THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1954—55

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 18th January, 1955.

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

PRESENT:

His Honour Mr. K. N. R. HUSBANDS (*Speaker*), Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS C.B.E., M.D., C.M., (*Minister of Social Services*), His Honour Mr. A. E. S. LEWIS, (*Deputy Speaker*); Hon. M. E. Cox, (*Minister of Communications, Works and Housing*); Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P., (*Chairman of Committees*); Hon. R. G. MAPP; (*Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour*); Mr. F. C. GODDARD (*Leader of the Opposition*); Mr. F. E. MILLER, Mr. J. A. HAYNES, B.A., Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY, Mr. V. B. VAUGHAN, Mrs. E. E. BOURNE and Mr. J. C. TUDOR, M.A.

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

The Minutes of the Meeting which was held on the 4th January, 1955, having circulated were taken as read and confirmed.

Messrs F. L. Walcott and O. T. Allder entered the House and took their seats.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Premier I am commanded to lay the following:—

Statement showing Gross Customs and Excise Receipts for nine months ended 31st December, 1954

NOTICES

Government Notices were given as follows:—

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: Resolution to place the sum of $1,000 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates, 1954—55 Part 1, Current, as shown in Supplementary Estimate 1954—55 No. 36 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: In connection with this Resolution Mr. Speaker, I should like to say that with your permission copies of the Resolution have been circulated to honourable members, and it is my intention to ask for leave to deal with the Resolution in all its stages today. I am also asking leave to move for the suspension of Rules 88 and 89 in order to deal with this Resolution. I will tell honourable members about the urgency of the Resolution when I come to deal with it.

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

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS on behalf of the Premier: Resolution to place the sum of $126,970 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. 37 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. M. E. COX: Resolution to place the sum of $1,050 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. 38 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Mr. Holder entered the House and took his seat.

Hon. M. E. COX: Bill to amend the Public Officers' Housing Loans Act, 1952.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: Of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply at its next meeting in order to deal with the other Money Resolutions of which notice has just been given.

QUESTIONS

Mr. Goddard.

To enquire of the Honourable Premier:—

1. Does Government agree that an anomaly exist in the case of the Headmaster of the Boys Foundation School of Christ Church as set out in the Dos Santos Report?

2. Is it true that this anomaly has been brought to the notice of Government by the Governing Body of the said school?

3. Is it also true that the answer given by Government to the Governing Body was that any adjustment in salary must await the completion of the building of the Foundation School to replace the two Foundation Schools?

4. Is the adjustment of this anomaly not the only item in the Report save the reduction of salaries for some new appointees—that has not in some way been implemented? If the answer is in the affirmative, will Government state the reason as it is now over two years since the recommenda-

tion for the adjustment was made in the Report Sir Errol Dos Santos.

5. Will Government see to the early correction of the anomaly, based on the recommendation of the Governing Body, and make such adjustment retrospective as from April, 1952, as recommended by Sir Errol Dos Santos?

Mr. TUDOR on behalf of Mr. BRANCKER: To enquire of the appropriate Minister present at the next meeting of this House:—

Whether it is true that the Office of Queen's Solicitor has recently been filled?

2. (a) If the answer to the above is "yes" did advertisement inviting applications for this Office appear in the Press?

2 (b) Does any reason exist for departing from the usual policy of appointing, or offering appointment to, the senior practising Solicitor in this colony?

3. If the answer to the above question is in the negative will Government fully explain why?

4. Will Government, for similar reasons, consider making the office of Queen's Solicitor wholetime as has been done in the case of the Solicitor General?

BILL READ A FIRST TIME

On the motion of Hon. M. E. Cox, seconded by Hon. Dr. H. G. Cummins the Bill to amend the Public Officers' Housing Loans Act, 1952 *was read a first time.*

SUSPENSION OF RULES 88 & 89

Hon. Dr. H. G. Cummins: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Rules 88 & 89 be now suspended.

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

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I am objecting to the suspension of these Rules, because I have not been given any reason as to the urgency of this Resolution. This is a Resolution in connection with the holding of a Trade and Industries Fair next month, and I must say that I am not agreeing to the suspension of these Rules to deal with any Resolution, unless it is made clear that it was impossible for the Government to have done otherwise. I am opposed to this method of dealing with Government business. This Resolution is in connection with something which has come to the notice of the public for months now. I want to be consistent. I am not agreeing with something being sent to me yesterday afternoon to be dealt with today. The very practice of dealing with matters given a week's notice also is inconvenient, much more as in this case. When the Government wants to deal with a Resolution like this, they must be prepared to show that it was impossible for the administration to have done otherwise. I am not satisfied that the administration did not know that we were committed to this matter of the holding of the Trade and Industries Fair.

3.25 p.m.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, from the beginning of Ministerial Status that has been the policy of the Opposition. The honourable member who has just sat, has only expressed the sentiments that we over here have been expressing all the time. However, sir, we have always added this proviso: provided that the Government can show us the urgency of the case.

Now, I can see right away as far as we are concerned, the necessity for having this Resolution passed in time, is to enable the Government to put up stalls for the Trade Fair; but like the honourable member who has just spoken, I query why could this not have been brought before? As I have said, it must be done in time so that the necessary arrangements can be made; but this Resolution could possibly have been in here last week. So sir, I will never allow any Resolution to pass in this way unless I support or initiate the objection which the honourable junior member for St. Peter has stated.

I will add this: this is not criticism of Ministers; but there seems to be something wrong with the various departments. You cannot tell me that any of these departments are understaffed, whether it is Trade, Works or otherwise. To the contrary, we come to the conclusion—

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of Order. I have been told in this House that when objection is taken to the suspension of rules, the question must be put to the House immediately. I myself have been asked to comment as my colleague has done now.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member is correct. The question must be put immediately, as soon as an objection has been made. The question is that Rules 88 & 89 be now suspended. Honourable members in favour will please say "Aye" and those against will please say "No." I think the "Noes" have it.

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

"Ayes": Mr. SMITH, Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS, Hon. R. G. MAPP, Mrs. BOURNE, Mr. HOLDER, Mr. MILLER, Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY, Mr. VAUGHAN, Mr. HAYNES, Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY and Mr. GODDARD.—12.

"Noes:" Mr. LEWIS, Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, Mr. TUDOR and Mr. ALLDER.—4.

Mr. SPEAKER: I now declare the "Ayes" have it.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON LIQUOR LICENCE BILL

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, I have something to say before the Orders of the Day are called. I rise to draw attention to the fact that the Select Committee appointed to consider the Bill to regulate Liquor Licenses, has been advertising for witnesses to come before it. I have always understood that before witnesses can appear before a Select Committee the House must grant its permission. I call it to Your Honour's attention Sir, so that if there is any irregularity it will be rectified. My reading of Rules 180, 181, and 182 seem to suggest that there should be that permission granted by the House first.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the honourable member is referring to an advertisement which appeared in the *Barbados Advocate* for people to come and give information to the Committee, I do not interpret that as coming under Rule 180. That Rule deals specifically with people who are being sent for or summoned before a Committee. It is then obvious that the House must give permission to issue that summons. In the present case people are appearing voluntarily before the Committee. They may come or they may not. So I do not think this case comes under Rule 180.

In addition to that, this is what is said on page 599 of the 15th edition of May's Parliamentary Procedure: "A Select Committee cannot require the attendance of witnesses or the production of documents without express authority from the House." I do not think that in the case to which the honourable member has referred, these people are being

required or demanded to attend. The passage in May's goes on to say: "when the object, or one of the objects of a Select Committee has been the investigation of facts, Committees have, without any express authority for that purpose, examined all witnesses who voluntarily appeared before them and all papers laid before them by such witnesses or by members of the Committee, and all records to which they could obtain access in the prosecution of their enquiries."

In my opinion I do not think the point raised by the honourable member is appropriate under Rule 180 of the House.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Hon. Dr. H. G. Cummins moved that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply and that it be an instruction to the House when in Committee of Supply to deal with the Resolution with $1,000 *in connection with the Trade Fair.*

Hon. M. E. Cox seconded the motion.

3.35 p.m.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope the Honourable Leader of the House understands the motion he has made. The first item on the Order Paper is wrong. I think Item No. 1 should be to resume Committee of Supply. The motion which has just been moved can only refer to the Resolution which was given notice of on the 11th January and the one today. When we go into Committee, we should not be able to discuss the ones which we have already been deliberating on.

Again for Your Honour's information, at the last meeting of the House the Hon. Minister of Social Services moved that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply. There were three Resolutions to be dealt with; two were dealt with in Committee. The Honourable Leader of the House today has given notice of his intention to move the House into Committee of Supply, so that that motion can only apply to the Resolution which was given notice of today. As I have said, Item No. 1 should be to resume Committee of Supply, and all Your Honour had to do was to leave the Chair. The Order Paper has been made up wrong and has misled the Hon. Leader of the House. I hope in the future it will be made up correctly.

Mr. Bryan entered the House and took his seat.

The question that Mr. Speaker leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply and that it be the instruction when in Committee of Supply to deal with the Resolution of which notice was given earlier today was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

The House then went into Committee of Supply Mr. Smith being in the Chair.

Supplementary Estimates No. 33

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is that this Resolution do now pass. [VOICES: Which Resolution Sir?]

Mr. LEWIS: What is before the Committee? Not one single motion is before this Committee. I would like Your Honour to tell me what is the Resolution before it? Is it the Resolution for $23,752?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Mr. HAYNES: Before you put the question Mr. Chairman, the Committee was dealing on the last occasion with the Head Highways and Transport under which an item for Road rolling equipment for $2,000 for the St. Joseph Road Board was being discussed. I should like to make some remarks on that item. I want to say that that roller is very useful and suitable for the roads in the parish of St. Joseph. It is not an old roller, and I do think that it should be repaired. As a matter of fact, two or three years ago when I was a Commissioner of Highways of the parish I saw that roller doing good work, and I am sure that the money spent on it would put it into condition to give several years of good work.

I presume you will allow me to talk a little about the St. Joseph roads, because all of that come under this heading. I have seen a letter in the Press recently about the Spa road which is a road adjoining Cane Garden. I also saw in the *Advocate* this morning something to the effect, that a certain gentleman in the parish of St. Joseph does not want any roads beyond the Cliff being repaired except a few around Bathsheba, where they can go and have their baths on Sundays. I happen to know that piece of road; and though I am not personally interested in it, when I was a member of the Highway Commissioners of that parish I was instrumental in having that road put on high priority for repairs by the Central Government. Unfortunately, we could not get the money to do it at the time. Personally, I think it is a most essential road. There are about seven or eight people on one end of it who have land which cannot be worked now, owing to it being in disrepair. This road when repaired, would allow them to bring their land into cultivation again; and as you know sir, we are told every square inch of land in this island should be worked. I personally feel that the Hon. Minister of Transport has acted rightly by putting this road in hand for repairs. I have also drawn to his attention that another road practically parallel to this one called Richmond Road, should also be put into his hands for repairs. As far as I know, it has been measured already, and Mr. Chairman, I think that you as a Vestryman was instrumental in having that road brought forward for repairs. I understand that it could not have been done by the Highways and Transport because the owner of Richmond would not allow the road to pass through his land. Anyhow, I am hoping that as soon as the Spa Road is completed, the Hon. Minister of Transport will see that the roads in Richmond which leads to an area of land where the people who live there cannot work it on account of the road being out of repair, will be put into hand for repairs.

3.45 p.m.

As I said already, although I am not a member of the Hon. Minister's Party, whenever the Government does anything which I think is good for the island, I say that there should be praised for it. I am asking that not only should this road be repaired but that others should be kept on the list and dealt with later on.

