of three or four years, would more than compensate for the actual expenditure which would be involved. It would not be necessary to purchase individual units, as I have stated already. I am sure that the Director of the Public Works Department will be able to suggest some suitable system for this purpose.

I hope, therefore, that the \$605 is only a token in respect of the intentions of the Hon. Minister with regards to the inmates of the Prison in general. It is only right that the officers should be given these facilities first; but speaking to the Hon. Minister in his capacity as a medical man, I am appealing to him to see that something is done to eliminate the rather odious practice of disposal which is now carried on at Glendairy.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: In answer to the two honourable members who spoke last, I would say that it is unfortunate that they did not listen to my introductory remarks. I deliberately said, for the benefit of the honourable senior member for St. John, (because I anticipated what he would say), that there is a scheme which will come before the House in the Estimates to improve the general sanitary conditions at Glendairy. The amount in this Resolution is a small amount which is needed because as an honourable member said, this thing takes place right at the door of the Prison. I am referring to the noxious odours. That has to be attended to first and the other scheme will come down in the Estimates.

I will say, sir, that my attention was drawn to this situation by Inspector Franklin when he acted for three months at Glendairy as Superintendent. We discussed it, but inasmuch as the new Superintendent was on the way we did not finalise the discussion; and when he arrived, we discussed it again. As a result of that discussion this small scheme, plus the bigger scheme which will come down shortly, has been decided upon.

The honourable junior member for St. Peter referred to visitors to patients at the General Hospital. That matter is now under consideration in an effort to see what steps we can take to improve that situation. I myself am not happy about it. We are discussing whether we will be able in a short time to make an immediate improvement, inasmuch as there is a long term policy for improvement which will take place along with the overall extension of the Hospital.

The honourable senior member for the City asked about laundry allowances. He wanted to know whether these allowances will be discontinued when the new hospital laundry is built. Definitely so. All laundry for patients and the staff will be done at the Hospital when the new laundry is built. The honourable member also raised a point about complaints at the General Hospital *re* doctors and nurses.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I would like to correct what the Hon. Minister has said. I said nothing whatever about nurses.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: The honourable junior member for St. John suggested that we should have a Commission of Inquiry to investigate these complaints. I do not see that is necessary. All that it needs, is courage on the part of the public of Barbados. People come to me and make complaints

about nurses and about doctors. When I ask them if they are prepared to put their complaint in writing and go before an investigating board, what is their reply? The reply is, "You know my sister or my mother or my child is still in Hospital and something is liable to happen to them." (A MEMBER: A justifiable fear.) Until people who make these complaints are prepared to put them in writing in my presence or in the presence of whoever is to investigate these complaints, there will be no improvement in the situation.

One of the elementary principles of British justice is that a man who is accused should be faced by his accusers; and that is the system that I adopt. So it needs no Commission of Inquiry. It needs courage. If that courage is forthcoming, I will back up to the hilt those who make these complaints. Only two weeks ago a man met me in the yard below this chamber and complained about treatment meted out to his wife when she was in the Hospital. I asked him if he were prepared to put the statement in writing and give it to me. He said his wife was still in the Hospital and he was afraid to do it. I repeat, sir, that until these people are prepared to substantiate their complaints, I can do no good.

The honourable junior member for St. John referred to a lady from St. Lucia. What happened to her was entirely her fault. There was a bell there and if she did not get her meals, all she had to do was to ring the bell and call someone. To lay in bed until 3 o'clock and then complain, is childish. Those, sir, were some of the most important points raised by honourable members.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I want first of all to express my astonishment as to much of what has been said by the Hon. Minister of Social Services. He has said that people come to him and make complaints about grievances at the Hospital, and he is saying that unless they are prepared to sign a statement he can do nothing about it.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: I said nothing about signing a statement. I said they should put their complaints in writing. The honourable member is giving the impression that I will make out a statement and give it to someone to sign.

Mr. CRAWFORD: If you have a Board of Inquiry and a person makes a statement and does not sign it, what use is the statement? A statement only has value when it is signed. If the Hon. Minister would take his duties seriously he would not talk nonsense like that. The Hon. Minister should know that if the average person has someone in Hospital who has received ill-treatment he will not be prepared to run the risk of having that person victimised, or poisoned, or something of the sort by making a statement and signing it.

The Hon. Minister's duty is this: he is Minister of Social Services in Barbados, and the Hospital is the Barbados General Hospital (it is not a hospital in Africa or Jerusalem) and if a complaint is made, the Minister should have it investigated whether or not he gets a signed statement summarising the complaint. If someone actually died at the Hospital with nurses, attendants and doctors and other people there, and in his position the Hon. Minister could not get sufficient information to decide if it were really a case of neglect or in what direction the blame should be laid, he should not be where he is. To sit there and say that until such time as people are prepared to run the risk of victimisation conditions will remain as they are, is an indication of callousness, indifference and sheer irresponsibility for a man occupying his position.

5.25 p.m.

Sir, the second thing is that we all have conceded, that it is important to provide the best possible services at the General Hospital; but we must bear in mind that the General Hospital is not the beginning nor the end of medical attention in the island. I have complained before of the very grave conditions which exist because people in the island cannot get medical attention at night. Sir, you cannot get a doctor from six in the evening until six in the morning, unless you are a very special person. I believe any member of this House who may want a doctor can get one, even at midnight; but the general public cannot get a doctor at midnight, and there are cases in which people have died and more cases in which they die because they cannot get medical attention at night.

It might well be that the number of doctors in Barbados is so small that the majority are overworked in the day, and are too harassed and tired to answer calls at night. Of course, some are beyond the point where they do not bother to answer calls because they are wealthy; but I am asking that in the interest of the general public, the position with regard to the general public being able to obtain medical attention at night should be improved.

Now that we have all the doctors we want at the General Hospital, I am suggesting that there should be a panel of doctors at the Hospital to answer calls at night. You should have a panel of doctors there who on payment of the normal fee, (I am not suggesting that they should go to a person free unless the person cannot afford to pay the normal fee) can come to you at any hour of the day or night. Let us hope that sooner or later there will be a sufficient number of doctors here, who would begin to answer calls at night; because, while the number of them remains as it is, the people are dying for lack of medical attention at night. Sir, I am seriously suggesting that the Government is mindful of this situation and something should be done to alleviate it along the lines I have suggested, or along any other lines. I will agree to anything which is done to make available some sort of medical attention to people who may need it at night.

Mr. LEWIS: I think it would be well if the Hon. Minister of Health would hear one more member on this matter. I think he will be a bit shocked to learn of the terms and conditions which he wants adopted. I think there must be some way for a person to make a complaint of something at the General Hospital. Ministers are in the habit now of using up the columns of the Press making public statements and if persons who make complaints would not give their names, the Minister can make a public statement and say that he has investigated such and such a thing that was alleged to be happening at the General Hospital, and has found that the criticism is unfounded. I think it is wrong to expect in a small community like this, with the unemployment situation as it is, to say that you will only investigate a matter disclosed by a signed statement. Sir, if you are demanding that, and you do not get it, do you mean to say that you are not making any investigation at all? I suggest that he should go up there and find out if the criticism is a fact or not. The Hon. Minister of Social Services has said that he wants a signed statement, perhaps with the view that he can order an enquiry. I think it is ridiculous to expect that, especially under the circumstances. There is the fear that if you interfere with a doctor and he can get a chance at you, he will put you in the grave.

Sir, why have we in this country asked P.M.O's to keep out of the House? There was a time when

there were three or four of them in here. We have asked them to keep out of the House in order to allay the fears of the people. People felt that if a P.M.O. came and asked them for a vote and that particular P.M.O. did not get elected to this Chamber, they would lose their lives. That was the feeling of the public. Whether it was true or not, it was talked around. You may say that it is not true, but you cannot say that it is not a feeling which exists in the minds of the people.

There is a view that it is not right for the Minister of Social Services to be a doctor, because he is not going against a doctor. A lot of people believe that it is there where the trouble with the Hospital and other services are concerned. We have a case here and a member of the House was advised not to discuss the matter in the House, but to ask a question about it; we must not take advantage of people who are not sound mentally and perhaps physically as well. This is a case where I would like to see a different attitude adopted.

5.35 p.m.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: My case is different from that of the hon. members'. I would not talk about people in the Hospital not eating before three o'clock, because that would be hell. My complaint is that people in this country are complaining that doctors are being paid salaries, and they should be on duty at the Casualty for four, five, six, seven or eight hours a day. They are always on duty in big countries, and the Hon. Minister of Social Services has said that a doctor is on duty at the Casualty at all times and at all hours. If that is so, I will carry the person to him because this is a person who would not be afraid of any victimisation inasmuch as he does not use the Hospital in the proper sense of the word. Here I come with my own ambulance with a patient who has a stroke and ask you to do something for him because I cannot get a doctor in the island, and the answer is "No, I cannot do anything for him until tomorrow." If that is so, out the doctor should go, because there is no shortage of doctors.

There are grievances real and imaginary; several people come to me with grievances against nurses which are imaginary. A nurse cannot always be an angel; she has to be rough at times, but that is not what I have come in here to talk about. Hon. members will be afraid to come in here and accuse doctors. I have passed through the valley of the shadow of death and what difference does it make? You will never get in this colony people who are suffering as a result of some real grievance at the Hospital, making a statement and putting it in print. There is always a feeling that if you speak against a doctor he will poison you; and it is not a bad feeling either. If I wanted to be selfish, I would say thank God that I have worked myself in a position today that if I want a doctor at any time I can get one; I can get as many as five, and it is not confined to any colour either. Because the Premier and the Hon. Minister of Social Services can telephone and get a doctor, do you think it is fair to the people who have elevated you to power to allow a doctor at the Hospital to get drunk and not be on duty? Out they must go. I could get five doctors to come to me if I want to, but I suggest to the Hon. Minister of Social Services that if anybody tells him anything, he has his clerks and secretaries who can investigate the matter; and I agree that you must have some statement on which you can go. But do not ask people to go into any lawyer's office; because, as you tell a man about making a statement, he thinks of a lawyer. Let one of your clerks or secretaries write out a statement for people and keep it; do not pigeon hole it or put it in the waste paper basket.

At the Maternity Hospital where you had a matron who was accustomed to slapping, beating and biting people, I complained to the honourable member who was not a Minister then. I say there was a case at the Maternity Hospital in which the Matron was accustomed to be brutal and bullying people, but a man made it quite clear that he was not going to the honourable senior member for St. Joseph but he was going to see Mottley, and before he got to Strathclyde he had the whole staff calling him back. Everybody knows that I would talk in here, because it was the woman and her husband who elected me here, not any Matron. I repeat, you must have a statement on which to go, therefore let your secretary write out the facts and when you get them, please make an investigation.

5.45 p.m.

Among the things that I have mentioned, one case was reported by Mr. Alleyne of New Castle in which a man got his foot badly hurt in an accident. He went to the Hospital and after remaining there for five hours with the blood pouring out, the man had to be carried to Dr. Johnson in St. Joseph. Is it not a fact that a doctor must be on duty at the Casualty? Take the case of a Police Station. If someone is taken to a Police Station and a lawyer goes there to arrange for bail, the first thing he asks is which Superintendent is on duty. The Superintendent may not be actually there, but one has to be on duty.

In some hospitals, even if there is nothing to do in the Casualty the doctor on duty still has to sit there waiting to do the work that he has been paid to do. In others he may be able to go into his room; but in Barbados he can go to the club and he can even shake dice.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am asking the honourable member to address the Chair. I see him turning his face all around.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I did not know that turning my face away from the Chair meant that I am not addressing the Chair, I always address the Chair. I am appealing to the Minister. I agree with him about making a statement. In that connection he and some other honourable members seem to be at cross purposes. But do not call upon a man and tell him to go and write a statement. The man may not even be able to write; and even if he can sign his name, he may not be able to prepare a statement properly summarising the complaint that he is making. You have secretaries, and assistant secretaries and deputy secretaries etc. They should assist such a man to make a statement.

There are no two ways about it. There is the feeling that when complaints are made against certain medical men, as long as they are favourites, nothing will be done about the matter. I will go as far as to say that some of the nurses are even afraid to complain about certain doctors. I am not talking in the air. If you took a plebiscite tonight you would find out that what I am saying is true. Only if you lived in Mars as some of the Ministers do, you would not know it.

I believe that the staff of any Government Department or institution should be disciplined. I believe in discipline. But apparently the tendency is to discipline certain people and let others like doctors and the better off people run wild. If people from top to bottom are drawing money, then people from top to bottom should be disciplined. If the doctors because they are at the top can be outside doing as they like when they should be on duty, do you not expect that the nurses will follow that example?

I could call several names to establish what I am saying. If this is published and the Director of Medical Services sees it, he will realise that the members of the House are waking up to the position; and if he realises that the Government will sink party prejudice, you will see the difference. It is the Government's duty to see that these things are investigated; not to sit complacently and say that these things are not true. As soon as the people concerned see that the Government will back us up when we make such statements you will get the situation improved.

I remember well that when I was merely Churchwarden of St. Michael, I had a matter that affected the lives of people of this country. Do you think that I called in to see the Director of Medical Services? I sent him my compliments and asked him to call at my office. When we make these complaints about the Hospital, let the Minister issue an order for the Director to come to his office. Some of you kow-tow too much to people, (that applies to the Premier too,) but you want to lord it over people in another position. Certain people have put you in the position that you now occupy and then you want to be subservient to others. Let them laugh and grin like a bunch of hyenas. Everyone knows that what I am saying is true.

I know what it is. I have come to this House and said that I heard Colonial Secretaries and Governors etc., use derogatory terms about you. You laughed at me; but you will never get me associated with them making fun at you. That is what they do and you should make them know their places or boot them, kick them out.

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: Because I do not shout as loudly as the honourable member, he feels that I kow-tow. I do not shout at all, but I know what is due to me. I have been associated with the Hospital since 1942, before it became a Government Department. It was then run by a statutory board. I remember well two cases which I tried to remedy. Once a man complained to me about a nurse. I stated the complaint to the Board and the Board decided to investigate it. The nurse of course denied it. When I called on the man to come forward and give evidence he said let the matter drop. There was another case in which complaint was made to me. I moved at the Board that it be investigated and the lady who had made the complaint came forward. She said she had not put the matter in the way I had put it, and that I must have misunderstood what she said. She tried to pass the buck to me. From that time on I have always told anyone who complained that they must put it in writing.

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

On the motion of Hon. Dr. Cummins seconded by Hon. M. E. Cox, Mr. Chairman reported the passing of the Resolution in Committee and Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On motions of Hon. Dr. Cummins seconded by Hon. M. E. Cox in each case the Resolution was read a first and second time and agreed to.

5.55 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to move that this House do now adjourn for half an hour.

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

6.00 p.m.

On resumption.

BILL TO AMEND LAW RELATING TO CIVIL LIABILITIES AND RIGHTS OF THE CROWN

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to take Order No. 3 as the next Order of the Day.

There being no objection leave was granted the honourable member.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Premier: second reading of a Bill to amend the law relating to the civil liabilities and rights of the Crown in right of its government of this Island and to civil proceedings by and against the Crown in right of its government of this Island to amend the law relating to the civil liabilities of persons other than the Crown in right of its government of this Island in certain cases involving the affairs or property of the Crown in such right and for purposes connected with the matters aforesaid.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I hope that honourable members have had time since this Bill was given its first reading, to read carefully the Objects and Reasons given, even if they did not read the actual wording of the Act; because while some of the sections would of course be clear to legal minds, some honourable members might have felt "at sea" with the explanation given to each clause. I do not know if I can add anything to what has been set out in the Objects and Reasons, because the effect of each clause is clearly stated in the Objects and Reasons.

In broad outline, this Bill is doing in Barbados what has been done from time to time in nearly all of the Dominions and in some colonies. I have not personally checked on that; but what was begun in an Australian State and then became Dominion law after that, as recently as 1947, became the English law, that is: the Crown giving up its rights to say that the King as such could do no wrong but in matters arising out of contract or relating to real or personal property, an action can be brought against the Crown. In effect this Bill puts the Crown in the same position as any person who is liable to be sued.

As honourable members will know, a person is always liable to be sued if he is wrong in his acts. If a policeman through negligence does something wrong, you can sue him, but you could not sue the Crown because of the doctrine which I have just enunciated,—that is, that the Crown can do no wrong. Of course, the practice has been in most colonies that if a suit took place between some person and some servant of the Crown and damages were awarded against the person who was acting as an agent of the Crown, those damages would be paid by the Crown. Normally speaking, if the offended person were not so to speak over guilty of negligence, if the damages were not terrific, and if the Treasury felt it could afford to pay the damages, the damages would be paid out of the Treasury by the Crown. The Crown carried out the moral obligation of finding the money to pay for the wrong acts done by its agents, or to use the normal expression, by its servants. As lawyers know, Civil Servants are not servants in the same sense as other persons of the Crown.