Another matter which I have heard and I hope that it is true, is in connection with the East Coast Road. I am suggesting that in the same way that a part of the road is being done from the St. Andrew side, they should deal with a portion of the road from the St. Joseph side. I hope that the road would be got through and when it is completed, it would be considered as a main road, and that it will be widened to 19 ft. 6 ins. in the near future. I should like to see the road completed; and the money which is spent on it should not be lost. I am very pleased to see that Dr. Buie's report has been circulated; he has made a special report about that road, and in that report he says that he does not see any reason from the point of view of erosion, that the road should not be done. With those remarks, Mr. Chairman, I will vote for this Resolution.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Chairman, I think it is appropriate for me to suggest that inasmuch as you

are an interested party in this road which has been under construction in the parish of St. Joseph, and inasmuch as the equipment for which this Resolution is making provision will be used on that road, I am suggesting that in view of that fact you should relinquish the Chair during the discussion on this Resolution. It is true that this road runs along your land.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Which road is running along my land?

Mr. ALLDER: This Resolution calls for a sum of money for the replacement of equipment for the parish of St. Joseph, and the same equipment will be used on a road which has been started already by the authorities and which runs along the land which you own in St. Joseph.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Which road runs along my land?

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, does this Resolution call for anything in connection with the repairs of roads? As I see it, this Resolution calls for the repair of a Road Roller. I think the honourable member is therefore out of Order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: This is what is stated in the Note to this Item:— "No funds are available to meet this expenditure, and as the early repair of this roller is essential for the proper maintenance of the roads of the parish, supplementary provision for the sum of $2,000 is needed."

Mr. ALLDER: The entire note reads as follows.

"In assuming responsibility for the maintenance and upkeep of the parish roads of Saint Joseph by virtue of the Department of Highways and Transport (Amendment) Act, 1954, the Department of Highways and Transport has acquired an additional road roller from the Highways Commissioners of Saint Joseph. On examination it has been found that this roller requires a complete overhaul and the replacement of many parts to put it into proper working condition. It is estimated that the necessary parts will cost approximately $2,000. No funds are available to meet this expenditure, and, as the early repair of this roller is essential for the proper maintenance of the roads of the parish, supplementary provision for the sum of $2,000 is needed."

From that explanation Mr. Chairman, I am about to raise a question and to suggest under the whole roller construction programme (not only in St. Joseph but anywhere else) inasmuch as this roller will be used on this road which has already been started, it would be a good gesture if you would leave the Chair during the discussion of this Resolution.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: In all the remarks which the honourable member has used, I would like him to let the Committee know where this road passes along my land.

Mr. ALLDER: I was only making a suggestion; but I see that you are not willing to take my suggestion into consideration. However, regardless of what the honourable junior member for St. Andrew might say, I remember that he emphasised the statement about "blazing the trail through" which means that not only this road, but all other roads in the parish which are needed should be dealt with, not only to accommodate tenants who are unable to put their roads in order, but also the plantations in the parish who want assistance from the Government in making their roads better than they have been, so that the canes can be got out. We are all acquainted with the Rules and Regulations which control the running of the Department of Highways and Transport and also the Rules and Regulations which control the Road Commissioners of the respective parishes.

3.55 p.m.

I have been to the parish of St. Joseph after the question was raised last Tuesday; I have travelled over the road by foot, (the road which is now under construction) and I can say, Sir, that according to the Rules which are adopted in giving priority in the repairs of roads, the work which is being carried on at this present time over the lands of the Spa Plantation in St. Joseph is wrong, and without public morals.

I say so sir, because in my hands I have a copy of the cost of the construction of a tenantry road in St. John in a district called Welch Village. That district is about —

Mr. CHAIRMAN: We are dealing with St. Joseph roads.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Chairman, I am discussing—

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please discuss St. Joseph roads.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Chairman, before I go further, I must tell you that I feel it to be my right to discuss about construction of roads in Barbados because this Resolution is for the replacement of spares, tools and other equipment for the Highways and Transport Department which has to do with road repairing in all the parishes and districts of this island.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: In your opening remarks you began to deal with road rollers going over the same road in St. Joseph.

Mr. ALLDER: I think you will know sir, that it is legitimate for anyone to discuss the general running of the department for which the Resolution had been brought to this Chamber.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am not entertaining anything unless it has to do with the St. Joseph roads.

Mr. ALLDER: I am sorry to hear that sir. I think it would be better if you left the Chair, in view of the fact that your name might be drawn into this. What I was doing was trying to show out the inconsistency of the Minister or the department responsible for carrying out these road construction schemes. As I said, nineteen peasant proprietors own land in this village, and a good job was being done in that area.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: To which village the honourable member is referring?

Mr. ALLDER: Welch Village in the parish of St. John.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am not entertaining that. If it is a Welch Village in the parish of St. Joseph, it is all right.

Mr. ALLDER: As I was saying, Mr. Chairman, when the Hon. Minister for Communications was invited to the scene, it was to get his permission—

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Invited to the scene where?

Mr. ALLDER: I think it would be better sir, if you waited to hear what I am going to say.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am not entertaining anything about the Spa Road.

Mr. VAUGHAN: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member is trying to show the comparative cost between the repairs to one road and the repairs to the other road.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: On what is the hon. member speaking?

Mr. VAUGHAN: On a point of Order, sir. The hon. member was trying to explain the comparison of the cost of the reconstruction of one road and the reconstruction of another road. He may compare it to his own detriment; but he is entitled to compare it.

Mr. ALLDER: I must thank my colleague for trying to think of what I intended to say. However, Mr. Chairman, what I am trying to point out is that the policy of the Government as far as the re-

construction of roads in the various parishes is concerned, is wrong and very partial. What I am saying is, (and the hon. sen. member for St. Michael can say if the statements which I am going to make are wrong or whether they are right) but the hon. member in my presence although presented with a copy of the cost of carrying out the reconstruction of that road—

Hon. M. E. COX: I have never been anywhere in St. Joseph with the hon. member.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Chairman, I have not said that the hon. member has been to St. Joseph with me. He knows what I am speaking about; but he is just trying to confuse the issue.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Keep to St. Joseph. I will not allow any discussion on anything else.

Mr. ALLDER: I am trying to show that when the Highway Commissioners of St. John had partly completed—

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am appealing to the hon. member not to try to make trouble or to confuse the issue. The Resolution is for St. Joseph. Do not continue to speak on St. John.

Mr. ALLDER: There seems to be a difference of opinion between yourself and myself as regards the interpretation of freedom of speech on a Resolution such as this. I suggest that you call for the Speaker who might be able to settle this issue.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Has the hon. member finished speaking?

Mr. ALLDER: If you will not permit me to discuss what is my right to discuss you might as well call the Speaker.

Mr. Crawford came into the Committee and took his seat while Mr. Allder was speaking.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, I think that the decision to call the Speaker is yours. However sir, since last we discussed this Resolution, I have heard it said outside the House that the road appears to some people not to be leading to any tenantry. They say that there is only one house that they can see there. I hope that this road will be very useful, (as the Hon. Minister has said) to people in getting out their crops. I know sir, that in the various Vestries and Boards they are people who will repair roads which they care to repair, and fail to repair others. Perhaps this road is one that has been neglected as a result of that. I would like to hear however, that the charge be substantially refuted that the Government is doing something which they would otherwise not have done, but for the ownership of the land surrounding that road.

I would also like to ask the Hon. Minister this: he made a statement last Tuesday that the money to repair this road was $15,000 taken out of Capital expenditure; looking up capital expenditures, it seems to me that a programme was drawn up because the money voted was for the continuation of a programme. I am wondering whether this money has been saved on the programme, or whether it has been deliberately taken from some other road; and if so, would some justifiable reason be given. I know that the amount is in round figures and you might be able to get $15,000 off for an additional road; but since this road was not the responsibility of the Highways and Transport Department when these Estimates were before the House, I feel that either this $15,000 is something extra or they have taken it from another road. If the Hon. Minister gives a reasonable explanation I think it will satisfy the Committee.

I intended to ask if you saved $15,000 on the programme, whether you can divert it to a road which was not under your jurisdiction when the Estimates were passed; or if you have decided not to spend $15,000 on one road and to spend it on this particular road because you regard it as more pressing. That aspect of the matter struck me when the Hon. Minister said what he did.

If I can get an explanation, I will be perfectly satisfied because I know that in the parishes, there are people who may repair roads leading up to their own estates, while essential roads will be neglected; and I would not like a similar charge to be brought against the Government.

4.05 p.m.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, on the last occasion when this question was being discussed I explained, and I will attempt to explain again, the special circumstances surrounding this case.

I should like to say here and now that as long as I happen to hold this Ministry, I am going to run it in the best interest of the people of Barbados, despite whatever criticism is brought down on me at any time from anybody who might only be able to see no further than his or her nose. Criticise me as much as you like; but show me what is wrong in repairing this particular road. The debate has shifted to the question that the road brought in should not be repaired. Inasmuch as the question of the repair of this road has been brought in, (and I can see how it worked up to that) I will say that for sometime since I have been holding this portfolio, which was sometime before Ministerial Status, this road was brought to my notice and I made investigations about it. Let me say that this road has been a parish road, I believe long before any of us were born. It is a road which leads to St. Andrew; and part of that road which is in St. Andrew was repaired by the Department of Highways and Transport sometime in 1948 and 1949. When it came to this part which is in St. Joseph, (what we will call the St. Joseph section of it) the Department of Highways and Transport could not repair it because it was under the control of the St. Joseph Highway Commissioners. As I have said on the last occasion, we in this island depend on sugar for our revenue, and anybody who knows anything of the Scotland area will realise, that peasants are greatly handicapped in the growing of canes in that particular area through the disrepair of that road. It is a fact that the peasants in that area have to pay much higher for cultivation and reaping of their crops, because of the structure of the land. When it comes to freightage of their crops, they also have to pay much more because the land there is hilly and lorry owners cannot carry as much in their lorries over the hills as they would be able to do if it were level terrain.

I should like to tell honourable members that it is not repairing a road on somebody's plantation. This is a road leading from Mellows Hill. If this road is constructed and I am sure it will be constructed, it will serve peasants who live in that area and who find it difficult to get their canes over the hill and on to Andrews Plantation. It will cheapen the cost to them.

As you will see, reference was made to two letters in the Press; one was a letter which was written sometime ago, and the other was one which appeared in the Press to-day containing a comment by Mr. Cox a former Chairman of the St. Joseph Highway Commissioners. I think everybody remembers the stupid and illogical argument this gentleman put up when the question of taking over the St. Joseph parish roads was under discussion. This gentleman has taken this opportunity to say that partiality has been used in the repair of this road. I think the public should be well aware of the fact, that Mr. Cox is a shareholder in Andrews Factory, and the more cane that is ground at Andrews Factory the more will Mr.

Cox profit by it; and it is for that reason that he is pressing against the repair of this road. This gentleman will press against repairing this road all the time. Let me say, that this Government does its business in a different way to what this gentleman thinks. What has happened is this: a road roller which the people in St. Joseph bought was passed on to the Andrews Factory by the Highways Commissioners of St. Joseph when they were about to hand the roads of the parish over to the Central Government, and up to now nobody knows what that road roller was sold for. Let me say that this Government does not do things like that. As I have said, as long as I have anything to do with this Ministry, things like that are not going to happen. Mr. Cox is seeing after his own interest. He knows that as soon as this road is properly repaired, the peasants in that area will send their canes down the hill to the factory underneath and will get more profits as a result. Let us accept the argument that sometime ago Mr. Cox approached the Director of Highways and Transport to have this road repaired, and the Director told him he could not repair it because of some law; of course I do not believe any word of law was ever told to him; what I think was told to him was: if you want to repair it, it could be repaired out of the funds which were given to the parish by the Government plus the taxes which the parish collected.

4.15 p.m.

What I am trying to say is this: this road, like all other roads which the Commissioners were drawing $17,000 as a grant—,the Commissioners of St. Joseph never touched for over 12 years although these Commissioners were drawing $17,000 as a grant every year and $409 in another way, in spite of all that money which was given to them, and in spite of the flood damage and so on, and if you go into St. Joseph and pass a road like Mellows you will find that it has never been repaired for over twelve years. That is the state of affairs which we are confronted with and which we are cleaning up now. I am more than justified in allowing that road to be repaired. I have promised that in so far as where roads and water are concerned, I am prepared to supply them throughout the length and depth of Barbados; and to go myself and see these things are done, so that when I say that they are done, the House can censure the Government and we can go back to the country.

It was grossly disrespectful to you Mr. Chairman, when the hon. senior member for St. John referred to you as having an interest in this matter. I think the rule is that if an individual has a monetary interest in any matter which is being discussed in the House, then that individual must not vote on it; but because you sir, (who has been elected by us as Chairman of Committees,) owns an area of land near where this road which is to be repaired, is it fitting for a member to insinuate that you are influencing this matter and that you should not remain in the Chair while it is being discussed? I say that this is a disgraceful state of affairs; I say nothing stronger than that.

On the last occasion I told the House when we were dealing with this Resolution, that it was being financed out of Capital Expenditure; and again I want to make it clear that this road was not a tenantry road. It was not such a road under the principles and rules which have been laid down. This road is a parish road and therefore, it could not be qualified for treatment in the Capital Estimates. But now, you have this matter of reconstruction, and you have $500,000 in the Five Year Plan and we voted $30,000 on the last occasion. In this connection the explanatory note says "for widening and improving bends and corners and or certain highways." When the Estimates were passed, the Government had not yet taken over these roads; and therefore, Government might not have anticipated the repairs to this road or any other roads in St. Joseph which the parish held under its control at the time. Yet at the same time, I think the hon. member will admit that with a set-up such as ours, it is fitting that if there is anything wrong, if there is money under a vote which deals with roads — I will digress to say here, that this is not a vote which was passed for any Fire Station, Police Training School or anything like that; this is a question of road improvement and therefore the vote has been certified by the Auditor General as a proper vote, and I think that is about all which should be required. As to whether this $15,000 is a saving, I would not say that; but at the same time I would like to inform honourable members that at the end of a financial year it is proposed to spend $3,000, and when the Estimates for the next financial year come before us, then under the Head "Roads" in general, hon. members will see that there are other roads which are to be considered. I want to show the hon. member that it is merely up to the end of the year that we are spending $3,000 and not $15,000 on the whole of the construction of that road from Melvin Hill to St. Andrew which goes to Boarded Hall Road (St. Andrew) is for $15,000.

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

Mr. LEWIS: There must be a programme for that money which was put in the Estimates. Obviously that is not the case, even when you take out certain roads that might have been taken into consideration. This is a reallocation of money and I hope that no other roads will suffer. The House could not have voted the money to deal with that road at all, and therefore an explanation is necessary. I shall like to hear that explanation given.

Mr. ALLDER: What the Hon. Minister for Communications has said with regard to the road being convenient for the getting out of canes would be correct, if it had been applied to a road which accommodates a number of small peasant holders, but sir, as I said, I have taken the trouble to go to the district and to see the roads for myself, and I can say that the land was pointed out not only to me but also to others; I mean the land where this road is under construction and which is owned by the Spa Plantation or other plantations which carry the same name, Big Spa and Little Spa. When you leave Melvin's Hill and you swing on your left going down the hill, you will meet a couple of houses whose occupiers were said to be renters to yourself. When you pass these houses, you do not meet another house until you get to the Great House of the Big Spa. You will have to pass through the yard in front of its front door right around the corner to the building which is occupied as the Manager's house, and if you carry your car or even if you walk, the width of the road to the corner of the building would be within three or four feet.

4.25 p.m.

You leave there then, and you walk through fields of canes bordered with cocoanut trees and banana trees and you go right down for nearly a quarter of a mile before you reach the part that a bulldozer has just finished levelling. One can see that a great mound was removed, and that tons of earth was pushed some distance in filling in what is called a chasm

ci a miniature gully which cannot stand the weather even when the road is finished.

After travelling about a quarter of a mile down deep slopes and up steep hills, you reach one house between the Spa Estate yard and the borders of St. Andrew. That tenant is a tenant of the Spa Plantation and we are told, (and many of us do know) that the honourable junior member for St. George and his family have interests in that plantation; and we are also told, and we observe from the Newspaper's sales columns that you Mr. Chairman are interested in the small Spa which is put up for sale and is still for sale. It is also public knowledge that the sale was difficult to be effected, due to the difficult terrain and the absence of a proper road.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The sale of what?

Mr. ALLDER: The sale of Little Spa's land.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Difficult?

Mr. ALLDER: That is known.

Mr .CHAIRMAN: Known to whom?

Mr. ALLDER: To several people who know, sir. As I was saying, when you leave the Great House of the Spa Plantation, (the Big Spa) you have to travel a difficult course for nearly a quarter of a mile and you find one house situated near the extreme end of where this road is being constructed, and that tenant is a tenant of the Plantation called the Spa. Therefore, the argument about the accommodation of peasants does not hold water at all; and even if several hundred feet of that land had contained peasants' houses, according to the Rules and Regulations—

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You have heard from the Hon. Minister that this road is a highway, a parish road. It is not under the head of tenantry roads.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Chairman, the only people I think who will be willing to accept that statement, will be those persons directly interested in the adjoining lands and the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works. The parochial authorities in the parish who have had something to do with these roads in the parish for years before we were born, are saying differently.

I was getting to my point sir. Even if every hundred feet of land attached to that plantation had a peasant's house on it, according to the Rules and Regulations that we will find at the Department of Highways and Transport, it will still be wrong; because, the land would be privately owned and the private owner would have been getting income from those tenants; and therefore, the obligation would have been his to make provision for roads and water and other things appertaining to the proper running of a tenantry.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That road is an abandoned parish road. It is not a tenantry road. I can tell you about it. That road used to be used by people going to the P.M.O. People used to go to the St. Andrew P.M.O.

Mr. ALLDER: That is why I suggested sir, that you leave the Chair so that you could make your speech when the time comes. You would be able to enlighten the Committee, having a direct interest in the area and knowing so much. I was saying, that there is no argument that the Government—I do not blame the whole of the Government. In this case we all know that the Ministries are divided, and that if a road is to be done in any part of the island, all of the Ministers could not be expected to go into the details as regards the priority of the road or the legitimacy of including such a road on the priority list. But sir, even if you were working within the ambit of the law laid down at the Department of Highways and Transport, the action still causes doubt. It causes doubt regardless of how the Hon. Minister might sneer.

It is not sufficient for things to appear right; in their essence they should be right. How comes it that the parochial authorities comprised by the land owners in the parish or their families, owned these two places before yourself and the honourable junior member for St. George took over, and even some of the present members of the Vestry and the Highways Commissioners, (I am told still hold an interest in the same plantations) and they having had it within their authority to put this road in order all these years, never saw fit to do so?

When it comes to the present time, the actors in the play are the Hon. Chairman of Committees, (which is yourself) the owner of the Little Spa, (the honourable junior member for St. George) an interested party in the Big Spa and the honourable senior member for St. Michael who is Minister of Communications and Works; and all three actors sir, belong to the same theatrical company—the Barbados Labour Party!

4.35 p.m.

Doesn't it show you Mr. Chairman, that the Hon. Minister of Communications should be careful in condescending to such things? It is a fact that the Hon. Minister of Communications condescended, by his giving priority to that road to be repaired. Whether it was a road which led to poor peasants holdings, a parish road, a highway road, or what ever kind of road you might care to call it, is not the question at all. What has the Hon. Minister got to say to justify the failure of the Government or Governments over many years before we were born, in refusing to relieve the difficult conditions which obtain at the New Orleans?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I cannot allow the honourable member to stray.

Mr. ALLDER: And Carrington's Village?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Do speak on the Resolution.

Mr. ALLDER: And Delamere land? I am trying to make the comparison Mr. Chairman. For the sake of guidance, you can call Mr. Speaker.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am asking you to take guidance from the Chair; or else I will have to call Mr. Speaker.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Chairman, I am told that when that road is completed it will cost $15,000. The only persons who are going to benefit by that expenditure will be the owners of those two estates. I have not stood in town and heard that; I went and saw it. The Government equipment is still on the spot. One of the tractors is resting on a man's land which is situated on the border of St. Joseph and St. Andrew, and another bit of equipment is resting on lands owned by the honourable junior member for St. Joseph. I am going to say, (and the honourable junior member for St. George can bear me out) that the work carried out on that road will cost this Government a large recurrent expenditure, due to the fact that bordering that area you have hills with chasms running between them, and the large chasm which all these chasms run into is being filled up with mud and dirt which are scraped off by the bulldozer. The Hon. Minister knows that when the rain comes there will be no means for the water to run off. He also knows that it is not the intention of the Government to complete the bridge which should be erected. What is really happening at the present, is that they are just filling in this large chasm with the clay soil and they are hoping to get through with it by the time the crop season begins. It simply means that after the crop has been reaped, you will read in the *Advocate* newspaper that this road between two plots has gone, and then you will have to bring in a Resolution to have this road put back. It would also mean that the Government having committed itself to the laying down of this road, would

be reminded of its obligation to construct a bridge. All of us who know the area realise that nothing else but a bridge will do. I say this with a meaning. This is something free; this is not for the benefit of the populace of Barbados or the peasants who are situated in the area. The only persons who are going to benefit from this are those individuals who found the ability of influencing the Hon. Minister of Transport and the Highways and Transport Official in going to construct that road, instead of constructing other roads in their rightful places.

Of course, Mr. Chairman, constituted as we are with the distribution of members in this Chamber, the honourable members who should be forced to go up there and stop that work going on, can sit back and sneer and accuse other members of saying things which should not be said. At any rate, this is public business and somebody must say these things. I am fully aware that this Resolution will be passed; but the honourable member knows that this road should not be constructed. Naturally, set up as we are with this unequal distribution of seats, this Resolution will be passed, with some members hoping that as land owners their time will come, and others while they may feel it is wrong, would pass it because they want to be friendly; and they also are hoping that they will be compensated with some future kindness. Mr. Chairman, the day of reckoning will come some day. This is wrong, and anyone who takes the trouble to go to that area will see that it is wrong. Are you going to give preference to a land which has a couple of peasants and to investors in that area who are depending on patronage to help them to make more money, or are you going to give preference to the thousands of people in the many districts not only in the Metropolitan areas which the honourable senior member for St. Michael represents, but in the other areas in the respective parishes where you get cases similar to this and no attention is paid to them? Right now the Hon. Minister knows that pressure is brought to bear on him by the parish I have the honour to represent.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I am sure that no pressure is brought to bear on me by any person in the parish which the honourable member represents.

4.45 p.m.

Mr. ALLDER: What irritates me, is that in the month of November the Hon. Minister, the Road Commissioners of St. John and myself went to the spot.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am not entertaining anything about the parish of St. John; you are representing St. Joseph and you should go on with St. Joseph.

Mr. ALLDER: I represent all of St. Joseph except your interest Sir! (*Laughter*). I was saying sir, that a very important bit of road which would have accommodated—

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am entertaining that.

Mr. ALLDER: What am I going to say, sir? As to the road which accommodates about 90 peasant proprietors, (each of them owning a plot of land which produces canes, the Hon. Minister can say if I am wrong) the road to accommodate these people only cost $8,167.20; beneath the Estimates which was provided for the job. That is why the honourable member was asked to go and give his blessing so as to relieve—

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Asked to go where?

Mr. ALLDER: If I had the capability of a schoolmaster, I would certainly undertake the job [Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Of doing what?] I was saying Mr. Chairman, that because one peasant proprietor owned a spot which was on one side of the road and a spot on the other side of the road, the Hon. Minister of Communications said "No;" and I was present when the Road Commissioners said that it was of more advantage to have the peasants carry their canes along there.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am asking the honourable member to keep to the particular Item of this Resolution. I do not see anything about any Road Commissioners in this Resolution; you are not a schoolmaster, but I am going to be one.