The Crown of course is protecting itself in this Bill; because Civil Servants will have to indemnify the Crown, though any damages may be paid out by the Crown. If that were not done, taxpayers would be held at the mercy of careless servants, because the money which may be paid out of the

Treasury would not be recoverable, since it went out for the wrong doings of its servants.

I think I should make this last point since one can easily see, that some taxpayers may feel that they will be hit very hard because the Crown will now be called on to pay for the carelessness of its servants. They may say: "It is pretty hard that I have to pay taxes for every mistake a servant of the Crown may make, inasmuch as the injured can now sue the Crown." I am therefore issuing a warning to all Civil Servants that by this Bill they are liable to pay the damages, although in the past, persons in the lower grade of the Service were not called upon to pay damages. In common fairness to the Crown it must be made clear to all Civil Servants, that their negligence although they were acting as agents of the Crown, would be foisted on them. However, it is only fair that a private individual who suffers from some act or neglect on the part of some Civil Servant should be in the position to recover damages if he cares to bring an action. He should be placed in the same position as he is placed to recover it against a fellow subject.

Substantially, the law is this: Clause 3 of the Bill makes it clear that a cause of action, which before the passing of the Act, might have been pursued by petition of right can now be pursued by proceedings taken in accordance with the provisions of the Act without presenting a petition of right and without the necessity of Her Majesty's fiat.

Clause 4 removes the immunity of the Crown for wrongs committed by its servants or government departments, and provides that henceforward the Crown will be liable in tort to the same extent as a private person in respect of the following classes of wrongs:—

1. Torts committed by Crown servants or agents.
2. Breach of the duties which a private employer owes to his servants or agents at Common Law by reason of being their employer.
3. Breach of the duties attaching at Common Law to the ownership, occupation, possession or control of property. This includes liability for nuisance and dangerous animals or chattels.
4. Liability for breach of a statutory duty.

Sub-clause (5) exempts the Crown from liabilities for anything done or omitted by a person discharging judicial responsibilities.

Clause 5 deals with industrial property such as patents trade marks copyright, and provides that when a servant or agent of the Crown acting within his authority infringes a patent, registered trade mark or copyright and the infringement is committed with the authority of the Crown, proceedings shall lie in respect of such infringement against the Crown. Subclause (3) is intended to make it clear that a person can ascertain his rights in regard to infringement from this clause alone and has no need to look further in the Act.

The objects of Clause 6 are—

- (1) to give the Crown a right of indemnity against those of its servants who render the Crown liable in tort;
- (2) to apply to the Crown the law as to contribution between joint tortfeasors; and
- (3) to provide that the Crown cannot rely upon contributory negligence as an absolute defence.

Clause 7 imposes liability on the Crown for loss or damage to registered inland postal packets up to the amount covered by the registration. The paragraph at the end of the proviso to subclause (2) puts

the onus on the Crown of proving that the loss of damage was not due to the negligence of any servant of the Crown. The Crown is thereby put in the same position of an ordinary bailee who is responsible for the safety of goods delivered to him. Subclause (3) is intended to protect the Post Office against a multiplicity of actions.

Clause 8 deals with the liability in respect of members of the armed forces and relates only to claims in respect of death or personal injury suffered by a member of the armed forces. Where a soldier causes injury to a fellow soldier (apart from the Act) the latter might make a claim against the former soldier at Common Law. This clause prohibits such a claim against the first soldier and the Crown if both soldiers were on duty at the time or the first soldier was on duty but the claimant was not, provided the latter was on military premises, etc. In every case, however, the prohibition against bringing a claim applies only if the claimant is covered by a certificate issued by the Minister of Pensions in the United Kingdom in the case of a United Kingdom soldier, that the injury is attributable to service for the purposes of an award under the Royal Warrant, and by a certificate issued by the Governor in the case of a local soldier that the injury was attributable to service for the purposes of a gratuity or pension under any local enactment. Exemption from liability is limited to claims arising from death or personal injuries, and does not extend to false imprisonment, defamation, malicious prosecution or other wrongs. The exemption from liability will only apply where the Act on which the claim is based will be treated as attributable to service for the purpose of entitling the soldier to a pension or other award.

While the real purpose of this legislation is to make the Crown liable only to the same extent as a private person, there are many duties which the Crown has to perform in relation to the defence of the realm and public safety, and Clause 9 is intended to save those prerogative rights or any acts done for such purposes under statutory authority.

Clauses 10, 11 and 12 deal with the jurisdiction and procedure of the various Courts in which actions under the Act may be brought. Ancient procedures are abolished and the proceedings now proposed will be as far as practicable similar to proceedings between private persons.

By Clause 13 the Crown will be able to interplead and interpleader proceedings can also be taken against the Crown.

Clause 14 provides for proceedings to be brought by or against the Attorney General.

Clause 15 provides for the service of documents.

Clause 16 provides for removal and transfer of proceedings from a Superior Court to the Assistant Court of Appeal or Petty Debt Court or vice versa.

Clause 17 deals with the nature of relief which may be given by or against the Crown. This relief is the same as may be given in actions between subjects, except that a Court cannot grant any injunction or make a decree for specific performance or restitution of property against the Crown.

Clause 18 deals with costs by and against the Crown. Normally the Crown never paid or received costs, but now the Crown will be treated in the same manner as a private party.

I think honourable members need no further explanation than that contained in the Objects and Reasons. I cannot really add anything useful to that; but if there is anything honourable members need me to help them on, I will be very glad to do so. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time. 6.45 p.m.

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

Mr. GODDARD: As the Hon. Premier has said, the "Objects and Reasons" of this Bill are very long. I will not repeat what he has said, but I am told that this Bill is long overdue; because as the Government takes on greater responsibility, it becomes very obvious that there will be more opportunities when the subjects of Her Majesty the Queen might want to have recourse to this privilege. There are all sorts of new departments of Government and there is more traffic on the road for which they are responsible. The Objects and Reasons set out clearly the purpose of the Bill; this Bill is very much of a legal nature and I welcome it. I see how necessary it is to have it to-day.

Mr. LEWIS: In spite of the comparatively long adjournment of the House, this Bill was not circulated until recently. It is really a Bill in respect of which I suppose it would be better for us to hear from other lawyers in the House, as to whether they have read it through and seen whether there is anything wrong. I have read the Objects and Reasons and it appears to me as if it is a very good Bill to be put on the Statute Book, and I am wondering how much harm has been done on account of its absence from the Statute Book for all this time.

There is one thing on which I would like the honourable Introducer to help me, and that is in respect of Clause 4 in which there are four liabilities for breach of statutory duties. I am not saying that it is a statutory duty of the Government, but since holidays with pay is a statutory duty of an ordinary employer I am wondering if it now becomes a statutory duty for the Government. An ordinary employer is liable for all the penalties which we have in the Holidays with Pay Act, if he employs anybody for a period of twelve months continuously or casually and if a certain time is reached and he does not give the employee two weeks holiday. When I read that, I wondered if this Bill would make such a condition applicable to the Government. I do not know if there is any word to express it, since the Government of this colony can come to the Legislature and say that they insist that employees be given two weeks holiday but in the case of a person who comes to work with the Government, they can tell him that he has to work for two years before he can get a holiday. Mr. Speaker, I do not know what word you can use for that. The matter goes further than that; the Government will take on a student nurse at the Hospital and train her for four years, and then decide if she is really worthy of their keeping her; and they take her on probation for two years and during that time, she is not entitled to any holiday. That is a ridiculous state of affairs where the Government is concerned; and what is worse, they insist upon it. They have just sent away one employee who was with them for more than two years; and on account of some technicality they would not give her one day's holiday. In fact, they gave nine days' holiday because they wanted to get her out of the department. I am wondering if this regulation for breach of statutory duty will apply there. I remember that the matter was discussed in this House and the Minister in charge of the item under discussion, thought that it was impossible to employ anybody for two years and not give him any holiday. This is a Bill in respect of which you would have to be trained legally in order to understand it.

In case we do not read each of these Clauses in Committee, I am asking the honourable Introducer to look at Clause 35 and see if the word "Therein" in Sub-clause 2 should not be "Herein." I am giving the honourable Introducer this early opportunity to

look at this word so that some attention can be paid to it. It is a matter of legal phraseology pure and simple. While the second reading of this Bill was being moved, I looked through the Bill and noticed that word. I would like to hear something about this amount for a registered letter, but I take it to be the regular amount which is given for a registered letter or a postal packet which has been lost.

6.55 p.m.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Leave Regulations apply to Civil Servants and not the ordinary Holidays with Pay Regulations. It may be that the terms of employing some members of the unestablished staffs are different in the sense that they are not permanent Civil Servants; and if they put in a certain number of days, they are entitled to leave. In that case everything appears in the terms of employment. The relationship of the Crown to Civil Servants is not the relationship of master and servant. If the Crown does not pay a Civil Servant he cannot sue the Crown, although it would be silly of the Crown to refuse to pay. The Crown can break its contract with a Civil Servant at any time. If you employ a man for a year you have to give him six months' notice. If the Crown says that there is no money in the Treasury that law can be automatically repealed. But even with the law the Crown can refuse to pay.

Civil Servants have much better terms under the Colonial Regulations because they get leave with pay, casual leave etc. Every year we pass a certain amount in the Estimates to pay substitutes for Civil Servants on leave, because the person on leave, still draws his salary. There is no hardship on Civil Servants if they do not come under the Holidays with Pay Act. If a member of the Unestablished Staff puts in a certain number of days he is counted as a full time person.

The question that the Bill be read a second time was put and agreed to without division.

On the motion of Hon. G.H. Adams, seconded by Hon. Dr. Cummins, Mr. Speaker left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. Smith in the Chair.

Clauses 1 to 15 inclusive were called and agreed to.

Clause 16 was called. It read as follows:—

16. If in a case where proceedings are instituted against the Crown in a Petty Debt Court or in the Assistant Court of Appeal an application in that behalf is made by the Crown to a Superior Court and there is produced to the court a certificate of the Attorney General to the effect that the proceedings may involve an important question of law, or may be decisive of other cases arising out of the same matter, or are for other reasons more fit to be tried in a Superior Court, the proceedings shall be removed to a Superior Court.

Where any proceedings have been removed into a Superior Court on the production of such a certificate as aforesaid, and it appears to the court by whom the proceedings are tried that the removal has occasioned additional expense to the person by whom the proceedings are brought, the court may take account of the additional expense so occasioned in exercising its powers in regard to the award of costs.

(2) Without prejudice to the rights of the Crown under the preceding provisions of this section, all rules of law and enactments relating to the removal or transfer of proceedings from one court to another shall apply in relation to proceedings against the Crown:

Provided that an order for the transfer to a Petty Debt Court or the Assistant Court of Appeal of any proceedings against the Crown in a Superior

Court shall not be made without the consent of the Crown.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, I see here that under this Bill if anyone wants to bring a case against the Crown, notice is to be served on the Attorney General. Would that exclude him from defending the Crown? What is the position? I suppose that it is only natural that notice must be served on the Attorney General; but what would be the position? Because, it means that the Crown would be robbed of the services of its Chief Crown Law Officer.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: The provision to serve notice on the Attorney General is purely formal. He can still represent the Crown as Attorney General and fight the case.

The question that Clause 16 stand part was put and agreed to without division.

7.05 p.m.

Clauses 17 to 34 were called separately and passed.

Clause 35 was called.

Sub-section (2) reads as follows:—

“Except as therein otherwise expressly provided, nothing in this Act shall—”

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I do not think that there is anything wrong if the word “herein” is used, or whether the word “wherein” is used. Wherever “wherein” is used it seems to refer to the whole Act, while “herein” seems to refer to this Clause. I beg to move that Clause 35 stand part of the Bill.

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

The question was put and agreed to.

The first Schedule was called and passed.

The second Schedule was called and passed.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, perhaps it is not necessary for me to say this publicly, but if honourable members look on the last page of this Bill they will see a comparative table showing where parts of this Act come from. It is put there purely for the benefit of hon. members who want to see where this Act came from. It is nothing to be incorporated in this Bill. Similarly is this so, with all the side notes which you see aside of different sections of the Bill. All these will be omitted from the Act when it is printed.

Mr. LEWIS: I remember seeing notes similar to these in a previous Bill which came before this Chamber, and I think they are very helpful to honourable members. In the previous Bill this comparative table was put at the beginning. I think they were printed at the back of this page in this instance more for the sake of the page.

On motion of Hon. G. H. Adams seconded by Hon. Dr. H. G. Cummins Mr. Chairman reported the passing of the Bill in Committee.

Mr Speaker resumed the Chair, and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. G. H. Adams, seconded by Hon. Dr. H. G. Cummins, in each case the Bill was read a third time and passed.

BILL TO GENERALISE AND AMEND LAW RELATING TO THE LIMITATION OF ACTIONS

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Premier: second reading of a Bill to generalize and amend the law relating to the limitation of actions in respect of persons acting in execution of statutory and other public duties and matters connected therewith.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: This Bill is a sort of complementary Bill to the one we have just dealt with. Again, hon. members will see a comparative table to show where the various clauses of the Bill

have been taken from. The Objects and Reasons set out very clearly the purpose of the Bill. I will only just say that we having passed the preceding Bill, the question of limitations of actions naturally arises, and it has been thought best to put that legislation in a separate Bill.

This bill therefore seeks to provide that actions against Public Authorities for acts done in the execution of public duties should not be brought after the expiration of one year from the date of accrual of such action and, in case of criminal proceedings, after six months. The provisions are in substance identical with those in the United Kingdom and many of the colonial territories and include a provision for extension of the period of limitation for actions in cases of disability such as infancy, lunacy, etc., an extension of which is not permitted under existing enactments.

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

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

7.15 p.m.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, this really is another Bill of similar nature to the one which we have just passed. I had the opportunity of reading this Bill and of course, not understanding everything that is in it.

There are just one or two little things in this Bill. Legally, the word "Accrued" and "Occurred" may mean the same thing; however, I do not want to delay the Bill in Committee by dealing with these things, and I am therefore giving the Hon. Premier the opportunity of telling me how foolish I am when he is actually moving the passing of these Clauses. If you would permit me, sir, to say this, subclause 5 of Clause 5 does read a little funny to me. This is what it says:—

"A person shall be deemed to be claiming through another person, if he became entitled by, through, under or by the act of that person to the right claimed".

It seems to me, as if you are having too many "by's" although you cannot have too many words in the law so as to make it more lucrative to pay for an interpretation. There seems to be something of a joke in Clause 4. That Clause ends this way:—

"the action may be brought at anytime before the expiration of one year from the date when the person ceased to be under a disability or died, whichever event first occurred."

I am not saying that that is not legally correct, but it appeared to me to be something of a joke when I read it. That can be taken to mean that you are under a disability after you have died. [Mr. CRAWFORD: You can die before you get seriously disabled.] I enjoy reading that part of the Bill.

Another point which interested me, is that of the appointment of a Curator. I did not associate that word with anybody who is of unsound mind. I thought that that word was something in connection with a Museum. There is an obvious error towards the end of Sub-paragraph (A) of Sub-clause (2) of Clause 3 which the Clerk should change lest we get the Bill thrown back at us. This is a Bill on which I am unable to do anything but display my ignorance, and hope that the Bill is in order.

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

On the motion of Hon. G. H. ADAMS, seconded by Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS, Mr. SPEAKER left

the Chair, and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. SMITH being in the Chair.

Clause 1 was called and passed.

Clause 2 was called.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: In moving that Clause 2 stand part of the Bill, I should just like to ask the honourable junior member for the City what was his point in connection with this Clause. I beg to move that Clause 2 stand part of the Bill.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

Mr. LEWIS: Sub-clause 5 reads as if one of the "by's" is superfluous. I think that you should take out one of the "by's" and let the Sub-clause read intelligently.

7.25 p.m.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I do not know that lawyers are as careful in their punctuation as some of us others are. I would put a comma after the "of" and then it would not be clear. In ordinary English you would put a comma after "of" and not between the last preposition. You could perhaps also put a comma after "under." In any case it would be clear to legal interpretation.

The question that Clause 2 stand part was put and agreed to without division.

Clause 3 was called and passed.

Clause 4 was called. It reads as follows:—

4. If on the date when any right of action accrued for which a period of limitation is prescribed by this Act, the person to whom it accrued was under a disability, the action may be brought at any time before the expiration of one year from the date when the person ceased to be under a disability or died, whichever event first occurred, not withstanding that the period of limitation has expired:

Provided that—

- (a) this section shall not affect any case where a right of action first accrued to some person (not under a disability) through whom the person under a disability claims;
- (b) when a right of action which has accrued to a person under a disability accrues, on the death of that person while still under a disability, to another person under a disability, no further extension of time shall be allowed by reason of the disability of the second person;
- (c) no action to recover land or money charged on land shall be brought by virtue of this section by any person after the expiration of thirty years from the date on which the right of action accrued to that person or some person through whom he claims;
- (d) this section, so far as it relates to the disability of infancy or unsoundness of mind, shall not apply to any action to which this Act applies, unless the plaintiff proves that the person under a disability was not, at the time when the right of action accrued to him, in the custody of a parent; and
- (e) This section shall not apply to any action to recover a penalty or forfeiture or sum by way thereof, by virtue of any enactment, except where the action is brought by an aggrieved party.

Mr. LEWIS: I take it that it is quite correct to say that someone may be under a legal disability after he is dead.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: There again it is the question of how lawyers write. What it means is that if you have a right to bring a case and you are under 21 years of age, you cannot bring a case. You begin to have a year after you are 21, or a year is given to you from the time that you die before the age of 21, whichever period is the shorter. To put it more simply, if you are ten years old now and a right accrues to you, when the disability ends you have up to the time you are 22 to bring a case and not after that. If you die before you are 21 your executor has a right to bring a case from another 12 months from the date of your death.

The question that Clause 4 stand part was put and agreed to without division.

Clauses 5 to 10 inclusive were called and agreed to.

Clause 11 was called. Sub-section (1) reads as follows:—

"The enactments mentioned in the Schedule to this Act are hereby repealed to the extent specified in the third column of that Schedule."

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, from the previous explanation I think I see the reason for saying "that Schedule" in this Bill. Really and truly it was only one Schedule in the Bill. If there were two or more, I would agree in saying "that Schedule" because there might be a second one. The use of these words in this Bill gives the impression that there is more than one Schedule.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I really do not see that it makes any difference, and it reads infinitely better than the horrible expression "said."

Mr. LEWIS: I did not say it was wrong. It was quite clear to me.

The question that Clause 11 stand part was put and agreed to without division.

The Schedule was called and agreed to.

On the motion of Hon. G. H. ADAMS, seconded by Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS, the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Bill in Committee and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair, and reported accordingly.

On motions of Hon. G. H. ADAMS, seconded by Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS in each case the Bill was read a third time and passed.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to take Order No. 10 as the next Order of the Day.

There being no objection leave was granted the honourable member.

BILL TO IMPLEMENT CERTAIN TERMS OF THE AGREEMENT FOR TECHNICAL CO-OPERATION

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Premier: second reading of a Bill to implement certain terms of the Agreement for Technical Co-operation assistance entered into between the Government of the United Kingdom and the Government of the United States of America.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I am asking honourable members to do this now, because heavens knows what will happen later on, and I would like to get this through. As honourable members will see the Bill is a result of this two way agreement between the U.K. and the U.S.A., and it covers the position of persons who may come to this island under the Agreement for Technical Co-operation Assistance. Under that Agreement employees of the U.S.A. engaged in the projects arising out of the agreement are exempted from Income Tax and certain Customs duties. Materials brought in for the purpose of technical assistance are exempted from Customs duties. This agreement has been entered in between the

two Governments; and those countries of the British Empire to which technical assistance may go, are now being asked to come into line.

We have at present two United States citizens who have come down to help us under the technical co-operation agreement chiefly with the Aided Self Help Housing. I have reason to believe that if the Government or a Minister were to approach them on other matters, they would be willing within their ability to help although they are specifically here in connection with Aided Self Help Housing.

7.35 p.m.

I say that, because some people have been wondering what has brought these people here, and what exactly they will be doing. It is going to cost us a loss on Customs Duties it is true, but it is reasonable.

Honourable members may have seen some reference to them in the newspapers. It is a fact that they are most outstanding men; and I have no doubt that as far as we can make use of their services and their ideas and comparisons on the American method of housing we will do so. I have reasons to believe that if they are approached, they would be willing even outside of their special jobs, to help us. In matters like this I feel every country can teach another country something.

This Bill as will be seen from Section 2, amends Section 13 of the Income Tax Act, 1921, by adding immediately after paragraph 12 the following new paragraphs:

(XIII) Income upon which any employee of the Government of the United States of America assigned to duties in this Island in connection with technical co-operation assistance programmes or projects to be carried out wholly or partly in British Guiana, British Honduras or any British West Indian Island, under the provisions of the Agreement for Technical Co-operation entered into between the Government of the United Kingdom and the Government of the United States of America at London on the thirteenth day of July one thousand nine hundred and fifty-one is obligated to pay income tax to the Government of the United States of America;

Provided that the provisions of this paragraph shall not apply to the income of any such employee who was resident in the Island at the time of his assignment to such duties;

(XIV) Income upon which any person, being a member of the family of an employee of the Government of the United States of America assigned to duties in this Island in connection with the purposes mentioned in the preceding paragraph of this section and accompanying such employee to this Island, is obligated to pay income tax to the Government of the United States of America.

Provided that the provisions of this paragraph shall not apply to the income of any such person who was resident in this Island at the time of assignment of such employee to the aforesaid duties."

As can be seen the proviso covers the position where Income Tax is concerned. If a person happens to settle here at anytime but that person is giving technical assistance to say Martinique or Guadeloupe, he does not get exemptions from his tax but in this case, while he is here for such purpose, the personal baggage and household effects he may bring in and for which he would be entitled to have tax exemptions, the appropriate place to put that baggage exemption is under the Custom Tariff Act. As can be seen from this Bill, it will be put in immediately after the provision for the Australian Trade Commissioner.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think there is anything more I can add. If honourable members have read the Bill carefully, they will see that it just applies to those persons affected by the Agreement for Technical Co-operation entered into between the Government of the United Kingdom and the Government of the United States.

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

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, while I appreciate the reasons for this exemption, and these exemptions do apply to people who might come here not to render us any assistance but to render themselves assistance, and we have also exemptions for the Trade Commissioners of Canada and of Australia and other things like that whether it is by way of Customs or Income Tax, it strikes me that we should merely add these type of people (for which we are now making provision by this Bill) to the Schedule at the Customs, and leave it at that. I know that what I am suggesting might entail two Bills; but I do not see the reason why we should pass an Act with all these technical things in it; an Act which might come to nought at anytime.

This Act does not do anything to you; it is really an Act to implement certain terms of Agreement for Technical Co-operation and Assistance between the United Kingdom Government and the Exchanging Government according to how it is worded in the Objects and Reasons, but it is really not such a thing. It goes on to say that Section 13 of the Income Tax Act, 1921, is hereby amended by adding immediately after Paragraph XII thereof the following new paragraphs.

(XIII) Income upon which any employee of the Government of the United States of America assigned to duties in this Island in connection with technical co-operation assistance programmes or projects to be carried out wholly or partly in British Guiana, British Honduras or any British West Indian Island, under the provisions of the Agreement for Technical Co-operation entered into between the Government of the United Kingdom and the Government of the United States of America at London on the thirteenth day of July one thousand nine hundred and fifty-one is obligated to pay income tax to the Government of the United States of America;

Provided that the provisions of this paragraph shall not apply to the income of any such employee who was resident in the Island at the time of his assignment to such duties;

(XIV) Income upon which any person, being a member of the family of an employee of the Government of the United States of America assigned to duties in this Island in connection with the purposes mentioned in the preceding paragraph of this section and accompanying such employee to this Island, is obligated to pay income tax to the Government of the United States of America.

Provided that the provisions of this paragraph shall not apply to the income of any such person who was resident in this Island at the time of assignment of such employee to the aforesaid duties."

As I have said, I would not be carried away by the comments as to how glad we are to get the assistance of these people. To put an Act like this on the Statute Book seems unnecessary to me.

As far as Customs is concerned, there is one little thing which I believe is definitely wrong. Towards the end of Clause 3 we have the following:

Baggage, personal and household effects and other articles including vehicles and marine vessels imported at any time by an employee of the Government of the United States of America assigned to assistance programmes to be carried out either wholly or partly in British Guiana, British Honduras or any British West Indian Island under the provisions of the Agreement for Technical Co-operation entered into between the Government of the United Kingdom and the Government of the United States of America at London on the thirteenth day of July, one thousand nine hundred and fifty-one exclusively for the personal use of such employee or members of the family of such employee if such employee certifies to the Comptroller of Customs that the said articles are imported exclusively for the purposes aforesaid. The provisions of this paragraph shall apply only to such employee as are—

- (a) not citizens of the United Kingdom and Colonies;
- (b) not engaged in private occupation for gain in the Island;
- (c) permanent employees of the Government of the United States of America, or, if not permanent employees thereof were not resident in the Island at the time of their assignment to such duties."

I am not saying that this is not the method used in other Acts as far as this is concerned, but I do say that it is not a matter of these people certifying to the Comptroller of Customs; it is a matter that the Comptroller of Customs has to be satisfied, and we should make it so. It seems to me when you have finished reading this Act, that so long as these people certify to the Comptroller of Customs that the articles are imported exclusively for purposes mentioned in this section, that is the end of the requirements of the Act. I think the Comptroller of Customs should have the same power under this Act, as he would have with British subjects. As I have said, it does not seem as if he need to be satisfied here. So long as the person complies with the law he can do nothing about it. That is the one feature of this Bill which I do not like. No matter how grateful we should be to certain people for coming here, we should not place our Comptroller of Customs in any different position as he would be with anybody else.

7.45 p.m.

What is right, is that the Comptroller should be satisfied with a certificate or an oral declaration, or with the result of an examination. I think that in other Acts you have to satisfy the Comptroller of Customs that it is so; if he is satisfied, that is alright. If he is not satisfied with this certificate what can he do? The law says that he must get this certificate and if he gets this certificate he must act on it. However, I want to argue that point out at the proper time. There is nothing original in this specific Bill; the whole thing is an amendment to one Act and an amendment to the Schedule of another Act.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I am of the same opinion as the honourable junior member for the City. This Bill, to be specific, is really two amendments; an amendment to the Income tax act and an amendment to the second schedule of the Customs Tariff Act. The term "Technical Co-operation Assistance," is an American terminology. The Technical Assistance Programme varies in certain things which you put under that programme. The Government has a housing policy, but there are other things which come under the Technical Assistance Programme. We are now amending these Acts so as to deal with this matter. Those of us who have been watching the

Technical Assistance Programme would like to see more of it being used in Barbados; but in view of the fact that we are now amending the Income Tax Act, I am taking this opportunity of saying something on Income Tax which would apply locally. I think that this would give the Government the opportunity of looking into this question and saying whether they are satisfied as to the present exemptions which they make to people who live in Barbados. I do not feel that it is fair that in this Island, no Income Tax-payer is allowed anything for medical expenses which he is likely to incur. I do not care of what political complexion we are. It is reasonable for people to be given exemptions in respect of the medical expenses which they incur. If that is a means of allowing the Income Tax Commissioner know what the doctors are earning, then that would be a very good thing. I feel that anybody who incurs medical expenses should have the particular exemption. Those of us who have to pay Income Tax feel that it is a hardship that we have to incur medical expenses and cannot get any exemption.

On the question of the Customs duty, if you are making other exemptions, what I would like to know is this: nearly six months ago a letter was written by an organisation asking for exemptions from Customs duty in connection with projectors to be used in the Caribbean area for Trade Unions; it may be that the particular Ministry was so busy that we have not been treated with any reply; however, I am sure that this is something which has come to light and it would be a good thing to know that these things are being considered. You have the British Council and you have the University College of the West Indies; you did not pass a special Act for the University College of the West Indies, and I would say that technical co-operation assistance is not anything which is particularly defined in the law. There is no objection to giving people any exemption; however I have made certain points and as the honourable junior member for the City has said, you did not make an amendment to the Act instead of passing a specific Bill. But the Attorney General may know what he is doing.
7.55 p.m.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: As far as I can remember, (and I have traced quite a number of the amendments to the Act) there is only one amendment in connection with the Comptroller being satisfied about the bringing in of parcels from the United States of America.

The Customs Tariff Act allows a variety of things to be brought in free of duty. The last item I can remember that was so exempted is sea island cotton. If the person bringing in these items makes a false declaration, of course the law is there. As far as I can remember, since 1921 there have been about 15 or 16 amendments to the Customs Tariff Act, but no amendments to this particular portion of the Act.

In the second Schedule of the Customs Tariff Act which deals with exemptions we see it stated that all articles and things of every description imported for his use and accommodation by any officer, non-commissioned officer or man in full pay in His Majesty's Military or Naval Service, on the certificate to that effect of the officer so importing and in the case of a non-commissioned officer or man, on the certificate to that effect of his commanding officer, are free of duty.

There is also a provision for exemption from duty of articles imported by the Central Council of the Barbados Women's Social Welfare League or any member thereof etc., on the certificate of the Secre-

tary of the League. In the case of the Girl Guides Association there has to be a certificate of the Commissioner etc.

I have cited those portions of the Act to show that the law has for a long time deemed that certain people in certain positions will not make a false declaration. If the American Consul brings in a car and he declares that it is for his own personal use, you assume that a person in his position will not hire out the car.

I do not think that there is any real danger in this. I do not want to refer to societies which import clothing for distribution to the poor, because I think that they are likely to be as scrupulous as anyone else, and I do not know why it was written that way. This is apart from the normal Customs practice of giving a certificate which makes the giver of the certificate liable to a penalty if he makes a false declaration.

The question that the Bill be read a second time was put and agreed to without division.

On the motion of Hon. G. H. Adams seconded by Hon. M. E. Cox Mr. Speaker left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. Smith in the Chair.

Clause 1 was called and agreed to.

Clause 2 was called.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, I just want to draw to the attention of the Committee the fact, that while this Clause talks about "technical co-operation assistance programmes or projects" Clause 3 refers to "technical co-operative assistance programmes or projects." I am making comparison between the two clauses so that if "co-operation" as it appears in this clause is wrong, it can be changed now, and if "co-operative" as it appears in Clause 3 is wrong we can correct it when we come to that clause.

The question that Clause 2 stand part was put and agreed to without division.

Clause 3 was called.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS moved seconded by Hon. M. E. COX that Clause 3 stand part.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, as I was saying just now, Clause 3 refers to:

"All supplies, equipment building materials and other articles including vehicles and marine vessels imported by or on behalf of the Government of the United States of America for purposes of carrying out either wholly or partly in British Guiana, British Honduras or any British West Indian Island, technical co-operative assistance programmes or projects under the provisions of the Agreement for Technical Co-operation entered into between the Government of the United Kingdom and the Government of the United States of America at London on the thirteenth day of July, one thousand nine hundred and fifty-one.

Clause 2 on the other hand refers to "co-operation" and not "co-operative." They are two different things. Clause 3 may be right because the words are a quotation.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: There has apparently been some looseness in the drafting. The exchange of notes between the two Governments speaks of "technical assistance" in the Caribbean area and then it goes on generally to speak of the Agreement for "technical co-operation." I would say that the word "co-operative" should be changed to "co-operation."

The question that Clause 3 stand part was put and agreed to without division.

Clause 4 was called.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS moved seconded by Hon. M. E. COX that Clause 4 stand part.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, Clause 4 says that this Act shall be deemed to have come into operation on the first day of January, one thousand nine hundred and fifty-five. I would like to know the reason for that. Are the people here already and have they begun to work, or is it because the Income Tax year is the calendar year? I take it that the latter is the reason.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: That is the reason. I had hoped to get this Bill through before the end of 1954. It is because the Income Tax's year is the calendar year that this provision is made for the Act to come into operation as from the first of January, 1955.

The question that Clause 4 stand part was put and agreed to without division.
8.05 p.m.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, I am going to make a formal motion for the reconsideration of Section 2 in order to ask the Hon. Premier just to look at the method which is used for the numbering of these clauses. I mention it at this time so that if anything is wrong, perhaps the Clerk can make the necessary changes. I wonder if the Hon. Premier would say that the proviso is a paragraph in itself. I mention that because the next clause — clause (xiv) — has a phrase in it which says "in connection with the purposes mentioned in the preceding paragraph of this section." Do you regard a proviso as a section?

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: A proviso cannot be a separate paragraph. If anybody does that, it would be a mistake.

On motion by Hon. G. H. Adams, seconded by Hon. M. E. Cox, Mr. Chairman reported the passing of the Bill in Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On motion of Hon. G. H. Adams, seconded by Hon. M. E. Cox, the Bill was read a third time.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, in moving that this Bill do now pass, I would just like to say now, and purely because it slipped me to say it earlier (and I do not want to be accused of creating any misunderstanding) that these two gentlemen will be domiciled in Barbados for the next two years. It therefore can be seen that this is an exemption, which will be for some time. I beg to move that this Bill do now pass.