Mr. ALLDER: That is why I ask you to leave the Chair. It was pointed out to the Hon. Minister, that it would be better to allow a couple of yards to be completed so as to avoid the peasants having to carry their canes up the hill with the difficult terrain which they got at the head of the hill, instead of going on to the East Coast Road, or another road which was recently done by the Government called Pot House Road. It would only have cost a couple of hundred dollars more, along with the amount they saved on the general repairs of that road. The Hon. Minister said in my presence that the law says—

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am not entertaining anything about what the law says.

Mr. ALLDER: The Hon. Minister for Communications said that the rules of the Department did not permit roads to be repaired between lands owned by one person; and it is striking that that case would only have been a couple of yards distance. But in this case, if my estimation is correct, it is over a quarter mile of road running between this terrain and leading to the estate yard of one of two members of the Labour Party. [A MEMBER: Shame!] Before the Hon. Minister of Communcations had given consent to do a job like this he should have had the Rules changed, and then no one would have been in a position to criticise his lack of policy in such matters.

Mr. Speaker In The Chair

At this stage the Chairman of Committees left the Chair, and Mr. Speaker took the Chair.

4.55 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Chairman of Committees has reported to me that on more than one occasion during the debate on which the House is now engaged, he called on the hon. senior member for St. John to refrain from making mention of roads in St. John. The Chairman has reported that the hon. senior member for St. John on several occasions has refused to obey his ruling that the hon. member should stick to the Resolution and not stray to any matter dealing with roads in St. John.

Rule 139 of this House says: "Every member against whom any charge has been made, having been heard in his place, is to withdraw while such charge is being debated." I will now hear the hon. senior member for St. John.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Speaker, I will be grateful if you would remind me of the charge that was made.

Mr. SPEAKER: The charge was disobeying the ruling of the Chairman in straying from the subject matter, and in dealing with roads in St. John. The Chairman said that on more than one occasion he told the hon. member to stick to the Resolution, and not stray to any roads in St. John.

Mr. ALLDER: We were discussing, Mr. Speaker, the Resolution for the replacement of spares tools and other equipment for the purpose of road construction, and I was making reference to the comparison in policy as practised by the Depart-

ment of Highways and Transport. It was not an intention of mine to disobey the Chair; but I felt Sir, as has happened on many occasions in the past, (even before this Chamber was comprised as it now is) that members were given freedom to discuss not only an item which was before them, but if there was anything which the member thought was going wrong in a Department, he could raise it under the particular money Resolution.

I do not know if you will take that as not obeying the Chair, because that is all that I was doing; and we all know and realise that this is a privilege of an hon. member of this Chamber. But what is more, I suggested to the Chairman that in view of the fact that I intended to refer to the area in which he is interested, he should leave the Chair, because I wanted to avoid the same thing which he is accusing me of—that is embarrassment.

Mr. SPEAKER : Is the hon. member finished?

Mr. ALLDER : I only brought in the road in St. John, because I was forced to do so, so as to strengthen my argument as to the inconsistency practised by the Minister of Communications.

Mr. SPEAKER : The hon. member will now withdraw. [*Mr. Allder withdrew.*] The charge is now a matter of debate. Hon. members have heard the charge reported to me by the Chairman. It is now a matter for the House to debate in the absence of the hon. senior member for St. John. When hon. members have debated that charge, it is the matter for the House to resolve to make a motion in the light of the gravity of the issue. I think the Chairman might be allowed to speak first.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT : Mr. Speaker, I was here when the debate was going on. I would like it to be made clear what procedure is to be adopted in this matter. It is the first time since I have been here that I have seen this course adopted; and I would like for my information to know precisely what I am going to debate. I am not clear as to what is the issue.

Mr. SPEAKER : The issue is one of disobeying the rulings of the Chair in the matter of straying from the Resolution, and going on to discuss roads in St. John. Hon. members will understand that they can only make one speech. They will not be able to speak as if they were in Committee.

5.05 p.m.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: According to your ruling, honourable members should debate the charge.

Mr. SPEAKER: Not according to my ruling, but according to the Rules of the House. I stated quite clearly that the Rules of the House make it clear that this House should debate the charge.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: The charge seems to be made by the honourable Chairman that the honourable senior member for St. John in dealing with a money Resolution under Head Highways and Transport, that the honourable senior member for St. John made reference to the parish of St. John and in making such reference, he made reference to the highways in St. John.

Mr. SPEAKER: What has been reported to me by the Chairman is that the honourable senior member for St. John disobeyed the Chair, and persisted in refusing to obey him when he told the honourable member to desist in making reference to things in St. John. The Chairman referred to disobedience.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Why I am speaking on this matter Your Honour, is because I want to get the whole matter clarified. You are saying that the Chairman reported that the honourable senior member for St. John disobeyed the Chair; I am going to say that any honourable member should obey any right and partial ruling; but if the Chairman says to jump through this window, of course an honourable member will disobey that ruling, and he rightfully disobeys; so it is not a question of disobeying the ruling of the Chair, it is a question of disobeying what? The charge by the Chairman is that the honourable member disobeyed the ruling of the Chair. I happened to be in this Chamber during the entire debate. On more than one occasion the honourable senior member for St. John when he found that his opinion was not being given the latitude which he thought it should be given, called on the Chairman to have Your Honour's ruling on the matter. On every occasion that the Chairman clashed with the honourable senior member for St. John, the honourable member asked the Chairman "Will you call the Speaker to rule." He has been showing to the Chair this: I am willing to obey the Chair, but as one representative of the people to another, I feel this is my right and therefore I appeal to you to call the highest authority, and if I am wrong I will obey. The Chairman said "Calling the Speaker was his right"; let me say that debating a question in keeping with the honourable member's view is his prerogative.

What really happened in a matter of this sort; we are debating Head 32, Department of Highways and Transport — Item Road rolling equipment. Whether all the views expressed by the honourable senior member for St. John are right or not, that is besides the point. What every honourable member must be careful about, is that the privilege which is given to honourable members and which if allowed to be taken from the honourable senior member of St. John, will also be taken from us. This is a question dealing with a money Resolution, and where part of it comes under the Head Departments of Highways and Transport, for the Item road rolling equipment. That Item deals with a particular road and any Chairman who is impartial, and who has a knowledge of what he is doing —

Mr. SPEAKER: I must caution the honourable member not to make any reflection on the Chair.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I beg your pardon. The honourable Chairman is the last person I would say anything against. I was saying that the debate started when the Hon. Minister of Transport made reference to roads outside the parish of St. John.

Hon. M. E. COX: I rise on a point of Order, Mr. Speaker. I have never done that. No one who was listening to what I said, would say I made reference to roads outside of the parish of St. Joseph. Furthermore, I want to draw to Your Honour's attention that there is no motion before the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: The House is debating the charge.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Even if the honourable Chairman would give some latitude to the honourable member who was speaking, he was aided and abetted by the Hon. Minister of Communication [VOICES: Nonsense!]

Mr. Speaker, I would go down to my grave defending honourable members in this matter, because I am defending my own self. As I was saying, I would like to draw to Your Honour's attention that on an occasion when a question was being discussed about the Hospital in a money Resolution which was before the House, objection was taken to honourable members touching on the Administration, and Your Honour's ruling was, that it was a money Resolution and as long as members did not go outside of the particular department, they could touch on anything concerning it. I may say that your ruling was much to the displeasure of some members of the Government.

Mr. SPEAKER: May I again draw to the honourable member's attention that there is a charge before the House. The House is considering whether

that charge is well founded or not. If the charge is well founded a motion will result.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I know that there is absolutely no charge against the honourable senior member for St. John. I was saying that honourable members are persistent in making the honourable senior member for St. John a martyr. I say again there is no charge against the honourable senior member for St. John; there is an alleged charge; the honourable member was not referring to Poor Relief, Agriculture or Housing; he was merely drawing a comparison. What honourable member will sit in this House and say, that because the honourable member in making a comparison between a road in St. John and one in St. Joseph, and that if the Chairman consistently said that he was out of Order, that because of that, he is out of Order?

5.15 p.m.

Therefore sir, there is absolutely no charge founded on any fact; a charge would be founded on a question of prejudice. In a matter of this sort where the honourable member expresses his views, I think the Government should refrain from doing any thing at all to prevent the honourable member from airing his views. As to whether we agree with all the sentiments he expresses is another matter, but he should be allowed to express his views in this matter; and as long as I am elected to a seat in this House I will support him. I am therefore suggesting that it is not merely what the hon. member will do, but it is what the public will think. The honourable member has not initiated anything new in this House; as a result of a debate which started in this House last week the honourable member has come to this House today and said "I have investigated this matter and I am saying that I do not agree with it. You, Mr. Chairman, are interested and you should leave the Chair." All that is beside the point. What I am arguing is this: the honourable member is charged with disobeying the Chair, and I most respectfully suggest and I mean no offence by it, that while you must uphold the parliamentary traditions of obeying the Chair and the like—Mr. Speaker. I hear a *sotto voce* remark from the other side of the House. I will say that the greatest offence in disobeying the Chair started with the Hon. Premier [VOICES: Hear! Hear!] I have heard the Hon. Premier challenge Your Honour and refuse to sit down. I will say that of the Hon. Ministers over there, that the Hon. Minister of Social Services is the only one who does not challenge the Chair. We have wondered over here whether the Hon. Minister of Communications wants to be Speaker. As soon as the Chairman rules, he starts to say what the Chairman should do and what he should not do, especially since he spent two weeks in England. I say that there is no case against the honourable member. If the Government wants a showdown and wants to offer somebody against the honourable senior member for St. John—

Mr. SPEAKER: That is irrelevant.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: It might be irrelevant.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member should not be so incensed in this matter; let him deal with the charge which has been made against the honourable member.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: To say the least of it, it is very unfortunate that an elected representative of this House should be in the Chair and you are discussing a money Resolution relative to roads, and an attempt should be made to stifle discussion.

Mr. SPEAKER: It has been reported to me that the honourable member has disobeyed the Chair in a particular matter. It is not a question as to whether he should speak on this matter or on that; let the honourable member confine his speech to the particular question.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: It is easy to say that the honourable member disobeyed the Chair; it is a very easy thing to say that a man resisted the arrest of a policeman, but was the arrest a legitimate arrest? The arrest must be legitimate. It is easy for the Chairman of Committees to get there and because he dislikes the views expressed by an honourable member, to say that he disobeys the Chair. There has been no disobedience to the Chair because there has not been any legitimate ruling of the Chair. Let me put it this way: there was absolutely no disobedience founded on fact, and I say that this charge was unwarranted. If the honourable member is speaking about a matter, because he makes reference to Little Spa and Big Spa should the Chairman stop him? It was not a legitimate ruling. That is where the honourable member insisted that the Chairman did not want him to go into the matter, and he called upon Your Honour to rule. The Chairman says: "This is my prerogative; I will call him when I like." The honourable member went on to say that if the Chairman felt like doing so, he could call Your Honour..

I beg to move that the charge against the honourable member be not entertained. I do not know if I am in order to make that motion. I know the honourable members over there will say that this will put the Chairman in a very invidious position, but I cannot help that; because you are Chairman, you should not transform things into the beginning and to the end. You are not the monarch as soon as you are elected to the Chair. I want to say this: peculiar as it may seem in this country (because of the overwhelming majority which the Party in power seems to have, and because the Chairman and the Speaker belong to that Party) I will say here that the Chairman should follow the example which has been set by Your Honour. Despite whatever clashes they might be, more latitude should be given to the Opposition than to the members of the Government's Party. It has always been so. Mr Speaker, I again beg to move that this charge against the honourable member be not entertained and that the honourable senior member for St. John be recalled to his seat. This is the first time I have had to make a motion of this sort in this House. I do not know if Your Honour thinks that that is the correct procedure.