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

The question was put and agreed to.

LEAVE TO TAKE ORDER NO. 5

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I ask leave that Item No. 5 be taken as the next order of the day.

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

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE EXCHANGE OF LAND AT SIX CROSS ROADS

Mr. SPEAKER: The next order of the day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries: to move the passing of the following Resolution: Resolution to approve the exchange of land at Six Cross Roads, St. Philip.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, as honourable members will remember, quite recently, an area of land containing approximately 48 acres was acquired by Government from the Admiralty and

that land was two separate and distinct plots of which one plot was comprised of 32 acres approximately and the other plot 16 acres approximately. But intervening land, the property of Messrs. Foursquare Estates Limited comes between these two plots, and it is now the intention of the Government to develop this plot of land and resort by effecting an exchange of the plot of approximately 16 acres as set out in the first schedule, for the plot of approximately 10 acres owned by Messrs. Foursquare Estates Limited and which adjoins on the western side the government-owned land of approximately 32 acres. The schedules are as follows:—

FIRST SCHEDULE

A plot of land approximately 16 acres, being the eastern site of the area of land recently acquired by the Executive Committee from the Admiralty at Six Cross Roads, St. Philip.

SECOND SCHEDULE

A plot of land approximately 10 acres adjoining on the Western side the government-owned land (approximately 32 acres in area) at Six Cross Roads, St. Philip.

Now, the object of that, as the Addendum sets it out, is to have one compact plot for development purposes. The Addendum sets it out quite clearly. It reads as follows:—

The Government has under consideration the further development, of the land at Six Cross Roads, St. Philip a Scheme of Development and layout of the area has been approved in principle, subject to the provision of the necessary funds, and provides for the distribution of the land between various purposes, as follows:

	Acres
School and playing field	10 $\frac{1}{4}$
District market	$\frac{1}{4}$
Health clinic	$\frac{1}{2}$
Housing	3
Model vegetable farm	27
	41

It goes on to say: the area acquired consists of two portions of land to the east of Six Cross Roads separated by intervening land which is the property of Messrs. Foursquare Estates Limited. In order to provide the Government with a single parcel of land which could be developed as a whole, it is desired to exchange the more easterly of the two areas acquired for an amount of land of equal value immediately adjoining the more westerly area.

The matter of the proposed exchange has been taken up with Messrs. Foursquare Estates Limited who are willing to exchange a plot of 10 acres of their land for a plot of 16 acres of the land now owned by the Government.

The lands in question have been independently appraised. The appraised valuation of the land to be given up by Government is \$9,600 and that of the land to be acquired is \$12,000. Government is satisfied that the exchange is fair. An exchange on an acre-for-acre basis is not obtainable since the government-owned land has been out of cultivation for ten years whereas the Foursquare land is under cultivation.

The expenses of the transfer will be borne by the Government. Messrs. Foursquare Estates Limited will be willing, in the circumstances, as a gesture of goodwill to disregard the difference in the appraised valuations.

Now, Sir, all these negotiations have been conducted by the former Queen's Solicitor on behalf of the Government.
8.15 p.m.

As I have said, the Addendum states that "the lands in question have been independently appraised. The appraised valuation of the land to be given up by Government is \$9,600 and that of the land to be acquired is \$12,000. Government is satisfied that the exchange is fair. An exchange on an acre-for-acre basis is not obtainable since the government-owned land has been out of cultivation for ten years whereas the Foursquare land is under cultivation."

The object of this exchange is to provide the Government with one plot of land for their plan of action. I would like to bring these points to the attention of honourable members in dealing with this matter of the exchange of Government land: Honourable members will remember that under the Executive Committee Act of 1951 the approval of the Legislature is required in this matter of the exchange of land; the Governor-in-Executive Committee authorised the Queen's Solicitor to see after all the negotiations; the valuation was done by competent independent appraisers, and the exchange of this land is to enable the Government to have one compact lot for development purposes. Finally the Government land comprising 48 acres has not been under cultivation for the past ten years, with the result that it was not considered by the appraisers to be as valuable land as the Foursquare land which has always been under cultivation. It was considered by the Government that we would accept these ten acres of land in exchange for the 16 acres which formerly formed part of the Admiralty land. I do not think that there is anything more I can say in connection with this matter; I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: In this Resolution it is proposed to exchange 16 acres of Government land at Six Roads St. Philip for 10 acres of land owned by Messrs. Foursquare Ltd. I want the Hon. Minister to tell me if this land is quality for quality. If you are exchanging 16 acres of arable land for ten acres which are also arable, I want to understand by what method can you appraise the one at £200 an acre and the other at less. The argument which you use in the Addendum will be all right if you appraised the land at the same value and then say, that inasmuch as the Foursquare land is under cultivation and there is this other land which is not under cultivation, there would be a difference of so much. I speak with some experience in this matter; according to the Addendum the appraised valuation of the land to be given up by the Government is \$9,600 and that of the land to be acquired is \$12,000, and I would like to know how they arrived at this valuation. It seems to me that if you arrive at a valuation of £200 an acre in respect of one lot of land, unless you can satisfy this Committee that this other land is not the same quality, then the two lots of land would have to be at the same valuation. I think it would be the Government's duty to tell us what would be the cost of putting these 16 acres of land in cultivation as against the cost of the other lot.
8.25 p.m.

I have no grouse as regards the price in itself; but how can you say that 10 acres should be at £200 an acre and when you come to the 16 acres, it must be at a different price? This thing will need a lot of explanation. In the circumstances, I reserve my right to vote against this Resolution until the Minister can tell me by what stretch of the imagination they have arrived at what the figure would be for putting the land in cultivation.

When the Government is bringing Resolutions of this sort to this Chamber, they must reckon with the Opposition. No one is against the Government making this exchange; but make an exchange on a basis that seems equitable. The Government must not think that the members of the Opposition are a bunch of fools. When people want to push these things down the throats of the Ministers, I respectfully suggest that the Ministers should tell them that they cannot take such things to the House of Assembly.

I would like to ask if any of the Ministers read this. If this transaction were one in their personal business, would they do this? Not one of them would do it. I would not. Foursquare would not do it—not if I know Mr. Robinson and Mr. Lisle Ward. I am not saying that the price is too big or too little in itself. But if you value ten acres at £200 per acre, how can you value 16 acres at less, and then come and say that inasmuch as the Government's ten acres was lying fallow for a long time the cost of putting this in order should be so and so? We are not a bunch of nitwits.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, there is no point in mixing matters. Only with the Government, comprised as it is, could this sort of thing be possible. The Hon. Minister, who is Minister of Agriculture and all that that implies, endeavoured to take the blame off the shoulders of the Government by saying that this arrangement was made by the Queen's Solicitor. Apparently the Queen's Solicitor is the Minister of Agriculture. Do you mean to say that Mr. Shilstone, who I presume was the Queen's Solicitor when this was done, is the sort of person to whom a Government like that should entrust arrangements of this sort? Even if they did it, are we to understand that a Government that calls itself Labour allows its policy and business to be transacted by a man with the known temperament and political outlook of Mr. Shilstone? I do not believe it. The Minister of Agriculture must take the full responsibility and blame for giving away the Government's land in a transaction like this.

Now the Government has the temerity and stupidity to come in here and call it a fair exchange. There is not a single member of this House outside of the five Ministers who would dare to suggest that this is a fair exchange. Let us examine the matter. The Government has two plots of land. One is 32 acres and one is 16 acres. Lying between these two is a plot of ten acres owned by Foursquare. Anyone who knows the area will tell you that all that land is the same. When the Admiralty took it over during the war, the entire area was under cultivation—Government's 32 acres on the one hand, the 16 acres on the other hand and Foursquare's. During the war it was allowed to lie fallow, and after repeated requests on the part of the Government, the British Admiralty turned it back over to us. Obviously all that the Government's land needs is to be recultivated.

I will tell you, sir, that acre for acre our land is worth more than Foursquare's. All of it is flat and easily cultivable. Foursquare's land has a big suck in the middle, and is by no means as easy to cultivate as is Government's land. But we are told by the Government that because our land has been out of cultivation for ten years we must agree to exchange 16 acres for 10.

Can you imagine anyone in their right senses, and with the faintest knowledge of land in the area or with any sense of responsibility occupying the Minister's position, telling the House that merely because under the Emergency Powers in force during the war the Government's 16 acres has been lying fallow while Foursquare has been cultivating theirs

we must give them 16 acres for 10? The land should be exchanged on an acre for acre basis. The most that the Government should be expected to do, if it so desired, would be to put the 16 acres under cultivation and hand it over to Foursquare. Does that lie beyond the ability of the Government to understand?

The Ministers appear to be so benighted and childlike, that merely because the valuation is put on the basis of cultivated land and non-cultivated land, they are prepared to accept this exchange on the basis on which it has been accepted. But the basis of valuation is cultivated land as compared with non-cultivated land; not cultivated land as compared with rab land. I agree that valuation of land at present under cultivation will be higher than that of land that has been lying fallow for years. But let us look at the position. Foursquare's land has been valued at \$1,200 an acre. If the Government's land was cultivated we assume that the valuation of Government's land would be the same. So when the Government gives away this six acres, they are giving away six acres at \$1,200 an acre, which is \$7,200.

Can the Minister of Agriculture tell the House that it would cost the Government \$7,200 to put that six acres of land under cultivation? The most you could spend on putting it into cultivation would be £50 an acre; that would be plowing it up, manuring, planting it up etc. As I have said, the most that the Government should have been expected to do would be to put this land under cultivation and hand it over to Foursquare; but do not come here like a bunch of idiots and tell the House that because the land was lying fallow for ten years, you must exchange 16 acres for 10.

8.35 p.m.

You have made the excuse that we have not been cultivating our land. Now, you have tractors at the Pine and at St. Philip, you also have manure spreaders and every thing you want, why can't you put the land into cultivation and then exchange it on an acre for acre basis? Is Government really as stupid as it really appears to be, by bringing this before the House? Is it possible that even if one Minister made a mistake like that, for all five to make the same mistake? I have never in all my life heard anything like that; nor did I expect to hear anything like it in 1955. There was a time in the history of the island when the people who ran the Government could do as they like. There was a time when the Government of the country was so closely linked with big business like Messrs. Four Square Estates Ltd., that it could be excused for exchanging sixteen acres for six; but is it fair in this year of grace 1955 for a Government to allow itself to be taken for a ride like this? In their own self-respect and in their conscience to this island, they should withdraw this Resolution and refuse to carry on with this exchange on this basis. Let us even say, that when this matter was first presented to the Ministers it was during the Christmas season and they allowed the festivities of the season to becloud their reason so much so, they could not study what they were doing. Now that they have got over the hang-over and in the cool lights of the facts, even they themselves should realise the inadvisability and the stupidity to attempt to put this thing on the public. When I saw this thing and read that an exchange on an acre for acre basis is not obtainable, since the Government-owned land has been out of cultivation for ten years, whereas the Foursquare land is under cultivation, I said, this is the end of everything. If, as an honourable member said, Government has been misled by people, and Government can be so easily misled, the Ministers have no right to occupy their positions.

Imagine sir, a Minister coming in here and saying that it is the Queen's Solicitor who conducts these things.

What I want the Hon. Minister of Agriculture to deny is a statement which was told to me. I am very sorry that my colleague is not in here at present to substantiate it, because he was also told the same thing; it is that the Director of Agriculture is already spending money on the Foursquare land which is proposed to be exchanged. I understand that manure on Foursquare land has been supplied by the Government. [A VOICE: Shame! Shame!] I have been told that the Department of Agriculture has manured that land. In other words this exchange has been agreed on by the big monguls of Foursquare and Government to such an extent, that the Government has assumed responsibility to put manure on the part of the Foursquare land. Sir, must we exchange this land on this unfair basis? I say the least that the Government should do is to withdraw this Resolution. It is far better for us to refuse to go through with this transaction than to go through with it on this basis. There can be no justification for it at all, unless the Government wants to establish a stronger reputation for not knowing what it is doing. The only sensible thing to do is to withdraw this Resolution.

There is one more point I want to make on this matter. It has been circulated by the Government that this area of land is for the purpose of a school and playing field, district market, Health Clinic, Housing, and a model Vegetable Farm. I am going to deal with the school which they say is to be a Modern Secondary School; but before I go any further, I should like to say that I think it is high time that some tribute should be paid to the Director of Public Works for the very fine buildings which he is now putting up throughout the island. [VOICES Hear! Hear!] We may rightly say here that he is being paid for doing it; but there are buildings and buildings. Certainly, the buildings erected by Captain Tomlin (to say the least) are strikingly modern buildings in conception and in architectural design and are very pleasing to look at. Even if one may disagree with the siting of the Fire Brigade Station, one must agree that the building which is now being put there is very attractive. Much as we disagree with the type of school to be erected at St. Philip, we must say that the building put up there is also very attractive and beautiful in its design. It may be true of course, to say that the staff with which Captain Tomlin is working is also highly competent; because, do not let us fool ourselves and do not let us be too modest. We have exceptionally good workmen in Barbados. Regardless of how clever or how capable your architect is and you have workmen who are no good to execute his designs, you are nowhere.

So that our workmen demonstrate that they can rise to the occasion and execute the work which suits the designs of the designer, never mind how capable he is. Most of the constructions put up by Captain Tomlin are a credit to the community; and in saying that, I would ask why should they embark on a plan for this school as a secondary school when it is not really a secondary school. The Minister of Education said that it was to be a Modern School, and then he said that it was to be a Secondary School and there was apparently some attempt to make it a secondary school. Now we know it is the intention of the Government to make it a Modern Secondary School with all the tomfoolery that implies. However, this is not the time nor the occasion to let the Government know

what it is in for, if it persists in this idea. There is no reason why the plan should mislead the public. To ask children to walk four or five miles in order to get to this Secondary School every day is almost as stupid as the proposal; and the least we can do at this stage is to change the description on the plan and make it more correct in conformity with what the Government really intends to do or not to do.

There is one further point. This development is to take place at Six Roads, St. Philip, but this land is not the only land which is owned by the Government in St. Philip; and I am suggesting as I have suggested on more than one occasion previously, that the Government land at Dodds and Summervale should not be run on the plantation system, but more on the basis of what they want to do with the land at Six Roads. At Dodds and Summervale we have room for more experimental profit-sharing farms and proportionate profit schemes; and this land should be developed more along the lines of what Socialists think of agricultural development. I suggest that the Government should proceed with further development projects with Government owned lands in St. Philip. The Government should consider the land hunger which exists at present; people have paid as much as \$3,000 an acre for land in St. Philip and in Christ Church; they have paid between \$2,500 and \$3,000 an acre for it, if and when they can get it. This Government has refused to put a sealing on the ownership of land as is done in other countries; but now that they have land, they are giving it away. We have no Crown lands and almost all the estate lands are already cultivated, and in order to get land you almost have to expropriate the owners. Can you imagine our giving away a few acres of land which we have got for nothing? In every single parish in this island there are people to-day who would buy land if it were available; so that even if it costs more to put all these 16 acres into cultivation and we get the value for it, the land should still be retained and exchanged for another 16 acres rather than exchange it for less. The argument of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture cannot hold water or stand the light of sensible examination. If the Government insists in this matter, we can come to no other conclusion than that they are fully aware of the difficulties associated with the matter and are still carrying it through.

8.55 p.m.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: This Resolution is asking the House to approve the exchange of 16 acres of land vested in the Government at Six Roads, St. Philip for ten acres owned by Messrs. Foursquare Ltd. An hon. member says it has been drawn to his attention that the Government has started to manure the land at Foursquare. I do not want to be mincing in my language but that would be reprehensible conduct. The Government has no right whatsoever to do that, if that is true. Knowing that they have to get legislative sanction for this scheme, how can the Government attempt to take up money and begin to cultivate land of which the Legislature has not approved of the exchange?

To my mind this is a very serious matter. It borders on the situation which existed in Great Britain with the Crickledon Scheme on which the Minister of Agriculture was forced to resign; because, under his administration the sale of land at Crickledon was carried out in such a manner that the House of Commons did not approve of it, and the Minister's actions were adjudged as not being worthy of a government or state. I am hoping that what the honourable senior member for St. Philip has said is not true. If it is true I will not be associated with any government which attempts to spend

public funds on any project which depends on the approval of the Legislature, without giving the Legislature an opportunity of saying yes or no to the scheme involved. If we begin on that road, it is a very serious road to follow.

Viewing this matter quite seriously, I am sorry that the Minister of Communications is not there, because he is a real estate expert, and he is very serious when it comes to the purchase and sale of land. The Minister of Agriculture is noted for his affability. Let us look at the whole idea. Going by the Addendum, there is something which the Minister must explain. You have two portions of land separated by an intervening piece which is the property of Foursquare Ltd. The Addendum says that the lands in question have been independently appraised. The appraised valuation of the land to be given up by Government is \$9,600 and that of the land to be acquired is \$12,000. Government is satisfied that the exchange is fair. An exchange on an acre for acre basis is not obtainable since the Government-owned land has been out of cultivation for ten years, whereas the Foursquare land is under cultivation.

Let us try to examine the Government's conclusion. The reason why you cannot exchange the land on an acre for acre basis is because Foursquare's 10 acres is under cultivation, and Government's 16 acres is not. Why is there a difference in valuation when you consider that in dealing with land, you are dealing with a continuing asset? Land is not something that can disappear and therefore you have to bring it up to valuation immediately. If there is a thorough examination of the economics of the valuation of this land, you will see that the 16 acres that you are giving Foursquare, is going to mean what the 10 acres is going to mean when cultivated. That is the only basis on which you can work. For Government's purpose in this transaction the Government does not need cultivated land as such. The position is that Foursquare has cultivated land lying between the Government's land.

If you took the amount of money represented by the difference in valuation and gave it to Foursquare as credit for putting the land under cultivation, then the transaction would be a fair one. Land, as I have said, is a continuing asset. It is not something that is going to disappear. It is not even like a house where you have to consider depreciation. The Hon. Minister must have given the matter some consideration. Now that he has heard all that has been said to-day, I do not believe that it appears as rosy to him as it did before.

We all agree that development at Six Cross Roads is desirable. But there is still another criticism that I have to make. The school and playing field has been allocated ten and a quarter acres of land. What I want to know is, why in a community like Barbados where we do not have a lot of land and where so many are land hungry, are we allocating ten and a quarter acres of land to a school and playing field? It seems to me to be a lot of land to use for a school and playing field. At these schools you want to give children enough breathing space; but you cannot provide them with a Wimbledon or Melbourne. They need enough space for recreation. But it seems to me that the Government would have to own all the land in Barbados and put some of the people to live in the sea to be able to give ten and a quarter acres for this sort of thing.

I will not say the things that the honourable senior member for St. Philip has said. What seems to me to be really unscientific is the conclusion that the Government has reached that they cannot make the exchange on an acre for acre basis because Four-

square's land is under cultivation. The Minister did not say that the land has a crop growing on it. The point about it is this, however, that you would not know the value of the crop. Anyhow this talk about a crop is a remark that was made in an aside. When the Minister replies he will deal with that point.

I am not so chary even about the matter of the crop. If you want ten acres you are buying ten acres for the convenience of having one plot. Therefore you do not have to buy the crop. From our point of view, as far as the development of this area is concerned the Government is exchanging 16 acres for ten. For your vegetable garden farm you need 27 acres. Suppose you did not include this garden in this scheme, would the island become bankrupt? 9.05 p.m.

The point I want to make is this: do not let any member of the Government pat himself on the chest and say that Government has got land with a crop on it. Government had many schemes in mind after they bought the land at the Admiralty.

Now, if the Government sold this sixteen acres of land which they propose to exchange, what price do you think they would get for it? I am going to suggest that you sell that land now and don't worry to buy that from Messrs. Foursquare Estates Ltd., I am sure nobody will say that it is an absolute necessity to have a school with a playing field of $10\frac{3}{4}$ acres. There are plenty of schools in this island without any land for a playing field, yet we are not going to abandon those schools. You now propose to move Bay Street Boys' School somewhere else, do you think it is going to have $10\frac{1}{4}$ acres to it? You have recently built one in St. Andrew, has that $10\frac{1}{4}$ acres? Sir, you do not have to buy the cane crop on the land which you are getting for your exchange. It is not a means of justifying this exchange. Sir, this is a commercial transaction in which the Government is not coming out the winner. The Government is really doomed by this commercial transaction. Do you mean to say that in order to get this land you are going to pay such a fancy price? This land is between two plots of land owned by the Government, yet the Government is called upon to pay this price. I am quite sure that this scheme in itself will not commend itself to all and sundry.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is time to move a short adjournment; but I see the hon. Minister of Communications is about to take his seat, and I was making a point in his absence which I would like him to hear. I was saying that what strikes me about this transaction is that it met the approval of the Hon. Minister of Communications whom I know is a stickler for things of this nature. It is true to say that the matter does not concern his portfolio; but how can Ministers of the Government agree to make an exchange on this basis? Here it is, you have ten acres of land between two plots of yours, one plot is 16 acres and the other 32 acres, and you are giving away the sixteen acres for the ten. You are giving away more land and you are getting no money to compensate for it. I cannot see the reason you should agree to the valuation of their land at £200 per acre because it is under cultivation, and because yours is out of cultivation its value is only £120. This is what the Addendum says.

The lands in question have been independently appraised. The appraised valuation of the land to be given up by Government is \$9,600 and that of the land to be acquired is \$12,000. Government is satisfied that the exchange is fair. An exchange on an acre-for-acre basis is not obtainable since the government-owned land has been out

of cultivation for ten years whereas the Foursquare land is under cultivation.

I really want to know what are the real reasons for exchanging this land and why should you exchange them on those valuations. I do not think that because the Queen's Solicitor should tell the Government that the valuation should be so and so, the members of the Government should abide by it. I am saying a transaction on this basis is not a fair exchange.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn for three-quarters of an hour.

Mr. GODDARD: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. Speaker adjourned the House accordingly. 9.15 p.m.

On resumption.

DEBATE ON SIX CROSS ROADS RESUMED

Mr. SPEAKER: On the adjournment the House was considering a Resolution to approve the exchange of land at Six Cross Roads, St. Philip. The hon. junior member for St. Peter was speaking.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, during the interim I am sure the Hon. Minister of Agriculture would have had an opportunity of considering the points which have been raised by hon. members; and I too had sometime to consider the project which is before us. I am not an expert on the valuation of land, but I am sure that if the Hon. Minister re-examines this matter, he will agree that the valuation of \$600 an acre for this land owned by the Government is one which has been considered to be very low indeed for this type of arable land. Moreover, I do not think that the Government should have been forced into this exchange and into this transaction, even considering the crop that was on the land at Foursquare; because, in so far as the Government is concerned, the Government does not want any land with any crop on it. I am suggesting that the exchange should have been made on the understanding that they would have allowed the owners of Foursquare land to reap the crop and send it to the factory. From a practical point of view, you do not want this land to be used as agricultural land; and it is the policy of the Government not to use agricultural land for carrying out projects. From the point of view of the calculation, it would have been quite easy for the Government to have arranged to wait until the crop had been reaped; there is no doubt that that could have been done, and the crop would not have had to be taken into consideration.

I have given every consideration to this matter; and the point I am making is that it is strange, and I do not like the idea of using such large portions of land for the construction of a playing field and the erection of a school. I am a member of the Governing Body of the Coleridge-Parry School, and we have difficulties with the land which runs out like a peninsula; but we cannot say that we do not have enough land to use; and this is an area of 10 acres. I do not think that the Government should have to utilize $10\frac{1}{4}$ acres of land for a school and a playing field.

On the question of proportionate profit farming, if the Government proposes to use 27 acres of land for this purpose, they are using the land which

is available; and it is not necessary to go to the extreme of making an exchange, because it is a question of using the land which you have at your disposal. I do not think it was necessary for the Government to make this exchange because it is uneconomic, unrealistic and impracticable.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. junior member for Christ Church who seconded the motion for the adjournment is entitled to speak now.

Mr. GODDARD: On the basis of what we have before us, it is very evident that something went wrong with this valuation. I think the valuation of \$600 an acre for land in Barbados is low indeed; that is not the true value, because in the last five or six years that was not the value of land at all. That is a pre-war value; the Government bought this land from the Admiralty at the same price at which the Admiralty bought it ten years ago, and to-day they are valuing this land for exchange at this value. If we were to put a truer valuation on this land you would find that the value of the Government's land would be \$24,000, and that of the land owned by Foursquare Ltd., would be \$15,000, a difference of \$9,000. They have gone wrong in putting on this land a valuation which is not there; I do not know how the assessment was made, but I do know that all of this 16 acres of land is in the same terrain, and the same depth of soil, and on the same main road; and I cannot see any difference in the valuation of the land. One lot has been left to the mercies of the weather; we know that land which is under grass is poor but is it so poor as to effect a difference of as much as \$9,000?

10.10 p.m.

I may be valuing the land too highly. I may be accused of that; but I do know that if it is put on the market my valuation will be much nearer than the one given us today. If the Government could not get a better valuation, why exchange the land at all? A model vegetable garden is all right, but when it comes to putting 27 acres into a vegetable garden at one spot, I do hope that the Government knows what it is doing. The island is definitely in need of the vegetables that will be grown in such gardens, and I would more agree if it were the idea to establish similar gardens throughout the island. But when you come to an acre of lettuce you are looking for an export market. It is all right if it is properly distributed and you know your distribution system is working.

I would counsel members of the Government to take this matter back and review it. Unless we can be given figures to prove that we are absolutely wrong in what we are talking about, I can see it in no other way. The disparity seems too great when you consider that the land under cultivation and the fallow land are so much alike.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Speaker, it is not the first time that I have had to make this quotation in this Chamber—"Power corrupts and money can destroy angels". It is not unexpected that the Hon. Minister for Lands and Agriculture would find himself in questionable dealings such as this. But I am now appealing to the Premier of this ancient and honourable Chamber and the leader of the masses of this colony, and also to the Hon. Minister of Social Services and the Leader of this House and Deputy Leader of the Labour Party. I feel, sir,—

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, on a point of Order. I would like to object to the unscrupulous remarks which have come from the unscrupulous mind of the hon. senior member for St. John, and to the type of imputations which are successful on an electioneering platform where everything is based on a

distortion of the truth. In this Chamber the hon. member cannot get away with that sort of thing. He cannot get away with the misrepresentations and untrue allegations which he is in the habit of presenting morning, noon and night.

Mr. ALLDER: The hon. member is making another speech.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I am objecting to the use of the words "questionable dealings".

Mr. ALLDER: I would not object to the remarks which the Hon. Minister made about my unscrupulous mind. What I am trying to prove is, that no honest Minister of a Government, colonial or otherwise, would have descended to such depths as to reach an agreement like this to exploit the people of this colony.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Agriculture is objecting to the words "questionable dealings". I myself do not think that they are quite parliamentary; and I think that they do savour of a reflection on the Hon. Minister. I would ask the honourable senior member for St. John to withdraw those words. If the honourable member reflects seriously on the import of those words, and when he remembers that if those words were to be used in reference to him he would have a right to object, I am sure that he will withdraw the words. He would be well counselled to do so.

Mr. ALLDER: The reason why I used the words "questionable dealings" is because I have been following the Resolution which has been compiled and presented to this Chamber—

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is stating his reason. I did not ask him to do that. I asked him to withdraw the words "questionable dealings" which are not parliamentary used in reference to the Hon. Minister.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Speaker, it is rather remarkable that while the Hon. Minister felt that my statements merited withdrawal, he should at the same time in asking your condescension in such a matter—

Mr. SPEAKER: My intervention; not my condescension.

Mr. ALLDER: It is just a difference of words. If Your Honour has asked me to withdraw the words, you have condescended to grant the request of the Minister. The Minister, as I was saying, has himself used insulting remarks.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is breaking an elementary rule of this House. He has been asked by me to withdraw the words "questionable dealings". The hon. member got up and tried to make an explanation as to why he used those words, and he has mentioned remarks used to him by the Hon. Minister. Any objection that he wishes to raise will be attended to by me; but I am now asking the hon. member to withdraw the words "questionable dealings".

10.20 p.m.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Speaker, I hope you will bear with me. If I may be allowed I would remind you of the statement I made. I said, that the dealing as far as the Resolution was concerned was questionable; and there is not a member of this Chamber—

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member used the words "questionable" followed by the word "dealing". I am now insisting that these words be withdrawn.

Mr. ALLDER: I was saying—

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member withdrawing those words? If the hon. member is not prepared to withdraw those words, then there is only one thing left for me to do.

Mr. ALLDER: I must be allowed to explain. I am saying that the contents of the Resolution were questionable dealings, and the Hon. Minister of Agriculture—

Mr. SPEAKER: I am saying if the hon. member does not forthwith withdraw those words I will name him.

Mr. ALLDER: I should like to draw to this hon. Chamber that the context of this Resolution can be considered as questionable dealings. If the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries feels that because he has something to do with the Resolution, I am saying that his dealings were questionable, I would only withdraw this statement; because I feel I can be of more use to the populace by staying inside this Chamber than by being outside of it. But it is conditional. I am hoping that the Hon. Minister would also withdraw the unscrupulous remarks which he made.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the hon. member does not now withdraw those words "unconditionally" I will name him. If the hon. member wants to object to any statement he will have the right to do so. I am insisting as Speaker of this ancient Chamber that the hon. senior member for St. John withdraw those words "unconditionally". The honourable member will not tell me under what conditions he proposes to withdraw those words.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Speaker, of course you will know that I hate at times to cause you to feel that I do not want to obey the Chair, but I feel I have a privilege which I shall make use of as a member of this hon. Chamber. If Your Honour insists that I should withdraw those words, as you have said previously, I feel that there is more use for me in this Chamber than to be out.

Mr. SPEAKER: No such thing came from me; that is your own statement.

Mr. ALLDER: As I was saying, Sir, I am quite willing to withdraw the remarks and I do so now. Even although the Hon. Minister of Agriculture made use of unparliamentary words towards me, I will not allow myself to be so petty as to ask him to withdraw them; because, I know that the unparliamentary words which he used against me cannot stand competition.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I take objection to the last remark made by the honourable senior member for St. John.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is not unparliamentary.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Sir, that is another way of saying the same thing.

Mr. ALLDER: Sir, I shall try, whether the Hon. Minister can see the wrong in a transaction like this or not, to draw not only to the attention of the Government, but also to solicit the observation of public opinion on transactions such as this.

Mr. SPEAKER: I shall now warn the honourable member that he is now treading on somewhat dangerous ground, and is getting pretty close to using unparliamentary remarks.

Mr. ALLDER: Can you imagine Mr. Speaker, that not very long ago this same Government paid within the vicinity of £28,000 for less than a quarter of an acre of land? In recent months, this same Government bought certain properties in this island, and I know that you are aware that the prices paid for them were far and above what the original owners paid for them. If I may be allowed to give an instance: Blackman's House in St. Joseph is one of them. The owner was paid twice as much as he paid for it by this Government, after he had extracted from the lands of the property trees to the value of £1,000. If you take "Enmore" which is less than a quarter of a mile from here, you will recollect the

huge profit which the original owners received from Government for it. If you take into consideration the purchase of the dilapidated tenantry at Cave Hill and the price which the original owners paid for it as against what this same Government paid for it, (I may say without any permission being granted the Government by the representatives of the people) you will see what a huge profit the original owner made out of Government. You also have to take into consideration that this Government is now begging Sir John Chandler the Attorney for Colleton Plantation, to sell them twelve acres of rab land at the rate of £500 per acre; and the owner is not even willing to sell his land to the Government at that price. Now, this same Government is going to Six Cross Roads St. Philip which is a desired residential area and which has land comparable to agricultural lands in other productive areas, to pay £250 per acre. This Government thinks that the public is so dumb in mind, as to accept as an honest piece of legislation, a Resolution like this which gives away some arable land for \$600 per acre. Do you think that the people accept this as an honest piece of legislation? Even although, they may be of the opinion that this Government is ignorant, incompetent, and I presume dishonest?

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member is presuming that the Government is dishonest. Of course the honourable member has not made any unparliamentary remarks so to speak on any honourable member. However, I will ask the honourable member to desist from using such remarks as referring to the Government as presuming that they are dishonest. I would like to tell the honourable member, that there are other ways in which the honourable member can express himself strongly. I do not think he should use the word "dishonest" in reference to the Government. While the honourable member has not misused any of the Rules of this House, I must warn him that he is getting very near to misusing the Rules.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Speaker, I regret very much if I find it difficult to beat around the bush.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the honourable member would be quite safe if he does not try any more to beat around the bush.

10.30 p.m.