When I see people trying to take advantage of other people, I have to come to their rescue. Consistently since the election in St. Lucy, attempts have been made to take advantage of, and to ridicule the hon. senior member for St. John; and that is wrong. I warn hon. members. If they do not like what the hon. member is saying, have an election. I know I cannot speak again on it, and that they are other hon. members anxious to speak. It is going to cause a tremendous row in this country. Let us have an election and settle it.

5.25 p.m.

Mr. BARROW entered the House and took his seat while Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY was speaking.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker,—I am seconding the motion of the hon. member for the sake of having the matter ventilated in this Chamber. We all cherish the institutions of the House and the customs of this Chamber, because parliament must have rules of procedure, and we must see that they are adhered to and preserved. I do

not think we have to be sensitive to what is written in the Press; because in this Chamber today, members have to represent a wider electorate than was represented in days gone by when tranquility and peace reigned in this Chamber. Members of those days only represented about six thousand electors, while today over ninety thousand people go to the polls. We need not be sensitive about the clashes that take place in this Chamber. What we have to worry about is to see that what comes before us, is dealt with in a manner in the interest of those whom we represent.

I am sorry sir, that you have taken notice from the Chairman of a charge to be laid, and that you yourself did not undertake to make a ruling on the issue.

I feel sir, that a ruling on this issue is a matter for Your Honour. I do not regard the Chairman reporting to you that something has happened in the Chamber is of necessity a charge by him, because when you examine the nature of what has taken place, it is really a cause for a ruling by you.

Mr. SPEAKER: The House having heard what took place would be in a very much better position to know about it. I was not present. The Chairman reported disobedience and that is why I dealt with it under Rule 139.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I am leading you up to that, to show why it would be a matter for Your Honour to decide what you would consider as disobedience in this context, it is going to be of a very doubtful character.

The Committee was discussing the Head Highways and Transport. That is a central organisation and not a parochial organisation. Without any reflection on the Chairman of Committees, we all know that he has the habit of telling hon. members that he does not see so and so in the Resolution. A Resolution is not an encyclopedia, and therefore you cannot expect that in any Resolution the hon. Chairman will be able to see every living thing under the sun. Sometimes when it comes to a matter of words and sentences, the Chairman says that the word or sentence is not in the Resolution and therefore you cannot debate it. But that point of view would reduce the entire debates of the Assembly not only to a farce, but past the stage of children in the primer standard.

We are dealing with grown-ups, and you must therefore realise that there are things which you understand and which you will take for granted; therefore, Mr. Speaker, I do not feel that within this context, what was said was irrelevant. The Hon. Minister was quick to correct what he did not say; but he did say that as long as he is in charge of that department or any department, and as long as he is a Minister of the Government, he will see that certain things are done in the interest of the community. The Minister was making a general statement. He was not dealing with the road in St. Joseph only. He said that he would take it on himself to see that the business of his department was properly carried out.

The hon. member was speaking as Minister of Communications of Barbados which includes St. Joseph. The fact that this Resolution says that you are getting a road roller for roads in St. Joseph does not preclude you from saying, that you are dealing with road rolling in another parish. What I am at pains to point out Mr. Speaker, is that it does rest within the Committee's power to advise the Chairman on an issue such as this. The Chairman took it upon himself to report this matter to you, and as I have said, the Chairman should follow practice and custom.

I do not believe Mr. Speaker, that it is within the realms of your duty or the Chairman's duty to make a ruling unless you are going to be guided by the usage, practice and customs of this Chamber. To say that a member is out of Order, to say that he should not mention St. John in this context, to say that he disobeyed because he mentioned it and that he is to be charged for so doing and that we are to have a special debate on it, if that goes down as a ruling which is not only for today but for all times, no member of this Chamber will be able to make any analogies in any debate at all.

If you are discussing under Highways and Transport money to deal with the Deep Water Harbour, no member would be able to ask now that you are dealing with the Deep Water Harbour, will it be possible for you to build the East Coast Road. If you take it upon yourself to say that hon. members cannot make analogies, we will not be able to debate anything.

It is regrettable that so much of our time is taken up with such issues at this stage of our political development and our political history, that we cannot accept that there are certain customs and practices which we ought to follow. I regard an issue like this as out of your prerogative; and it is going to be embarrassing to the dignity of the Chair and of your high office if on examination it is found, that not only no disrespect was used to the Chairman, but that the Chairman undertook to institute a ruling against the use of analogies, in spite of the fact that as far as the custom and usage of this Chamber are concerned, all members have the privilege and right to make analogies whenever they are making speeches, and especially speeches on a Resolution.

5.35 p.m.

There are those of us who do not like to fight unnecessarily, and who feel that things of this nature can very easily be settled in another quarter.

I would suggest to Your Honour that you undertake to give a ruling in the matter. If you feel that the hon. senior member for St. John should be called upon to withdraw any remarks he made or make an apology to you or to the Chairman, take such action. What I regard as a charge to call for action by the House is something of a very grave nature. This seems to me a matter of interpretation, and I feel that Your Honour is the best person to interpret when a member goes wrong in this Chamber. My reason for saying so is because your office is above party and above individuals, and what you say and do is something for future generations to follow. So as not to bring the Chairman into disrepute, let us adhere to what has taken place in this Chamber in the past on occurrences such as this. I am sure you will find something in the archives of this place on what has been done in the past on such matters. Is it the practice for the Chairman or the Speaker to stop debates or to stop members from debating a matter, because the member strays from the point, or is it the practice when the member strays or is likely to stray, for the Chairman or the Speaker to ask the member to stick to the measure, whatever it may be. This is no reflection on the hon. Chairman, but I feel that you should warn a member that he has strayed from the Resolution and if he continues, say that you are not hearing the hon. member. What is unfortunate about this matter is that the hon. Chairman during the time he was in the Chair, never intimated to the hon. member that he was not allow-

ing him to continue to speak on the matters outside of the Resolution.

I think this is a grave matter. It is one which brings hon. members in this Chamber into ridicule. Quite stupidly the Press is criticising hon. members and the Chair, some recently going on the borderline to challenge Your Honour's ruling. Some people by innuendo are suggesting that because members who occupy these seats today are of a different complexion from those who occupied them in the past, we are doing something different from what was done. As I have said, stupidly, some writers in the Press are indicating that they are experts on parliamentary procedure.

Again I say that we should try to settle this issue; and it can be settled without making a mountain of a molehill. I am suggesting that Your Honour undertake to settle it. I cannot make such a motion because I have already seconded one; but I am suggesting that some hon. member make such a motion because it is within your prerogative to settle it, and avoid its becoming a debate of this House. Do rule in this matter and bring an end to this debate. That is my suggestion to Your Honour without any reflection on what you may have said before.

Mr. SPEAKER: Before any other member speaks on this matter, I want to make it clear that the Chairman approached me and mentioned that the hon. senior member for St. John had disobeyed the Chair. He never asked me to make a ruling on anything. There was never any question of a ruling. As soon as such a report that an hon. member has disobeyed the Chair is made, it is the business of the House to discuss that. It must be fully aired by the House; I therefore put it to the House. I told the House that the debate has been instituted in order to discover whether the charge is well founded or unfounded. As on another occasion, and as the honourable senior member for the City said if my advice had been sought, I am sure I would have given the Chairman a different idea.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: Having had some years experience in this House I think I too should say a few words. I think I ought to say that it is quite evident that this debate is leading nowhere. I think we should stop beating the air; we should stop recriminations and we should also stop our mental contortions and admit that the honourable member against whom the charge was laid, was wrong. I hope the honourable senior member for St. Lucy who has even had more years in this House than I, would get up and say whatever appears to him would not throw oil on troubled waters.

Mr. BRANCKER: I am ready to rise as soon as the honourable member sits. I will be saying something for sometime.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: The honourable junior member for St. Peter said, that we should never mind or we should not be sensitive to remarks or comments by the Press. I do not agree with him. Those of us who have had years of experience in this House will readily admit that the tone of the debates the decorum and the dignity of the House have been lowered within recent days. Let us face up to those things. This House will readily admit that the decorum of this Chamber has been lowered. That is a fact. The honourable junior member for St. Peter says that never mind the House has been elected on a broader basis now, and we have more people to please—

5.45 p.m.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I would not like the Hon. Minister to paraphrase what I said: he has put a different construction on what I said. I said that we must not be too sensitive to the criticism which has been made in the Press about the debates to-day, because whereas we represented 6,000 people before, today we have an area of 90,000 to a 100,000 involved, and you are likely to get these clashes. The honourable member must put a fair construction on what I have said.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: I do not mean to misconstrue what the honourable member said, but it is true that years ago the House represented a smaller electorate as compared with the electorate today; but still, the standard of conduct should remain the same. Never mind the number of people we represent, our standard of conduct should remain the same. I have had the privilege of sitting under three previous Speakers and never did any one member dream of arguing or contradicting the Speaker. [Mr. CRAWFORD: You forget Adams.] Everybody knew what happened to the Hon. Premier. [Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: He disobeyed the Chair, and he was named.] Well sir, if there was any difference of opinion between a member of this House and the Chairman of Committees or the Speaker, that member obeyed the ruling of the Chair. I have often done it myself; and after the House adjourned I approached the Speaker in his chambers and argued the matter with him. I remember that on one occasion, Sir Harold Austin—I am glad to see that the hon. junior member for St. James has arrived because he has had considerable experience in this House, and he knows what the standard of debate was before as compared with to-day. I was saying sir, that I convinced Sir Harold Austin that he was wrong, and he was man enough to go back in the House and admit that he was wrong and change his ruling. But as I said, I do not suppose what I am saying now would make much difference, but I think we should take this afternoon as our turning point. It can be useful from that point of view. With a firm resolution we should try to restore that dignity and decorum of which this House once boasted, and especially when the question of Federation is coming more to the front and it is believed that Barbados will be at least the temporary if not the permanent capital; and we should bear in mind that we should now set our house in order. I have had the privilege of going to other islands even Jamaica, and they all look up to Barbados. I am appealing to honourable members. As I have said, I am quite willing to stop any further recriminations and let the honourable member be censured as he is wrong. [Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Which honourable member?] The honourable member against whom the charge has been made. I believe that he is wrong, but we do not expect the honourable senior member for the City or those who think like him, to censure the honourable member. We should pull our socks up and try to get back to the esteem which we once held in the West Indies.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT entered the House and took his seat while Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS was speaking.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I should like strongly to support the plea which has been made by the Hon. Leader of the House for the maintenance of the traditional decorum for which this Chamber has a reputation. I sincerely hope that the Chairman of Committees has listened very carefully to what the Hon. Leader of the House had to say, and that his fellow Ministers and members of his Party to whom his remarks should primarily have been directed, will benefit to a great extent from what he has said. Now sir, you will recall that about two weeks ago the honourable member against whom this charge has been laid and yourself, had some controversy; and when you asked him to withdraw certain remarks which you regarded as being offensive, he withdrew them

and said that in his opinion he would be of far greater service to the island inside this Chamber than outside of it, (and I add, even temporarily) because he is bound to come back here. I say all that, in order to say this: if on this occasion under discussion there has been any disobedience to the ruling of the Chair, it arose purely through a difference of opinion in what the Chairman of Committees regarded was his right, and what the honourable member regarded was the latitude to which he should be entitled in discussing a money Resolution. Traditionally we have always been allowed considerable latitude in discussing money Resolutions, and if the debate on a money Resolution is to be confined to the limit suggested today by the Chair, well then it appears to most of us that there need not be any discussion on money Resolutions, and all the Government need do is to say "we propose to spend this money and it has got to be spent; we are going to spend it and it shall be done, and that is the end of the discussion."

5.55 p.m.

Now sir, the position is this: the Chairman intervened so many times in the debate, that the honourable member for St. John has not yet been able to draw the comparison he intended to draw; as a result of which the parish of St. John and its roads would have been included in the debate. I merely want to say what he intended to say in that respect, in order to clarify the position for members of the House who did not have an opportunity to know exactly what he intended to say; and even Your Honour would be in a better position to appreciate how the name of the parish of St. John was included in the debate apparently in spite of the ruling of the Chair.