Mr. ALLDER: There is another wrong arrangement by the Executive Committee. While it is true that you are building a school at Six Cross Roads, you do not need to utilize 10¼ acres of land for a playing field, inasmuch as you have the King George V Memorial Park up there which is another area of grass. That is unnecessary and superfluous; you only need one acre of land on which the children can run around; you do not need any 10¼ acres since you have that Memorial Park which is an already established community centre used over the past number of years not only by the people of St. Philip, but by people from other parishes of the island. What kind of Government business is this? This is nothing but wastage; any official who could suggest that we should allocate 10¼ acres of land for the purposes set out here is not interested in the prosperity of the colony. You should allow your actions and decisions to convey to the world that you know what you are doing. The honourable member is not lazy to tell people about the inability and incompetence of others. If you were to allocate 10¼ acres or even 9¼ or even 8 acres of land to the peasants so that they could grow a little food, you would be surprised to see how many families will be made happy as the result of the generosity of the Government in this respect. Even if you allowed the peasants to use this land as kitchen garden plots, you would be surprised to see how many houses such an area would accommodate if it

were properly laid out. A mistake is being made at top; and there is no hope in these matters unless the present Government goes through a metamorphosis or is dealt with otherwise. I am not saying that just for the sake of saying it, and the Hon. Premier need not sneer at what I am saying either; his party will destroy itself, because it is rotten to the core; it is not that people want to destroy the party, but they want to make it good. Here you have a proposal for a model vegetable farm to occupy 27 acres of land, and a school and a playing field to occupy 10¼ in the same colony in which it has been decided to restrict the number of acres allocated to the production of food for the purpose of planting more sugar cane. By what stretch of the imagination could they have decided that a playing field is as important as a model vegetable farm? I have heard the honourable member say that he is not willing to use arable land for housing, so that the poor householder would not be able to get a square inch of land behind his paling so that he could pick a pepper or a bean. The honourable member only applies that policy to the poor because if a millionaire can buy Bulkeley and put a tractor in it and level down all the vegetation which is now grown on that estate, he can do it; the honourable member says nothing about people buying land and putting barbed wire and planting cactus around it. On many occasions I have heard the honourable member say that the poor people must be settled on non-arable land. As much as 95% of the people are living on plantation lands, and therefore a progressive Labour Government must find alternative means of getting land and putting people on it. Why should the owner of a plantation chase off people from the land as he likes? It is for the Government to permit people to eke out a livelihood; therefore, Mr. Speaker, the whole policy of the Government is wrong.

10.40 p.m.

They either think or thought that the members of this Chamber were such automatons as to accept everything, because it is produced by the Minister and supported by the Premier; or they feel that everyone's politics is as questionable as theirs, and therefore in a community of evil doers, everything is right. I can only come to the conclusion, Sir, that those thoughts and opinions were uppermost in their minds when they discussed this matter at the Executive Committee. I also want to say that even although we have a system of Ministerial Government, not only the public of Barbados, but also the British Government holds the Head of the Administration responsible for the final decisions which come from Government House as agreed to by the Executive Committee.

Let no Head of the Administration think that because we have a Ministerial system, every misdeed seen in legislation will be attributed to the party in power and not to himself also. I cannot see the body of cultured, refined men who comprise the Executive Committee, deciding on a Resolution like this. It seems that there was some big mogul who had the means of injecting ignorance and confusion into the minds of the others who comprise that Committee.

Everytime that the Government has to purchase property it has to pay twice the value of the property; and everytime it has something to sell, there is no one courageous enough to defend the interests of the taxpayers. When I look at the present Government and I remember them making appeals to the taxpayers and the electorate, it hurts my heart to see that things like this Resolution can come from that honourable group. Besides that I have been told by someone who lives near the area, that the land which the Government owns is as flat as a table and its ter-

rain is more manageable than the terrain of the ten acres which Foursquare Ltd. is going to force on Government. As soon as the canes which are at present on the land are cut, the Government will realise its mistake; because that land has a big suck well on it.

Apart from all those things, is the Government obliged to have this ten acres attached to what they already have? And is it obligatory to dispose of the 16 acres in a manner such as this? No business man, no matter how devoid of business acumen he was, would ever agree to the disposal of that valuable property of the taxpayers without a scruple. The only people who could agree to that, Mr. Speaker, are the honourable gentlemen facing me now. I say, so, Sir, with all the seriousness it demands. Take the hon. Ministers one by one and ask them if that land were theirs if they would dispense with it in such a manner. The fact that Foursquare Ltd. have valued their land so cheaply shows that they knew they could have got away with murder. If someone had two acres of land to exchange with me for four acres, I would value mine at 50 cents an acre; inasmuch as when the transaction was finished, I would have twice the amount of land that I formerly had.

That is the position, Mr. Speaker. [Hon. M.E. COX: A stupid argument.] Why don't the Hon. Minister get up and justify this transaction? *Sotto voce* remarks are only for serpents and snakes. Let him get up and justify his stand as a member of the Executive who agreed to such a transaction as this. I challenge all of them. They should terminate this transaction. How can they go around and tell the land hungry people of this island that they find themselves with land at Six Roads valued at only \$600 an acre, when Foursquare has adjacent land valued at \$1,200 per acre?

The honourable senior member for St. Joseph has said on a former occasion that there are about 12 people at the Colonial Office who follow all that is said in the legislative chambers of the colonies. I wonder how the Hon. Leader of the Government who is the only person capable of leading Barbados and this Government, could allow these officials to see such a decision coming from him and his Government.

This transaction is something that this Government would do. Obviously their appraisals are always on the side of the financiers. That is natural; because, they are mostly financiers themselves. But now that they have valued Foursquare's land at \$1,200 per acre, if I were in their position, having the power that they have, I would buy that ten acres; in fact I would buy the whole plantation at \$600 per acre. Let the Government attempt that and you will see how soon Foursquare will shout for murder.

Let the so-called Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries—

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member cannot refer to the Hon. Minister as "so-called".

Mr. ALLDER: But is not he called so? (Laughter).

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member is attempting to be clever. He will not deceive me by his cleverness. If the honourable member makes reference to a so-called Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries, he is not referring to the Hon. Minister on this side of the table, because the Hon. Ministers on this side are not so-called. [A VOICE: But they are so called.] They are Ministers. I hope the honourable member will not follow the facetious asides.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Speaker, I have always asked this Government to be consistent in its policy for the buying of land; I mean consistent in the sense that when the Government goes and pays a

higher price for land in a particular area, the adjoining areas, regardless of how far they may be from that part, go up in value. As a matter of fact, the owners fix their prices with the understanding that the Government should pay so much for so little. In this case it is so incompatible to reason as to why Foursquare land is valued at \$1,200 per acre, and the Government land is only valued at \$600. Naturally, if someone has land at Marchfield for sale next week, he is going to see to it that it is valued according to the value that the Government has paid for the land Government bought near by; and that will create a confusion which would be due to the misguided policy of the Government.

Sir, we are not obliged to have this ten acres of land; not even the sixteen acres which is proposed to be exchanged for it. If you are going to set up a system of vegetable farming, that system can be carried on where you have the land already. Let Messrs Foursquare Estates Ltd. keep their land. Let them keep their land unless you can exchange it on an acre for acre basis. I have been told that Foursquare land is not valued as much as the Government owned land aside of it in view of the bad terrain where it is situated. Tell Messrs Foursquare Ltd. we do not want to have any transactions with them. We have our sixteen acres; let us carry on our farming scheme there. Land cannot move. You are going to realise if Messrs Foursquare Estate Ltd. succeed in getting this transaction and they decide to sell the sixteen acres tomorrow as some of the others have done, you will be surprised to see the price which they will ask for it; and all the Government members may do is to hide their faces in shame. Of course, when they are hiding their faces in shame, the transaction would have been already concluded.

Mr. Speaker, I am not surprised that the Queen's Solicitor has got disgusted over the methods which the Government adopted in the transferring of land in this colony, and because of his disgust he has resigned his post as Queen's Solicitor. It is not the first time that I have heard expressions of regret by certain persons who have something to do with Government transactions. Naturally, no professional man or officer would want to associate himself or to put the prestige of his profession at stake, by having something to do with transactions such as this.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of explanation. The honourable senior member for St. John should realise by now that the transaction which he referred to as not being above suspicion or above board, was actually conducted by the Queen's Solicitor, no other person but Mr. Shilstone whose integrity cannot be questioned. By now the honourable member should realise that they were also competent appraisers who fixed these undervalues in both cases. One of the values was fixed at \$600 per acre and the other at \$900 per acre plus the value of the crop.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Speaker, the appraisers are as efficient as the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries; and we know how efficient the Hon. Minister is. The Hon. Minister still goes on with the idea that the appraisers did justice. Did the appraisers of Government do justice when they appraised the land down at the back of Newcastle Hill which was sold at £200 per acre. That land is under the hill. It is land which can only bear grass and shrubs in certain areas. It is also land that will move owing to landslides. How can the Hon. Minister expect people to accept this, something which he is trying to put over the House. The land at Six Roads is in a good residential area. It

is a desirable area—a place where anybody would like to live. The Hon. Minister of Agriculture said that the appraisers did justice. It is unfortunate that Government's business rests in the hands of those Ministers.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of explanation. I never said that the appraisers did justice. I said that the under valuation was both ways. Not one way.
4.00 p.m.

Mr. ALLDER: The honourable member is not even tactful enough as to admit that a mistake has been made, and that he is willing to accept a postponement so as to save his good name. I am helping the honourable member to do that by suggesting a postponement and the formulation of a Committee. I am willing to fight it out with the honourable member until he agrees.

I cannot help expressing my feeling in so far as this matter is concerned, but I certainly do feel that this is something which can cause a Government like this to fall; not that I purposely desire that the Government should fall on such a matter, but in respect of anything like this which they bring to a Chamber such as this, they should deserve any castigation which the electorate should decide to inflict upon them. The reason why I am saying that is this: I am only trying to appeal to the consciences of the Hon. Premier and the Hon. Leader of the Government. I do not mind the Minister who directly had something to do with this matter; I cannot repeat too often that any transaction such as this would not surprise me. But I am appealing to the Premier because no doubt the public cannot accept a dealing like this without having the feeling of suspicion. And those honourable members on the other side of the House know that it is wrong. If it falls my lot to draw it to their attention, I am in duty bound to do so. However, there is one thing which I cannot do; and that is to cause them to realise the necessity for discontinuing a transaction which I hope they have not yet concluded with Messrs Foursquare Company Ltd. If they were bent on doing justice, even although it might cause some inconvenience to them, they should realise that —

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of Order. The inference to be drawn from the remarks of the honourable senior member for St. John if one were to listen to them very carefully, is to the effect that a member of the Government would benefit as a result of this transaction.

Mr. SPEAKER: From what context of the honourable member's speech is that inference to be drawn?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: From the honourable member's last few words. That means that some personal benefit would accrue to a member of the Government.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member's remarks did not convey that impression to me as I heard them. The honourable member may proceed.

Mr. ALLDER: I will say, "Oh shame, where is thy blush?" I cannot help for the sensitiveness of the Hon. Minister. Probably he knows how far he went in this transaction. I am saying that when the time arrives, I will make a motion that a Committee be set up to go into this transaction; and I hope that the consciousness of public duty, the responsibility and the necessity for the display of public morals will appeal to the Government which is in possession of a majority not only in this Chamber but among the masses of this island, to permit a postponement of this Resolution and also to permit the setting up of a Committee so as to remove their dealings from doubt and suspicion. It is very

necessary that that should be done. I have very deep feelings in this matter, because I cannot find any other body in this island transacting its business in this manner. I am saying this: before this matter reached this Chamber, it had to be dealt with in Executive Committee and the Ministers concerned are not the only persons who reached the decision in this matter. We must infer that the Head of the Administration sat as Chairman of that august and honourable body; and out of public responsibilities they should not have agreed to a Resolution of this sort passing beyond the confines of the room in which it was discussed.

Of course, sir, I am now going to move formally that further consideration of the Resolution be postponed. I must also repeat that it would be discreet on the part of the Government to agree to the postponement.

11.10 p.m.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, before a decision is taken one way or the other, I would like to make a few remarks on this very important question. Quite a lot of argument has been adduced by the various speakers. As a Government, we have to accept collective responsibility; and therefore when one member of the Government, as in this case, the Hon. Minister of Agriculture is attacked, I feel that all members of the Government, and more especially the Ministers, are attacked also; because, their decision in all these matters is a collective decision.

I feel therefore that it is our duty to explain the circumstances under which we agreed to the transaction, and if possible, to try to convince the House that what we did, we did in the best interest of the community, and also that what we did is above board. I have not got up to reply to the honourable member who has just sat down, because it is immaterial to me at times what that honourable member says. The honourable junior member for St. Peter has for years been in the habit of saying that honourable members should do a little introspection, and perhaps I should use that phrase on this particular occasion.

I want to make a few remarks more particularly in reply to remarks made by the honourable junior member for St. Peter who knows, that for years I have expressed the feeling that where land is concerned, very little value should be attached to it; because, it is not an asset that can deteriorate, nor is it moveable. I have also said that the high prices asked for land in this island have been forcing quite a number of people to live on a false economy, in that many people who are not in a position to do so, have to pay the extravagant prices charged for rent of land by landlords who know well enough that people have to live on land. The landlords get the opportunity to buy up large tenancies and they increase the land rent by 100 per cent, and in some cases by 200 per cent. I know people who are paying as much as 4/- per week for housespots. That is because people who have been able to acquire wealth (by whatever means possible) have bought large areas of land and are inflicting a hardship on the people who have to rent land.

The Hon. Minister of Agriculture has put this motion before the House and has explained as far as possible, the negotiations which went on and the conclusions to which the Government came after those negotiations. He has pointed out quite clearly that the transaction was conducted by the Queen's Solicitor, Mr. Shilstone. I heard a *sotto voce* remark that Mr. Shilstone hates this person and the next person. It is immaterial to me whom he hates. The only point at issue is whether or not the Government has got a square deal.

I do not know if the Minister of Agriculture in putting his case told the House the difference in quality of the land. I am prepared to say that even before it was purchased I visited the area, and although I cannot claim to know much about land I think that if other members visited the area they would come to the conclusion that the land which the Government has and which they are offering to the Foursquare people in exchange, is not as good in quality as the land which the Government is getting. I am sure that honourable members saw the plan. The land has a few mahogany trees on it and it was valued by three valuers; persons who claim to know what they are doing. [Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Give us the names.]

One was Mr. A. King, another was Mr. Armstrong from Pool Plantation, and the third was Mr. Watson. They were the valuers of this land. They were the persons who made the valuation and fixed the price.

11.20 p.m.

The Government had no reason to doubt the *bona fides* of those individuals; and as a result, it came to the decision as you see to-day. I would like it to be clearly understood (although of course it is a very easy thing for persons to measure others by their own yard stick) that there was nothing dishonest or sinister about this matter as has been expressed by some members in this debate. I do not think that those people who value this land took this into consideration: it was not a question that the owners of this land wanted to exchange or was asking for an exchange of this piece of land, but rather it was this Government approaching those people for an exchange. Government feels it would be far better to have their land in one compound than to have somebody operating between their portions. [A VOICE: Foursquare Ltd., is in the same position.] Mr. Speaker, Foursquare Ltd. is not in the same position. There is absolutely no question of Foursquare being in the same position. However, whether Foursquare would be in the same position or not, the owners did not ask for any exchange of land. I am saying that it is the Government who asked for the exchange and because the Director of Agriculture and the Government felt that it would be far better to have this land in one compound. If you have this land in one compound, you will have your housing units, your vegetable farm, your Health Centre, your School and your District Market under one plot; and it would be better to have it in that way, than for it to be divided. That was the reason why this decision was taken.

As I have said sir, it is not because the government-owned land has been out of cultivation. It is because it is planted in sour grass and has been bearing that grass for years. It must also be borne in mind that this bit of land is also of poor quality. It is more shallow than the land for which it is to be exchanged. It is difficult to appreciate the remarks of some honourable members. The honourable senior member for St. John said not long ago, that the valuation of the Government's bit of land was at £125 per acre, and the land of Messrs. Foursquare Ltd., was valued at £200 per acre. The difference Mr. Speaker, is because of the crop on the lands of Foursquare. It is not on account of the land. The land of Messrs. Foursquare Ltd., is valued at £200 per acre and the government-owned land is valued at £125.

What I may say is: when the Government attempts to purchase land, it is a fact that it has to pay very dear for it. Members criticised the cost which Government has to pay for land from time to time; now on this occasion where this land which

can be considered to be valued at a reasonable price, you are hearing the criticism that it should be valued at a greater price; both that of Foursquare and that of Government. [A VOICE: Who said so?]

The honourable senior member for St. John talked of purchasing land at £500 per acre. The honourable member said that the Government should purchase land at St. John sometime ago on the floor of this House at £500 per acre, so as to put people in St. John on it. That land was grass land. This land for which we are making the exchange is arable land; land which produces cane. We are exchanging it on a valuation of £200 per acre and you are hearing that this is unscrupulous dealings. [A VOICE: We are saying it is too cheap.]

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, may I be allowed to speak on a point of explanation. The Hon. Minister made a reference to the effect that some honourable members said that the land was valued too dear. What I said was this: if one was worth £250 per acre, the other was worth the same thing. I make no apologies to anybody in my criticism that the transaction is a rotten one.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member is now making a speech.

Hon. M. E. COX: Of course I really did not rise on a point of Order when the honourable member was speaking, because I did not have all the facts at my finger tips. I only made reference to it now because a lot of extraneous matter was brought into the debate. These questions were not before the House at all. I would however say, that the same Queen's Solicitor who dealt with the arrangements for making this exchange also dealt with the arrangements for the Government buying Cave Hill; all these transactions were dealt with by him. As I pointed out on the last occasion when the House sanctioned an Address dealing with the Government purchasing bits of land out of the Labour Welfare Fund, as far as the principle goes, it must be borne in mind that this Fund is administered wholly and solely by the Government in accordance with the authority given it by this Legislature. There is therefore no point in any honourable member saying that this House did not know of the purchase of the tenantry at Cave Hill by Government.

11.30 p.m.

We have had experts to value this land. Where the price of land is concerned I have always been opposed to the exorbitant price which is asked for land, and I have been pressing to see if we cannot get a Government land valuer to go around the island and value land. You will buy land at £5 per acre today and tomorrow you will sell it at £200 per acre! People cannot get money even to rent house-spots; and that is why the Government has had to come to the assistance of the people and purchase land, so that when people are got rid of overnight, the Government can rescue them. These people will have the comfort of knowing that the landlord will not say "you have been paying 4/- for this spot all the time, but from tomorrow you will have to pay \$4.00."

The Queen's Solicitor was in charge of this matter, and the valuers pointed out the difference between the two areas of land. The land which the Government owns at present is not as good as the land owned by Messrs. Foursquare Ltd. The land owned by Messrs. Foursquare Ltd. is arable land: and as I have already pointed out, the Government asked Messrs. Foursquare Ltd., to make this exchange so that the Government can get all its land under one compound. It was a question of our asking Messrs. Foursquare Ltd., to make the exchange and it is not

fair to accuse the Hon. Minister of Agriculture or anybody else in the Government of having put through an unscrupulous or dishonest deal and of all the cheap remarks which have been made.

It is not a question of reaping any crop; if the honourable member boils the matter down to the reaping of the crop there would only be a difference of a few hundred dollars. I am not a land valuer, but all I can say is that I have differed on many occasions from the decisions of land valuers. There is a difference in the exchange to compensate for the quality of the land.

Mr. HOLDER: I have been listening to honourable members who have spoken on this Resolution, and I will say that in my opinion this scheme is a pretty good one. (ASIDES:)

Mr. SPEAKER: The asides are too loud in this Chamber; asides must not be so loud.

Mr. HOLDER: In my opinion the value of this land has been taken into consideration. I have never seen the land but I think I have some knowledge of it. Here you have 10 acres of land which are under cultivation and 16 acres which are not under cultivation. Taking into consideration the value of this land, what I want to say is this: the 10 acres of land is under cultivation with a crop and whether the Government needed the crop or not, there is a crop on the land. If the Government got this land now with plant canes on it, one has to consider that having 10 acres in plant canes you will have at least three crops. The Government's land has been lying fallow for ten years, and the Government must realise that they would have to pay some compensation for the Foursquare land, inasmuch as if the Government had allowed the plantation to keep these canes, they would have had at least three crops.

11.40 p.m.

The land is in canes and I am assuming that they are either plant canes or first ratoons, and therefore the land is worth the difference per acre. Let us say that the ten acres are in canes, and let us assume that the land gives 30 tons of cane to the acre; ten acres will give 300 tons and that makes the land worth the difference. Although the price of land, as land, may be the same, you have to consider what the growing crop would be worth.

I am not discussing whether the market price of land is too high or too low. I know there are cases where people buy land at too high a price; but there is no law governing the price of land and one cannot prevent a man from purchasing land at whatever price he likes. There are cases, as I have said, where people buy land too dear. It is not that they do not know that the land is not worth the price, but they are land hungry.

My view is that when you take everything into consideration as regards the matter before the House, this Resolution should not be held up. The honourable senior member for St. John has talked about having ten and a quarter acres for a playing field and school. Must you take children from Six Cross Roads when they want to play, and send them four miles to the playing field at King George V Memorial Park?

Mr. ALLDER: On a point of Order, sir. I did not suggest that. What I said was, that an acre of land would be enough for the purposes of the school. My view is that as a general playing field, it would be superfluous to have the King George V Memorial Park and have another ten and a quarter acres at Six Cross Roads.

Mr. HOLDER: I do not think that I missed the remarks of the honourable member. He stressed

the point about the ten and a quarter acres for a playing field. He did not talk about the school. I do not know how many schools they are amalgamating in St. Philip; but if it is going to be a case like the one where they amalgamated St. Pauls and the Methodist Schools at Bay Street years ago, there will be a lot of children going to school there. I saw the plan, and in case it does not mean that the playing field will be for the children alone. I think the playing field will be for the benefit of the district.

I am not defending the Government's plan of development in its entirety. I think that some of these things could be shifted a bit. I am saying that this scheme is of such a nature, that if land belonging to Foursquare comes between the land possessed by the Government, I do not see why they should not exchange the land in order to get an entire plot, so that they could be able to lay it out much better. I do not see anything wrong in the difference in value, considering the crop that is going on the ten acres of land now and what that can bring with three consecutive crops. To put the 16 acres into preparation now, you would have to wait for three years to get that; whereas, by the Government's scheme you have it already. In my opinion this land merits the price paid for it.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I would be the last in the circumstances of a Ministerial System to attempt to do what should be done by the Minister in charge of the Resolution; this being a Resolution concerning his particular department. But it would be impossible for me, having heard the course of this debate, and having noted the atmosphere in which some portions of it were conducted, not to speak. Some members always seem to assume that they alone are honest. You can anticipate their thoughts, let alone their speech, before they make it. If honourable members in this position constantly attack the Government, credit must be given to the Government for being conscious that they are going to be attacked and that all their acts must be clearly defensible and of such a nature as to be open to the most careful scrutiny.

Whatever honourable members may think of this Government, whether it has numbers or no numbers, it does not have to look, (no government should have to look) only to the strength of the Opposition in any particular Chamber. This Government, being in the position of having a majority, is representative also of the majority of voters in the country; and it owes a duty to the people of this country no less, if not greater than, the duty it owes to the opposition which it may encounter from time to time. If honourable members cannot help having the attitude that others are dishonest and that they alone are honest, it will not make any difference to these Ministers or this Government. They can go on forever calling us dishonest and ignorant. They can go on forever thinking that we take our tasks as though they were nothing serious. It only raises their blood pressure. They come in and shout and accuse us; but they never raise in our consciousness the slightest consideration that we have done anything wrong.

If occasionally I say that I wish the Opposition were stronger, I mean it from the bottom of my heart. What good is an Opposition that can only curse? What good is an Opposition that does not care whether it speaks the truth or not? Some honourable members will get over there and say things that are not true, because sometimes we do not have the files on a particular matter and it is late and we cannot get the files from the office to contradict what those honourable members are saying.

As the honourable senior member for St. James pointed out to the hon. senior member for St. John—why leave out the word "school"; that is a school for boys and girls.
11.50 p.m.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of explanation. I have not left out the word "school" in my remarks. The facts are: I said, if an acre and a quarter of land were left for the accommodation of school children, the other nine acres could be used for a Housing Scheme or an extension of the vegetable garden scheme. The fact that I mentioned the portion for accommodating school children shows, that I did not leave it out in my remarks. Let me again repeat that the whole transaction is wrong.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: The honourable senior member for St. James pointed out that the ten and a quarter acres were for school and playing fields. If the honourable member had cared to ask the Hon. Minister for Agriculture or had cared to ask that in the Minister's reply they should be told how much land actually was for playing field and how much for the school, one could well understand. That was not so. The honourable senior member for St. John went on with his argument that ten and a quarter acres were too much to use for playing fields. If the school is to be an agricultural centre it is inevitable, (even if it had not been said on this side of the House) that any Secondary Modern School in the rural areas will be teaching animal husbandry and agriculture; you should have a feasible plot of land attached to the school, as that will be part of your scheme. There was a time, when the Government did a large amount of work on this Six Cross Roads affair; many were the schemes which Government had in mind. We started out by having meetings in the Ministerial Offices. We then went on the spot and with every Head of the Departments that was concerned, we discussed matters. We saw for ourselves that it would be obviously better to have these two portions of land together. We discussed all sorts of schemes and we asked people, even the Commissioner of Police, whether he had any suggestion to make. Honourable members will remember that it was thought, that there was the possibility that up there could be used for a training school for Policemen. We had to modify some of the original plans. If honourable members will ask questions instead of assuming there must be dirt in everything a Minister does, then we will get on and work will be done in this country.

I repeat, that statements are made on assumptions which have no basis. As I have said, the ten and a quarter acres of land comprise playing fields, siting of school buildings, siting of staff quarters and an agricultural centre for the teaching of husbandry; because, it is inevitable that that subject should be taught in any rural modern school. Only this morning I was present at the opening of a school in Bridgetown, and that school has seven acres of land attached to it for a playing field. Would anybody suggest that that is too much; unless you have a school for only twenty or thirty children?

I think I have said in this place already, (I know I have said it in public) that it is the policy of the Government to be as economical as possible where you have to build new schools and community centres, and to use the assembly halls of secondary modern schools as community centres; and that you should have more land than you necessarily need for the school attached to it. Just like at Trents, the land attached to that school would also be for the use of adults as well as the school children. How can anybody if they were using what gray matter God has given them, begin to question the amount of ten and a quarter acres as being too much for a school, play-

ing fields and so on. This will be for a school, Post Office, Health Clinic, District Market and Model Vegetable Farm. This 41 acres of land will comprise a whole village in a small way. That is the answer to the suggestion that you are throwing away land when you have 10¼ acres attached to the school.

I have already said that when these negotiations took place, the ten acres for which we proposed to exchange our land had plant canes on it, and the valuers said that it was worth £200 per acre and that the crop on it was worth £50 an acre. Another portion of the plot was also valued at £200 an acre with crops on it; the crops on that portion worth only £30 an acre. They made a comment on our sixteen acre plot; these are the actual words they used: "This section which is in grasses of the type which is difficult to eradicate, and in weeds, is in poor condition from an agricultural point of view, and there is evidence of soil erosion. We value the land for agricultural purposes at £125 per acre."

You are the Government that used to accept the advice of agriculturalists who have been valuing land for years and years; you have no reason to assume that they were either incompetent or dishonest. But there is this stupid suggestion that this Government is foolish and will swallow everything. The Hon. Minister has already told the House that alternative suggestions were put up by Messrs. Foursquare Ltd.: and as far as the valuation is concerned, there is no reason whatever for the Government to say that the three valuers who did the valuation were not merely not honest but did an incompetent job on their part. Let me tell the honourable junior member for Christ Church early, that I am not suggesting that the Government considered the price of £200 per acre as too little to pay for land; fantastic prices have been paid for land in this island. Fantastic prices have settled the market value. If the Government finds itself in the position from time to time, that no valuer is going to give an honest opinion as to what land is worth, if somebody says that land is worth not £500 an acre but £600 an acre and if we think it is worth £600, this Government will not pay any more for it.

The honourable senior member for the City was contradicted by the honourable senior member for St. Philip; the honourable senior member for the City said that two bits of land lying side by side the crop on it was worth £50 an acre. Another portion should be valued at the same price. It is not often that I agree with the honourable senior member for St. Philip; but I do agree with him, that that is nonsense. Let us assume that both portions of land are of the same fertility normally; if you let one portion go out of cultivation and you assiduously till the other and there is a difference of ten years between them, it is absurd to value the land as the honourable member has valued it. The honourable member obviously knew that that bald statement would mean nothing; and he went on to make out the difference of what would bring this other piece of land into cultivation. You would have had to find by experiment year after year, what it would cost to bring this land back into cultivation with adjacent land. [Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Talk about law books! I appeared for the Panama people in their case and the report from the Court of Chancery shows that there is a period of three years in bringing land back into cultivation. Are we to wait to see whether the fertility of the 16 acres will come up to the fertility of the ten acres?

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: On a point of explanation. I did not agree with the valuers in valuing one lot of land at one price and the other lot at another price. I agreed that both lots of land should be at the same price, but the difference would be that one lot has

been under grass and the other has been under cultivation, and the question would be what would it cost to bring the other lot into cultivation.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: This is what the honourable member is saying. We cultivate land for ten years and it comes up to a point of fertility; we do not cultivate another portion of land for ten years and you value both at the same amount, but only take away the amount which it would cost to bring one lot up to the fertility of the other. In order to justify valuing the two portions of land at the same value, must you bring the one which is out of cultivation to the fertility of the other? My answer as a layman to that is what first class receivers have said in these matters. [Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Land which is lying down is more valuable.] The honourable senior member for St. Philip said that the valuation must be different.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I said nothing of the kind. I asked how land which is lying side by side could have two different valuations?

12.10 a.m.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, if one wants to criticise, one can say anything, evidence or no evidence. If the Government has pursued a certain course in this matter, it has done so on the advice of its own department, and on the advice of valuers; one valuer being the Government's Agricultural Attorney. If honourable members question the honesty of people associated with the Government today — (*Loud asides*).

Mr. SPEAKER: Honourable members cannot be allowed to make speeches from their seats when they have already spoken. [Mr. ALLDER: Wrong speeches like those?] I want to deal with the honourable member as charitably as I can, but I may have to deal with him as firmly as I should. Honourable members must not continue to make these loud asides. I am not in a position to hear what the speaker is saying.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Hate me if you like; but this Government does not have to defend itself. There will be time enough two years hence, when we will defend ourselves before the public of Barbados. Tuesday after Tuesday there is a degeneration in the tone of the debates in this Chamber; and there are attacks on people's characters indulged in by two honourable members. Some honourable members make the Government feel that it is no use listening to them when they begin to speak.

The suggestion is that we are so stupid, that any English Official can come along and put dust in our eyes and we will beg them for more. That cuts no ice with anyone. All that the Ministers are bound to do (because they owe a duty to the House) is to put the case clearly, conceal nothing and answer any reasonable questions. All these accusations against the Government mean nothing to us. If the honourable senior member for St. John thinks that all he has to do is to come here and shout, accuse the Government of dishonesty and disrespect the Chair, let him continue to do so. One thing that worries the Government and some other honourable members is, that spectators from other colonies and countries come here sometimes and see these things going on in a House composed as this House is composed. Those are the things that worry me.

I do not intend, Mr. Speaker, to depart from my practice of leaving a Minister to deal with his own portfolio; but the constant repetition of the overt attacks on the character of the whole Government has caused me, like the hon. senior member for St. Michael, to point out that we have put in substantial work on this question all through May, June, July and August; and that we have been on constant contact with Heads of Departments as far as the plan which has been drawn up is con-

cerned. Only after careful consideration, have we come to the conclusion that there should be this division of farm, housing, peasants holding, clinic and health centre. It is an attempt by the Government to create in a small way a self-contained unit suitable to a rural district.

We have had many other plans. We have considered whether we should have the proportional profit farm system as in Puerto Rico etc. It is suggested that we listen to anything and that we allow hanky-panky to be played on us. I am sorry if I have left very little for the Hon. Minister to say. I do suggest that this Government should have gone on holiday when it heard of land valued at only £200 per acre. That is something we have hoped for, for a long time—to get agricultural land at £200 an acre. If a man values land for the Government at £500 an acre it may be a good thing, because if one of these days he has land for sale, the Government can remind him of his valuation of £500 per acre.

12.20 a.m.

I pass by Mr. Speaker, the suggestion, not because I am going to suggest (which would be approaching disrespect to the Chair) that the honourable member was out of order in referring to the Central Foundry site. But I would say this: when the honourable member makes these allegations it does not create any impression except to confirm us in the view which we have that the honourable member has no regard for the truth. The honourable member referred to what I presume is the buying of the Central Foundry site. To suggest that this Government as it is at present constituted bought the Central Foundry land at some fantastic price connotes two things. Nobody has ever suggested, as far as I can remember, that the £28,000 for which it was bought was too much to give for it.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of Order. The Hon. Premier says, "As far as he can remember"; but some honourable members did say that the amount paid for it was too much. The Minutes of the meeting when the matter was debated can show that that was said.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I was very careful to qualify my remarks by saying, "as far as I can remember." I say it again. The honourable member said that we paid a huge sum for it, and all we are doing with it is making it into a Car Park; but, sir, whether that land is worth £2 or £4 per square foot, I do not know. I am not questioning whether £28,000 in those days was too much to pay for it.