What the honourable member for St. John said was that in St. Joseph where roads have now been taken over by the Central Government, you have the Minister of Communications deciding to construct a road a greater portion of which runs between two plantations at a cost of $15,000, while the same Minister refused only in November last year in St. John, an adjacent parish, to permit the construction of a road that would serve over 60 peasants at a cost of only $8,000, because a very short portion of the road passes through lands belonging to two landowners. That is the only reference that the honourable member made to St. John; and it was for the purpose of comparison. He compared the cost of the two roads and the policy of the Minister as regards the two roads.

If any member of this Chamber can say that that comparison was irrelevant to the debate or that the honourable member was not entitled to use an analogy to strengthen the terms of his discussion, I submit that we could put an end to parliamentary debates altogether. You cannot have the same Minister lay down the law that you cannot construct a public road merely because a few yards of that road happened to pass through land privately owned by two peasants, and then allow the construction of a road costing $15,000 which passes through almost the entire length of land owned by two members of the House. Therefore, sir, you need not be surprised, (since you are not in the Chamber) that there appears to be no desire to censure the honourable member for what the Chairman regards as an infringement of his ruling. It is merely a question of misinterpretation on the part of the Chair as regards the latitude which the honourable member should be allowed and whether or not the House feels that the comparison between the policy of the Minister in St. John and his policy in St. Joseph, was not a case for censure.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I rise to clarify one point. As the Minister of Social Services has said not long ago, the decorum of this House has lowered. That fact cannot be denied. I, like the Hon. Minister of Social Services, sat here under the former Speaker, Mr. George Evelyn, and I am sure that anyone or any member here present as well as the public who listened to the various debates in this House, must agree that the conduct of members was of a much higher standard then than it has been in these days.

Mr. BARROW: I rise to a point of Order, sir. I hope that the Hon. Minister is not reflecting on Your Honour's speakership.

Mr. SPEAKER: I was about to mention the same thing. The honourable member is attempting to tell the House that if my immediate predecessor were still in the Chair, the conduct and tone of the debates would be much higher. I doubt it very much. (*Cheers*).

Hon. M. E. COX: That is left to be seen. I am not going to press that point any further. I am not going to debate it at all. I only intend to reply to a point made by the honourable senior member for St. Philip and the very incorrect statement he has made, although I do not expect him to make correct statements. The honourable member said that this road to which he referred to as Welch Road in St. John, owing to the fact that there are only two peasants who own this large bit of road or the balance of this road—

Mr. LEWIS: I am rising to a point of Order. The purpose of this debate is not to discuss the merits of the issue that was before the Committee of Supply.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister has had much latitude and must now deviate.

Hon. M. E. COX: The honourable senior member for St. Philip made this statement as well as the honourable senior member for St. John.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I made no statement at all. The statement was made by the honourable senior member for St. John, and the time for the Minister to have corrected it was then. But the Hon. Minister did not correct it then.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think that the honourable senior member for St. Philip was just giving the background of what happened.

Hon. M. E. COX: It is an accusation made against my Ministry.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is not your duty to defend yourself or the Ministry at this stage. Let us get on with the subject.

6.05 p.m.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, much has been said in this debate already to give this House an indication as to what its feelings are on this particular matter. But I cannot help feeling that the Chairman when he reported that the hon. senior member for St. John had disobeyed him, should really have said that the hon. member had been difficult. That would have been substantially true, and the debate of this House would have shown why the hon. member was difficult. The reason was as follows: in the course of his speech he found it impossible to develop his theme unless he did it by way of analogy in comparison. It is still to be stated in this House whether analogy and comparison are improper for developing a theme in this House. They are not. The Chairman however could not see his way to allow the hon. member to proceed with his frequent references to analogy and comparison, and so restricted his latitude thereby.

If the Chairman had succeeded, and if therefore his appeals to the hon. member had borne fruit,

then of course the hon. senior member for St. John would have had no other recourse but to have sat. It could not be expected that the hon. member could sit unless he said all he had to say. The hon. senior member for St. John realised that quite early a difficulty was emerging and he therefore made frequent appeals to the hon. Chairman to summon Your Honour, and although he did not say so, I am sure his purpose of appealing to the Chair to summon you was to extract a ruling from you. The Chairman, (or so it seems to the hon. members on this side of the Table) felt fortitude in himself from the opinions he had by the provocative attitude of the Hon. Minister for Communications. I am quite certain that the provocative attitude of the Hon. Minister for Communications brought this encounter. Had he refrained, not only from his provocative designs which were designed to strengthen his oversight but to strengthen his own handling of the Government's attitude towards the question, the hon. senior member for St. John would not have been forced to pursue a course of analogy and comparison. Had it not been for that, the Chairman would not have thought it any part of his duty to restrict the Committee from analogy and comparison in developing a theme. For that reason obviously, the charge of disobedience against the hon. member cannot stand.

Sir, only you can give a final ruling; you are the final authority in this House. The Chairman of Committees or any Chairman appointed for such purpose is there on authority from you. From the way this charge has been made, it would appear that what the Chairman wanted to do was to have the hon. senior member for St. John censured; and since the hon. member has not disobeyed, but found it impossible to obey the Chairman which is different, the charge itself is without substance.

There is another aspect to this matter, and it is even more important than the facts under examination. I think it has got to be settled once and for all, and now is a good time to settle it. The question is whether in this House freedom of debate is a reality. Let me say Mr. Speaker, that you yourself and your predecessors before you whenever the Legislature has been opened by the Head of the Administration, exercised the privilege of asking not only that the best constructions should be put in the debates in this Chamber, but that freedom be given to hon. members to express themselves; that principle would be at stake if this charge was substantiated. I do not know how other hon. members feel about it, but I certainly feel (and those of us who love parliamentary procedure should also feel the same way) that we should be very strong on this matter. Therefore, this is not merely a question of defending the hon. senior member of St. John, (although he can be defended ably and with ease) but it is a question of asking members of the Govment to first take steps to straighten out themselves and show a positive awareness of the dignity of their views, particularly in their handling of Government's business in this House; because it is just true to say that the way in which they handle Government's business, is where the trouble starts.

I hope sir, we have not reached the stage, where the members of the British House of Commons in 1642 were so anxious to maintain and extend their privileges as members, particularly their freedoms, that they held Mr. Speaker down in his Chair while the House proceeded to pass Resolutions of privileges. Far from it that I should suggest that such a thing should come to pass in this House; but that incident shows that those privileges meant more to them than the dignity of Mr. Speaker. Of course, it is the reverse to us. Your Honour knows that your dignity means a lot to us; your dignity stands on an equal footing with that of those privileges.

I support the hon. senior member for St. John on two grounds. The first is that this charge of disobedience is unfounded; and it was due to an oversight on the part of the Chairman and a misinterpretation of his own functions. The second ground is that the privileges of this House as a debating Chamber require that hon. members must have recourse to analogy and comparison in the setting out of their themes of debate. (*Cheers*).

Mr. SPEAKER : I cannot reiterate too much, that I was never asked or consulted to make a ruling or to defend this Chair. What I told the House was that a report of a charge was made to me by the Chairman of Committees that the hon. senior member for St. John was disobedient. I do not have to make a ruling on that. That matter passes on to the House to debate; therefore, I flung it to the House. Had I been asked to make a ruling I would have already made that. If hon. members want my reassurance that I ever intend to maintain and defend the privileges of this House, they have it now again.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: Unfortunately, I arrived rather late.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable senior member for St. Lucy caught my eye first.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: I am sorry.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, what I would propose to do if Your Honour would entertain the motion, would be to move that the House resume Committee of Supply on the matter which was before it. We have so far fully discussed this matter under Rule 139 which has been invoked, and which has permitted this discussion here this afternoon. Now, sir, Rule 139 reads that every member against whom any charge has been made having been heard in his place is to withdraw, while such a charge is under debate. That pre-supposes firstly, that the charge has been made and then of course, that the honourable member has been heard in his place before he is required to withdraw.

What is the charge? I have looked in vain in the latest editions of May's in order to attempt to refresh my memory as to what a charge is in parliamentary language; and I see nowhere the meaning of a charge for the purpose of Rule 139. On pages 668, 662, 730, and 754 of May's Parliamentary Procedure, Sir Erskine May deals purely with matters of finance, expenditure of the Crown, or public revenue. It has been pointed out on page 730 that a charge has a highly technical meaning.

6.15 p.m.

Therefore Mr. Speaker, as any lawyer knows, and most Barbadians are lawyers (*Laughter*) if we cannot find any technical parliamentary meaning of the word, we will try and discover what is its ordinary English meaning according to the "Shorter Oxford English Dictionary." If one were to turn to page 293 of that dictionary which is no more helpful than "May's" in trying to give the word "charge" the meaning which is presumed it has with regard to Rule 139, we will find that the meanings of this word "charge" in the Oxford Dictionary are (1) load of trouble, inconvenience; anything burdensome, (2) importance, moment, (3) pecuniary burden; the price demanded for services or goods; (4) a liability to pay money laid upon a person or estate; (5) commission, trust, responsibility; (6) care, custody superintendence; (7) A thing or person entrusted to the care of anyone; (8) A precept injunction, mandate, order and (9) the accusation upon which a prisoner is brought up for trial. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, there appears to be no ordinary English meaning of

this word which can make Rule 139 applicable here. I am not questioning the —

Mr. SPEAKER: Has it occurred to the honourable member that charge can have the meaning of "complaint?"

Mr. BRANCKER: Perhaps it has more force than that. This is something which can only be decided upon after the charge has been heard, and the matter fully investigated; but May's makes no reference to the word "charge" from the standpoint of a complaint. Your Honour has stated that the Chairman of Committees has reported to you that on more than one occasion he asked the honourable senior member for St. John to refrain from mentioning roads in St. John, and that the honourable member refused to obey the Chair. I did not have the advantage of hearing all the remarks of the honourable member, because they are still some of us who are working men, and I was unable to arrive here during the discussion of the particular matter. However, my colleague, has pointed out that while the honourable senior member for St. John was trying to refer to roads in St. John *apropas* to the policy of the Department, the Chairman of Committees seemed not to follow the honourable member and did not realise that he was attempting an analogy and comparison when he was dealing with the roads in St. John. Some honourable members are more adept in using remarks than the honourable member, and there are those who can use the rapier more effectively than those who can use the sledge hammer. I would say that we all become occasionally incensed at times, and that we can be more upset on some occasions than on others. However, I know of no more good natured honourable member of this House than the honourable junior member for St. Joseph, the Chairman of Committees; and I realise that he is having a rather arduous session; but I am sure that after this interlude if Your Honour entertains a motion and it is passed, that he will resume the Chair in his customary demeanour and his customary flare for humour (and he will enjoy a good joke) and that this debate will continue to be conducted on parliamentary lines, but not without that analogy which is inevitable in any debate. At times an analogy is very helpful in debates in this Chamber. I know that the honourable junior member for St. James who has had 26 years of experience in this House and who is the senior practitioner at the local Bar, will in all probability be taking part in this debate and he will have the opportunity of seconding the motion after which I trust, oil will have been poured on the troubled waters

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I did not have the misfortune of being present in this Chamber when the offence or alleged offence of which the honourable senior member for St. John has been charged, was actually committed, if it were committed at all. I would have been perfectly willing to allow honourable members who have already spoken to make their observations and to listen patiently, and to say nothing on the matter if a fundamental principle of democratic government had not been involved. But Mr. Speaker, I consider it a duty on my part to speak on this matter, not so much to weigh in the balance the pros and cons of the report which has been made by the Chairman of Committees, but rather to draw to Your Honour's attention the rather regrettable state to which parliamentary democracy has degenerated in this colony.

6.25 p.m.

I consider it all the more necessary to do so because of the complete lack of sense of responsibility in the Press of this island, in publishing fair and accurate reports of proceedings in this Chamber for the benefit and edification of members of the general public. Thirdly, Mr. Speaker, I consider it my duty to rise and defend the House as it is presently constituted, because of the rather surprising and invidious remarks which have been made by the Deputy Premier and the honourable senior member for the parish of St. Michael, or the Minister of Communications and Works as he calls himself.

I cannot subscribe to the view that during Your Honour's tenure of office either the manners or the behaviour (that of the Ministers excepted) or the standard of conduct or Your Honour's handling of the affairs of this House have deteriorated in any way from those standards which existed before. It seems to me, that the honourable members whom I have named—not using that expression as a term of censure—have fallen into the easy complacency of accepting too readily what they read in the newspapers of this island; and they accept too readily not only in their particular department of public affairs and personal conduct, the lead given by the honourable senior member for St. Joseph when the occasion suits him.

I would like to point out to the Minister of Communications and the Deputy Premier, that if the debates of this Chamber at the present moment appear to be somewhat heated, and if sometimes in the heat of battle members indulge in references to each other or to mutual recriminations, it is only because we have now reached the stage in Barbados in parliamentary government which the Mother of Parliaments achieved some 250 years ago, of full and free expression of opinion; and the lack of homogeneity in political views would also, I submit Mr. Speaker, be partly responsible for the heat of debate.

But, sir, at no time during the three and a half years that I have been a member of this honourable Chamber, have I seen the spectacle of a member who has sat in the Chamber for 25 years or any period of time throw an egg across the floor of the House; and that is something that happened in the House of Commons last year. I hope that I am not maligning the worthy gentleman, but it is alleged that the missile was projected by no less a person than Sir Waldron Smithers (whom God preserve).

Also, sir, I have never seen the honourable senior member for St. Andrew hold up her skirts and dance a polka on the floor of the House as I saw Miss Betsy Braddock do some years ago in the House of Commons—the Mother of Parliaments. To those of us who are not to the manner born, every single high spirited expression of our political convictions is viewed with grave concern; and we are always told to emulate the example set by the Mother of Parliaments both in the conduct of our personal and our public affairs. But if we did that, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that members would be absolutely horrified by the remarks and by the boos and jeers and by the actual open defiance of all the conventional standards of proper behaviour, which takes place in that illustrious Chamber from time to time.

I consider it, Mr. Speaker, a personal insult not only to yourself but to all the other honourable members around me, to suggest that the members of this House do not conduct the affairs (again Ministers excepted) of this Chamber in a manner as decorous as that evidenced in the Mother of Parliaments or in any other Chamber outside the Supreme Soviet, where, there is no room, we understand, for any divergence of opinion or the development or generation of more heat than light during the course of a debate.

I resent that insinuation, Sir, and at the same time my heart is filled with compassion and sympathy for the Hon. Minister, because he does not know any better and the honourable senior member for St.

Michael is always trying to ape his betters even if he does not understand the driving forces behind the behaviour of those whom he so considers. And that is why carries his head in the clouds "scorning the base degrees by which he did ascend." And that is why he is always leaning over backwards both in the physical and metaphorical sense of the term, to make it appear that we in Barbados have so achieved the millennium in the conduct of our affairs, and that we are at such an economic or political stage that there is no need for discussion, and there is no need for any difference of opinion between one subject of Her Majesty and another.

You will know, Sir, that my purpose in rising is as much to reiterate the privileges of this Chamber as to make it clear that the allegations made by the Minister of Communications and his friends in the Press and the Premier when it suits him, are completely without foundation when parliamentary democracy is viewed from the light of experience and from the stand point of this one essential factor: that for the salvation of a democratic community there should be as much latitude as possible in divergence of opinion, and the manner of expression of those opinions.

6.35 p.m.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speake,r I would say that I consider that point not only the essence of parliamentary democracy, but indeed one of the social imperatives with which we cannot exist as a free and democratic community. I would go further by saying that perhaps a word of advice may be helpful to those who from time to time find themselves in the position of authority, and in the position where they can exercise control over the freedom of their fellowman. Like Sir Erskine May, (and as the honourable junior member for St. James as well as those other persons who have had the good fortune to be in the profession to which I have the honour to belong will tell you) I would like to say that those persons who find themselves in positions of authority (and this pertains particularly to members of the Government) it is the prominent essay of parliamentary democracy in the conditional mood that they must not exercise themselves in any way which would prevent them from expressing the wishes and aspirations of those whom they purport to represent; neither should they allow their self interest to exert itself to such an extent as to distort their vision, so that the people begin to be dissatisfied and to ask themselves whether they are living in a democracy or not.

I have studiously avoided making any reference to the actual complaint which has been made against the honourable senior member for St. John, but I think Your Honour is fully aware that the procedure which we are now adopting is probably without parallel or without precedent. I would only refer Your Honour to the Rules of this House from Rule 107 to 139, and would further refer Your Honour to the Manual of Procedure in Public Business which was laid on the Table of the House of Commons by the then Mr. Speaker, Mr. D. Clifton Browne, now Lord Ruffside in 1944. On page 141 provision for an order is made *ex cathedra*. I would also refer Your Honour to page 447 and onwards of the 15th edition of Sir Thomas Ersine May's Parliamentary Practice. In none of those publications you will find analogy mentioned; because, it is set out quite clearly that if a member is disorderly or in some way infringing on the rules of the House, no debate is allowed. That is the whole point. However, Mr. Speaker, the very thing that you, and there is no more enlightened Speaker in the whole of the British West Indies than yourself, and there is no one who is more acquainted with Sir Erskine May's Manual of Procedure than yourself (I know all of that by my excursions both inside and outside of this Chamber) have just permitted this so as to allow the safety valve which Parliament has to blow itself off, Mr. Speaker, there is some hope for parliamentary democracy in the British Caribbean As I have said, I have no desire to go into the merits or demerits of the particular action which has permitted me to rise to my feet. As you know sir, we sat on a Committee, (Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the House and myself, and other honourable members whom I know will forgive me if I do not mention their names) and we were most active in our revision of the Rules of this Chamber. As you know, we were informed that a parliamentary draftsman would have to scrutinise those Rules before this House finally adopted them. I think that is a reflection on the people of Barbados in running their own affairs. As you know, up to now we have not been informed whether those Rules were accepted or not. However, I hope this debate will serve to focus the attention of members of the public and members of this Chamber to the fact that our Rules even though revised, should have been approved and passed by now.

I will end by saying this as I do consider it can not be repeated too often: the remarks made by the Hon. Minister of Communications and the remarks made in the Press are completely unfounded, and the remarks made by the Hon. Premier on an unofficial occasion to which much publicity was given, are completely without any foundation in fact. I further would like to add that I consider it a grave reflection on the intelligence of the very members who gave voice to those remarks.

6.45 p.m.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I must say something in this matter at this stage, because honourable members have tried to make out a case in favour of the honourable senior member for St. John; and by so doing, they have tried to make it appear as if I did not want the hon. member to air his views or have anything to say on the Resolution which was before the Committee. Sir, last Wednesday morning this particular Head of the Resolution was aired freely by everyone; they talked about roads all over the island. The hon. senior member for St. John made one and only one point more than four times, in referring to a particular road called Pot House Road in the Parish of St. John. He made a very lengthy speech on it, and after the Hon. Minister of Communications had replied the hon. senior member for St. John got up and made another speech. The hon. senior member for the City went to New Orleans, Carrington's Village and all over the island, and if the hon. junior member for St. George had given way when he was making his last speech, I am sure that this particular Head would have been passed, because every hon. member had fully aired it and sat down quite willing to allow the Head to be passed. It was only after the hon. junior member for St. George began to make another speech, that hon. members walked out of the Chamber. Anybody will tell you sir, (and the hon. senior member for the City knows it well) that the matter was fully aired; but because the hon. senior member for St. John felt as he was inspired to do, that he could talk as he likes and whenever he likes, and I had to draw to his attention that he must keep to the particular Head of the Resolution, hon. members want to make it understood that the whole situation was caused on account of my action in trying to limit the hon. member in his speech. I am sure, that last Wednesday morning one of the members of my Party tried to draw

my attention to the wording of the particular Head under discussion, that the amount was in respect of the repairs to a road roller. I read back the note to the item and drew to the attention of that particular member of my Party, that in the note to the item, roads in St. Joseph were mentioned. Again to-day the matter was drawn to my attention and I repeated that roads in St. Joseph were mentioned in the note; and I was prepared to sit here all night and listen to roads in St. Joseph being discussed. The hon. ourable senior member for the City accused me of not giving the honourable member sufficient latitude

---

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: On a point of Order. I have never accused him of not giving anybody sufficient latitude.

Mr. SMITH: The hon. senior member for the City has said that we should give more latitude to the Opposition than to the members of the Government. What did that mean, sir? Would that not mean that I am working on the reverse? I am sure that the hon senior member for the City through that same loud mouth of his will say that ————

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I am not really objecting to that Mr. Speaker. I have merely risen to say that it is my loud mouth that will put some sense in his head. [VOICES: Allright!] You hear the parrots! They lower the dignity of this House because they are getting $600 a month.

Mr. SMITH: I did not see why the hon. member should have risen to his seat when I used the words "loud mouth"; because, he speaks more loudly than anybody else in this Chamber. You can hear the hon. member outside because he is given more latitude than anybody else! [*Laughter*] Sir, when the hon. senior member for St. John was speaking he knew what the hon. senior member for the City was telling him, and that prompted him to go as far as he went. The hon. senior member for the City did the same thing with the hon. junior member for St. John, and then told him he was wrong to do it. The hon. senior member for St. John was straying for most of the afternoon; I asked him to keep to the particular Head, and I read back to him the note which said that under the particular Head we were asked to vote $2,000 for the repairs and maintenance of a road roller. The hon. member went on to say that this particular road would cost in the vicinity of $15,000. [Mr. BARROW: The Hon. Minister of Communications gave that information.] I am saying what the hon. senior member for the City said to-day in the course of his debate; he said that this road is going to cost the Government somewhere in the vicinity of $15,000.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: On a point of explanation. Did the hon. member say that I said so?

Mr. SMITH: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker; I mean the hon. senior member for St. John. I like the hon. senior member for the City so much, that I cannot get his name out my mouth! [*Laughter*] However, sir, the note says that this sum of $2,000 was being asked for, and the hon. senior member for St. John was quarrelling about $15,000. That shows plainly that he was rambling away from the Resolution; he was talking about something which is not in the Resolution at all, which caused me to ask him to limit his remarks to the Resolution. I hinted to the hon. member more than once that I would have to call upon Your Honour, because of the attitude of some hon. members. You sir, know that when you are ruling some hon. members do not want to listen to you. I threaten to call on Your Honour, and the hon. member would not stop talking about this Pot House Road in the parish of St. John which he had freely aired last Wednesday morning.

6.55 p.m.

I am sure, that if the speech of last Wednesday morning and the one made today were compared, you would see that word for word the honourable member was only trying to waste the time of the House today. He had put all his points last Wednesday morning. I allowed him to make his points then. I allowed him to let the public know that the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works had prevented them from going through the plantation land at Pot House, and that here he is giving priority to another plantation which is wrong, because this is an abandoned parish road. [MEMBERS: Order! Order!] I was only trying to make the House understand that I did not in any way want to be partial on one side or another as far as speeches are concerned. The honourable senior member for the City who tried to defend the honourable senior member for St. John will tell you that the latter fully aired his point last Wednesday morning. I did not therefore see any need for going back over the same thing today. I tried to keep the honourable member in check because I knew that he would have to stop at some time.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker———

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the honourable member rising to a point of Order?