I am tempted to refer to some other transaction but I do not want to bring members to their feet on a point of order. However, the honourable senior member for St. John went on to talk about Blackman's House. I do not remember (he may be right, though I do not think he is) whether the price paid by the Government to the last owner was twice as much as he gave for it. It might have been; but there is a vast difference between what the Government bought it for and what that owner paid for it. That house was at one time sold for £3,000 without the right to do anything with it but to live in it. That was in the covenant. You could not afford to do anything with it; you could not even alter it; all you had to do with it was to keep it as a dwelling-house. Some American lady, so it appears, also bought it comparatively cheap because of the covenant. She had some Lodge School boys staying with her, and she had to get the original owners to relax the covenant so as to allow her to keep it as a Restaurant, owing to the fact that she might have had some canteen there for those boys. When the last owner bought it, it still had this special covenant attached to it. When the Government bought

it the Government could not convert it into a school according to the covenant, and we compelled Mr. Myles who was the owner to give us a clear title; and in order to sell us with a clear title, he had to go back to the original owners and pay something so as to get a clear title. I have been assured by more than one Solicitor that the Government was extremely lucky in getting that place at the price which was paid for it because the amount of money which Mr. Myles gave for it originally plus what he had to pay to get the covenant removed, was more than what the Government paid for it. Personally, I went so far as to ask the Solicitors to convey my personal thanks for what had been done to have the covenant removed. This gentleman had paid more money in the end for it than we paid for it. [A VOICE: That is not so.]

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: That statement is not correct.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member may not do that in this Chamber.

12.30 a.m.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: There again, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member is accusing me of lying. I mention that only because of the statement made by the honourable senior member for St. John. That statement standing by itself would give a completely different interpretation to what it would give if the context were all there. Although I do not normally have in mind to reply to attacks made in here, however, in consideration of the particular attacks which have been made, I do feel that in a matter of this sort where the Government is spending taxpayers' money in one form or another, as full an explanation as it is possible to give is due not only to members representing the taxpayers, but to the taxpayers themselves. And if a debate of this sort serves no other purpose than to bring to the notice of the public that no fact has been alleged by the Opposition to show that anything is wrong with the valuation of this land, except that it is not a case in which the Government is paying much more than they should pay in this exchange, then it is still useful. When you work out the figures and consider that the Government has been advised by three tried men as well as the Government's attorney, how can the Government do otherwise than accept the expert advice of its Agricultural Attorney? Must you not accept the advice of one of the most distinguished planters in the island? That fact would carry more weight in this matter than anything else. What was the Government to do but take the advice it has got and rejoice at the fact that in Barbados nobody will be able to throw anything at us at more than £200 an acre, and then continue with this scheme? I have no doubt that this scheme will be successful, and the opportunity given to the people of St. Philip to enjoy these amenities will be taken advantage of; and I have no doubt that this Government will be in a position to repeat a scheme of this sort in some other parish beside the parish of St. Philip.

Mr. LEWIS: I had really hoped that at this stage we would have had some further explanation by the Hon. Minister who claims that he has had more to do with this matter than any body else because, there are still many points to be answered. The first thing that strikes me about this land is this question of bringing it back into cultivation; and if this land is not in cultivation it will cost so much to bring it back into cultivation. The honourable member who has just sat down has been interrupted often enough, to ask if the land had been resting, whether it would give better yields. The great question I am asking, is this: who wants to bring it back into cultivation? Is this land being

exchanged with a covenant that you cannot sell it for house spots? The Government has not yet told us what they are going to do with these 10 acres of land. You can build schools and have playing-fields; you can have a Post Office; you can have all these things, but we have not yet been told what they are going to do with this land. The honourable senior member for St. James who can really help us in this matter is basing his argument on the fact that you will have plant canes and you will have the opportunity of reaping the crops. In the Addendum to this Resolution, it is pointed out that there would be a model vegetable farm; but do they really want us to plant canes? However, the claim that they are giving away six acres of land under any consideration is entirely wrong; even if they want it for agricultural land. Nobody knows what Messrs Foursquare Ltd. will do with that land. 12.40 a.m.

What would be the price per acre if that land was building land? This land does not worth as much as building land. If your land is not on the public road, it will cost millions of dollars to put in roads and water. If you have land on the main road, valuers would value it at \$3,000 per acre; and people who know about these matters tell me it will even cost more. It seems to me that the Government has satisfied themselves because they are taking land which is in canes. They are giving away sixteen acres for ten acres. That could not be right in any consideration.

As the background to what I have to say later, I will quote two short Acts, one of which has been repealed. One is a 1950 Act; this is what the members of this House sat down and passed while I alone on that occasion, asked that we should preserve some of our right. Section 12 of the particular Act said that the Executive Committee may let lands of which they possess on any terms which they think fit. I was the only person who opposed that. I said, that even if they are making a lease of Government lands, let them publish it in the *Official Gazette*. That was in 1950. But Mr. Speaker, that was repealed in 1951, exactly one year later; and the new Act said, that the Executive Committee might with the approval of the Legislature lease, sell, or exchange any lands they might possess. Look up the Debates and you will see, that I was the only member who said that the Executive Committee should not be given the right to do as they like with public lands. The Secretary of State for the Colonies must have seen the reason in that; and he must have sent back and said to get that Act off the Statute Book, because it will lead to corruption.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: On a point of Order. That is a serious accusation to make—that the Secretary of State for the Colonies, foreseeing corruption on the part of the Government, forced this Government to repeal an Act. I apologise to the Secretary of State for the Colonies for even dreaming that he could have the mentality of the honourable junior member for the City.

Mr. LEWIS: The fact remains that a year after we passed the first Act it was repealed. If the Government of the day wanted it in the way provided for in the first Act, someone must have said no. The King's representative here signed it. How can one come to any other conclusion but that the Government was asked to repeal it. [Hon. M. E. COX: Why don't the Secretary of State for the Colonies disallow it?]

No one knows, Mr. Speaker, what the Foursquare people are going to do with the land that they are getting from the Government. Not one member of the Government has told us that. The Government complains that peasants do not get enough for

their canes from factories; Foursquare is a factory, and the Government will have to sell the canes growing on the ten acres of land to Foursquare.

I have in my hand the Resolution for the purchase of that Admiralty property. It was to the tune of \$81,000. Legal expenses came to \$737. It is forty eight acres of land costing \$24,888. Buildings cost \$48,000 etc. We were told on that occasion that the primary purpose of buying the land was to establish a school and the Seawell type of pilot scheme. That was debated on the 10th November, 1953. We were told that \$27,888 was the amount paid by the Admiralty for the land. In the course of the debate, the honourable senior member for St. Joseph said that the Admiralty had asked \$48,000 for the land. I am merely saying that the Admiralty bought it at \$518 per acre, and they asked \$1,000 per acre for it.

The Admiralty must have had someone acting for them in this island. The King's Solicitor must have been acting for them. Someone prevailed upon them that they would have to accept what they paid for it. In Bermuda they had to sell land at less than what they paid for it.

We were told that it was going to be a scheme like the Seawell Scheme. We have heard tonight that the Government has laid out over 200 house spots. Government was day after day changing their minds about what they would do with this land. They said they would use it for a school, and we were glad to hear that the Scheme at Seawell was a success. The honourable senior member for St. John seconded the motion for the passing of the Resolution to buy this land, and he congratulated the Government on it. The honourable senior member for St. Michael admitted that this is an under-valuation.

Hon. M. E. COX: I never said anything about under-valuation. I am always saying that land should be one penny an acre.

Mr. LEWIS: If I quote him, will he admit it? He said it was an under-valuation in both instances.

Mr. SPEAKER: It was the Hon. Minister of Agriculture who said that. 12.50 a.m.

Mr. LEWIS: It does not matter. It was a Minister who said so and I am sure it was the Minister for Works.

That is quite alright if you are exchanging one acre of land for one acre of land. If you value it at a penny or a million pounds per acre it is the same thing; because, you are exchanging one acre for another. Can't you see it is a good thing to do if you are exchanging the ten acres for the sixteen to undervalue the ten acres? When you do that you are getting more than half again.

What I would like to know, is the reason why they went to the trouble to value these plots of land. Let them take up the challenge which was given by the honourable senior member for St. John. Do not let there be any exchange now. Mr. Speaker, I am sure if they were to send those three appraisers on behalf of the Government to value that land without the knowledge that it is to be exchanged, they would put its worth at more than £200 per acre. Let the Government put that land back in a condition for agricultural purposes and sell it back to the previous owners. We were told that the Admiralty wanted \$1,000 an acre for that land when the Government bought it. If the Director of Agriculture thinks that throwing out the land is going to injure it, why do they practise it?

Now, Sir, much was made of the fact that the honourable senior member for St. John said that the 10¼ acres was for the playing field. What do you see in the Addendum to the Resolution? You see the school and playing field 10¼ acres, and now some honourable member gets up to justify that and say

it would be for the school and playing field and a plot for teaching husbandry. Why did you put it down for a school and playing field, and did not say it was for a school and playing field and a plot for teaching husbandry? I am continually saying that you are denying members of this House information when you do things like that. Sir, do you know that there is nothing in the Addendum to show anything of the cane crop? Are you being fair and honest to members of this House when you say, that this Government is satisfied that the exchange is fair, and that an exchange on an acre for acre basis is not obtainable since the Government-owned land has been out of cultivation for ten years whereas the Foursquare land is under cultivation? You did not say that there is a crop on it; and nobody said anything on that, at least not when it was introduced.

Sir, this is another thing. If you take this agricultural land and you set about to level it and put roads in it, do you know that it is going to cost more than what it would cost to turn the other land into cultivation? I do not see the sense of their depreciating the value of the Government-owned land. It is also said by the appraisers, that there is evidence of soil erosion. Just fancy they have given that information. The Hon. Minister of Agriculture said nothing about that. It is stated that the Foursquare land is under cultivation; nothing has been said about a crop being on it, nor did the Hon. Minister of Agriculture say anything about that. The Hon. Minister of Communications has just said that it has a crop on it. I defy anybody to say that the Hon. Minister of Agriculture said that when he was introducing the Resolution.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Can the honourable member tell us the difference between a crop growing on land and land under cultivation?
1.05 a.m.

Mr. LEWIS: If it is under cultivation, it is land that you can plant something in right away. Everybody knows that land under cultivation is land which is under preparation for a crop. We can clearly see the amount of intelligence they are capable of bringing to bear on a question of this sort. Nobody can fool them; why can't they be honest enough to say that the crop has been valued at £50 an acre? Do you mean to tell me that a crop which has just started to grow, is worth the same thing as a crop which is ready to be reaped? It is dishonest to say that any such a thing was said.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of Order. Most honourable members will remember that in introducing this Resolution, I took the trouble of reading right through the Addendum. It was stated that the land of Messrs. Foursquare is under cultivation.

Mr. LEWIS: If it were a crop of yams or lettuce, would it be valued in the same way? The Hon. Minister of Agriculture does not yet know what is in the Addendum to this Resolution. He only got up to prove that this valuation of £50 an acre is in the Addendum; the honourable member is in charge of this Resolution and he should not have bidden anything. It is a gross misleading of the House to do things in that way. Land which is thrown out of cultivation means that you are preparing it for crops. I do not think that we should give away these six acres of land; that is ignorance. Give them the money which it is worth. In this manner, I feel that they have no right to give away the people's land. However they have been able to get this land for one half the price that was originally asked for it, and therefore they should be proud of this land. They have not even been honest to say what they are going to do with the land; if it

will be used for building purposes they will have difficulties in preparing it for that purpose.

Mr. Speaker, feeling the way I do, despite anything the Government's Minister may say, I think that both the Ministers and the members of this House should have an opportunity now that this matter has been publicly aired, to discuss this matter with the people who are more intimately connected with the cultivation of land. Many a time we have come to decisions in this House, and I myself have regretted, that we did not have time enough to consider matters. Let us take the recent Intra-regional Shipping matter; we regretted that we did not have sufficient time to consider it —

Hon. M. E. COX: What has that got to do with this debate?

Mr. LEWIS: It proves that you did not know anything about the matter; the honourable member called a meeting and he was not ready to deal with the matter.

Mr. SPEAKER: That matter is not now before the House.

Mr. LEWIS: I am seconding the motion for the postponement of the consideration of this Resolution. I believe that if they have a little time to discuss this matter with other people, they may know something more about it. The Queen's Solicitor dealt with this matter when he was going out and he might have regretted it.

1.10 a.m.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, I purposely waited until a late stage of this debate before speaking, in order to see if I could be satisfied as to the real value of this land. I must confess that after hearing the revelations of the honourable senior member for St. Michael, I cannot be otherwise than perturbed as to the valuation. The hon. member has told us that the valuers were Mr. A. King, Mr. Armstrong and Mr. Watson. As far as those individuals are concerned, I have no doubt that they do not have shares in Foursquare Ltd., but I also have no doubt that those persons' interests are with the capitalists interests of this island, and not with the interest of the poor of Barbados. I cannot accept their valuations, having regard to the valuation given by one who was responsible to the public of Barbados—the honourable senior member for Bridgetown. If they did not view the land and take independent opinions, and it came to having to accept either the valuation of those three valuers and the valuation of the honourable senior member for Bridgetown, I would accept his valuation in preference.

Those three valuers belong to the same social groove, the same Barbados bourbons, the same plutocracy of this island. I do not like to have to accept their valuations in the absence of what I would regard as an unbiassed opinion. In spite of the repeated knowledge of things agricultural possessed by the honourable senior member for St. James, I cannot accept his valuation or opinion, when he himself has said that he has never seen the land. However valuable is the opinion of that honourable member, I personally cannot place any reliance on the opinion of that eminent expert when he says, that he has never seen the land.

I myself have seen the land sometime ago, though not with the view to valuing it; but without the assistance of a competent person or persons, I would not be able to give any opinion to its value. I can see no other than that a useful purpose would be served by postponing this Resolution for a week, and satisfying ourselves that no attempt has been made to put anything on us.

Of course it is said in the Addendum that the lands in question were independently appraised. It

is a matter of opinion whether from the stand point of the people of a Government of this island we can accept the valuation of those three gentlemen, and whether members of the Barbados plantocracy are persons whom you can trust for an independent appraisal.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the honourable member speaking on the motion for postponement? I listened to the honourable member and did not hear him say anything about postponement.

Mr. BRANCKER: If you call on the official Reporter you will hear that I mentioned the postponement. I know that once you hear you readily understand. If there is any doubt in Your Honour's mind, I will say that my whole point is that unless I have further and better information, I will not be in a position to vote for the passing of the Resolution to-night; and consequently, I will have no alternative than to vote for the postponement and find out whether these three gentlemen did not put something on us, or whether the honourable senior member for the City in his valuation unwittingly put something on us.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is that further consideration of this Resolution be postponed. Honourable members in favour will please say "Aye" and those against will please say "No." I think the "Noes" have it.

On the division being called for, the question was put and resolved in a tie, the House dividing as follows:—

Ayes: Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. TUDOR, Mr. BRANCKER, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. ALLDER and Mr. GODDARD.—7.

Noes: Hon. G. H. ADAMS, Hon. Dr. CUMMINS, Hon. M. E. COX, Hon. C. E. TALMA, Hon. R. G. MAPP, Mr. HOLDER and Mr. BRYAN.—7.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question has resolved in a tie, seven honourable members voting "aye" and seven honourable members voting "no". I now vote with the "Noes". [VOICES: Shame! Shame!] Hon. members cannot question the Speaker's vote [A MEMBER: The Speaker usually maintains the status quo.]

1.20 a.m.

The question that the Resolution do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative on the casting vote of Mr. Speaker.

The division was as follows:

"Ayes": Hon. G. H. ADAMS, Hon. Dr. CUMMINS, Hon. M. E. COX, Hon. C. E. TALMA, Hon. R. G. MAPP, Mr. HOLDER, and Mr. BRYAN — (7).

"Noes": Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. TUDOR, Mr. BRANCKER, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. ALLDER, and Mr. GODDARD — (7).

Mr. SPEAKER: The question has resolved in a tie seven honourable members voting "aye" and seven voting "No", I now vote with the "Ayes".

THE ADJOURNMENT

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next 11th January, 1955, at 3 o'clock p.m.

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. Speaker, adjourned the House accordingly.

1.25 a.m.