Mr. TUDOR: That is what I am doing, sir. I am saying that the honourable Chairman cannot say what he has just said. It is not within his province.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, you can see what the attitude of members is, and what they would like to see happen. I reported to you the conduct of the honourable senior member for St. John and left it to you for your ruling. That is all that I have done.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member made a charge against the honourable senior member for St. John for disobeying him. May I remind the honourable member of that? The honourable member did not seek my ruling. Most expressly he did not.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, believe me. I do not want to challenge your ruling.

Mr. SPEAKER: Not my ruling this time; my statement.

Mr. SMITH: I do not want to challenge your statement. If I ask a member to refrain from straying from a Resolution or from a particular head and he continues to stray, what would you call it, sir? [A MEMBER: Persistence] [*Loud asides*] Mr. Speaker I leave it to the honourable senior member for the City to speak.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, I am very glad that I am speaking after the honourable junior member for St. Joseph, because this matter might resolve itself more into one of irrelevance, than one of disobedience to the ruling of the Chair. What I should like to say at the beginning is that no desire to conduct our meetings with decorum and dignity can succeed, unless we are willing to obey the dictates and rulings of the Chairs. [VOICES: Hear! Hear!] Unless we are prepared to do that, we can have no decorum in our debates.

Now, sir, it is to be presupposed that the Chair will rule impartially and in accordance with the rules of debate [*Cheers*]. If, however, we have a disobedience of the ruling of the Chair, it is our duty to see that the honourable member is put right about it. In this particular instance I believe that it is a mixture of generosity and misapprehension by the Chairman which has caused the conflict.

I feel also that it was the feeling of the honourable senior member for St. John that if he had abided by the ruling of the Chair, he would have been losing

his right, and that he and others would have been at a disadvantage.

Now, sir, the Chairman of Committees said that this was a Resolution for $2,000. I am merely establishing my point that the whole issue resulted from misapprehension. There are two items under this Head that should stand part, and they are governed by Notes 4 and 5. Note 5 is overleaf. Note 4 says that something has happened as a result of taking over the roads of St. Joseph. Item 63 which is covered by Note 5 is general.

The first thing is sir, that this Note starts off with the assumption of responsibility for the roads in St. Joseph. The fact remains that that is only Note 4 and there are only two items under the head. But that is not the deciding factor. The Road Roller can now be used in any part of the island. I am not expressing any opinion as to whether it is the right; I am not sure that we should be allowed to bring in everything concerning a department, because the department comes for supplementary estimates under one or two heads. I think that when the Annual Estimates are before us, we have the whole department before us as well as its administration.

But the Chairman was most generous, (perhaps it was because of the turn that the debate took) but he allowed roads to be discussed, and that caused the difficulty. Once the debate had strayed in that direction it had to be allowed to go on. The honourable senior member for St. John felt that something was fundamentally wrong in this debate and he himself asked for Your Honour to be called to give a ruling.

I am not sure now, sir, that we should have dealt with this case of disobedience in the manner in which it has been dealt with. I certainly would have taken part in the debate in Committee and made these points, if opportunity had been given. We have seen the same thing happen in debates in the past and the Chairman has always straightened matters up with the House. Out of his good nature he has resolved many difficulties.

7.05 p.m.

I feel that there is a method for questioning and debating the rulings of the Chair. If the ruling of the Chair is wrong, I feel it must be obeyed. There are rules and laws governing procedure as to how a wrong ruling can be dealt with on a substantive motion; therefore, a wrong ruling need not cause any worry. However, we did not adopt that procedure, neither did we adopt the correct motion. We should have had a positive motion. As it is, we have a negative motion and May's parliamentary procedure says we cannot amend it.

If the motion that we resume Committee of Supply is acceptable I am to second the motion that we resume Committee for the reasons I have stated; and I would urge that that motion be accepted by all honourable members. When that motion is adopted, we can inform the honourable member so that he can resume his seat. Mr. Speaker, as far as general procedure is concerned I have tried to avoid that. What I want to say is, that our Rule says how we should proceed; in this manner, but I know that in the House of Commons this procedure is not adopted. Mr. Speaker, I say again that I will unhesitatingly censure any member, if you make an absolutely correct ruling and the member disobeys it. We should not adopt the attitude of disobeying the Chair. However, sir, as I have said, there are extenuating circumstances on this occasion, because the honourable member felt that he was losing the right to debate the matter. I formerly second the motion that this House do now resume Committee of Supply.

The question that this House do now resume Committee of Supply was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Temporary Chairman Appointed

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Chairman, I beg to move that the honourable senior member for St. Andrew be appointed to act as temporary Chairman.

Mr. LEWIS: I beg to second that.

The question was put and agreed to. The House resume Committee of Supply, Mrs. Bourne in the Chair.

Mr. Allder entered the House. (*Cheers*).

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY RESUMED

Mr. ALLDER: I do not know Madam Chairman, if I shall be permitted to make any statement in defence of myself.

Mr. Smith entered the Committee and took his seat. Mrs. Bourne left the Chair and Mr. Smith took the Chair.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Chairman, speaking on the Resolution, I feel that the only thing for the Government to do in this matter is to cause a stoppage of the work which is being carried out on this road under consideration. While the Hon. Minister might feel that he and the Department of Highways & Transport are justified in giving priority to it, from the point of view of public responsibility and the necessity of allowing fair play and justice to show themselves in any policy of the Government, it is but right to leave roads such as this undone, until those districts which are heavily congested with peasants and householders throughout the island, are put into a proper state of repair. However right the Hon. Minister of Transport might feel, in a community such as this where you get the majority of poor people either straining themselves to purchase a spot of land or are renters to landlords, consideration for these people should be given priority. If that were done, no one would have felt that an injustice had been inflicted. No one would have felt that an injustice had been inflicted if that work were carried on in a tenantry or tenantries where the people have been suffering for many years, due to bad roads and the difficulty of getting in and out when the rain falls.

7.15 p.m.

We are all aware of the existence of similar areas not only in the metropolitan parish of St. Michael, but in the country districts; and if $15,000 were spent even in bringing back the East Coast Road into use, every honourable member in this Chamber and the general public would have been glad for that; because, it would have been satisfying the public who were making demands for sometime now for this East Coast Road to be brought under construction. I think it is some years ago when this Chamber voted a sum of over $7,000 to have that area surveyed for the purpose of laying down the road. Up to now that money has not been spent, and the public are still expecting to have that work done. Not only would it improve land value in the area, (in which the parochial authorities and the Government would get a greater income,) but it would open up new fields of cultivation for the people; not only the rich, but the small peasant owners who have land in that area. I should like, Mr. Chairman, to draw to the notice of the Hon.

Minister of Communications, (and this is a case which was pending for over three years now,) that in the parish of St. Joseph in the Foster Hall area the owner of the area charges one shilling for a vehicle to pass through it, and that was due to the fact that the Foster Hall road was out of repair for a considerable time. I have drawn the matter to the notice of the honourable senior member for St. Michael whose portfolio is responsible for controlling the particular department, but up to now nothing definite as far as I know has been decided upon as regards that road; and I daresay that that road accommodates not only the peasant proprietors in that part of St. Joseph and St. John but the public generally. Then it would also facilitate the tourist trade. I do not want to prolong this debate any longer, but I should like the Government in future to be consistent as regards the policy of dealing with parish roads and tenantry roads. I am the last person, Mr. Chairman who would try to flout your wishes when you rule, but I must express my unwillingness to sit silently when I see an injustice is being done to a large body of the taxpayers whom I have the honour to represent, as has happened in the case of which I made mention in this Chamber sometime ago.

Hon. M. E. COX: When this question was under debate sometime ago, what was the procedure in so far as the roads which have been already undertaken was concerned? The road of which the honourable member speaks is the Welch Village road. Sometime ago I was asked to visit the area and I was glad to go on the site and see for myself, whether the rule which is applicable to tenantry roads is being violated or not. I pointed out to the honourable member that that road could not be qualified under the Head "Tenantry Roads" and that was because of the fact that the remainder of that road passes through an estate which is owned on both sides by —

Mr. ALLDER: On a point of Order. I should like the Hon. Minister to call the name of the Plantation through which the road runs, because it is not in truth and in fact, an estate road. The land is owned by a peasant proprietor.

7.25 p.m.

Hon. M. E. COX: I am sure that the honourable member will agree with me because Highway Commissioners were on the site, and they all told us that the owner of that Plantation owned both sides of the road. It is something like ten acres stretching on both sides; one part is under sour grass and the other is under plant canes.

I told the hon. member at the time, and I told the Highway Commissioners that under the rules laid down as far as tenantry roads are concerned, that road would not qualify. But I suggested to them that the road could be repaired under the heading of parish roads, even if they asked for a larger grant. But it could not be repaired under the heading of parish roads. It is not therefore fair to compare the road in St. Joseph with the road in St. John, because in the first place he would have wanted that road repaired out of tenantry road funds, whereas the St. Joseph road is being repaired out of Highway funds.

I would like hon. members to disabuse their minds of any idea of partiality and of treating one parish in one way, and treating another parish in another way. Now the hon. member spoke about Foster Hall. I regret to learn that he has not been there for a long time, because anyone who has been there within the last few months will know, that the road is being diverted through the plantation yard. I am sure that the hon. member was present when a Resolution came to this House for $7,000 to reconstruct that road passing through Foster Hall right through to Highway F.

I got up merely to point out again that there are differences in roads. Roads qualify under different heads, and the road in St. John could not be repaired because if you repaired that road as a tenantry road, there is no reason why someone else could not come along and say that another road in similar circumstances could be repaired as a tenantry road.

There is no house on this road. There are canes on both sides. I said that the Highway Commissioners could repair it from Highway funds and not as a tenantry road.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I am inclined to agree with you that this Resolution was well ventilated last Tuesday; and but for the fact that a statement was made on the floor of the House and that we saw correspondence in the Press about it, and also saw what happened at some meeting of a Vestry, I suppose we would hardly have had much debate on it to-day.

The Hon. Minister is in the habit of replying after every hon. member has spoken. If that is his way of doing it, it is not for me to suggest that it should be done in any other way. It is usual for members whenever the question of roads is being discussed here to make reference, and rightly so, to roads in their various constituencies. I did so, as you rightly pointed out, and I shall always do so whenever the question of roads comes up. I will always be mindful of the roads in New Orleans.

What I am going to say now is that this question hinges on public morality. Last week the Hon. Minister of Communications held out that he felt himself to be a paragon of virtue. No one denies him that feeling. But I think I told him then, that when you are in public life, you must be like Caesar's wife —above suspicion. But on the other hand, anyone who is in public life is liable to find himself open to accusations and criticisms. Sometimes they are unfounded and at other times they are founded on facts.

What are the facts of this case? Last week a statement was made here by the hon. senior member for St. George who is a member of the Government's party; in that statement he asked the Government to confirm or deny what appeared to be a rumour. The statement was to the effect that the Government had been doing a road running through the properties of two hon. members of the Government's Party—the hon. junior member for St. Joseph and the hon. junior member for St. George. I think that the member of the Government's Party who made that statement, did it to prevent a little whispering that he had been hearing, and I think that he should be commended. If I were in that Party I would commend him, for the reason that he was giving the Government an opportunity to clear the air once and for all.

But what do we find? That statement having been made, and rightly so, the hon. junior member for St. George said that the statement made by his colleague was not founded on fact; because, this particular road had been first on the list and had been given priority long before the Government took over the roads of St. Joseph. If I am incorrect, will the hon. member correct me?

As to you, sir, you in your usual manner brushed the whole thing aside. As a result of that debate this House adjourned long after midnight. There are no two ways about it. A member of the Government's Party made a statement to the effect that it

has been rumoured. I do not think that he said it was so.

Mr. BARROW: I just want to correct the hon. senior member for the City. I made it abundantly clear when I made that statement, that I was only making it to give the Hon. Minister of Communications an opportunity to answer before it reached the Press of this island or some other body like the Vestry with which the hon. member is associated. I said that I was embarrassed; but when it comes to the question of rumour, I said that I had seen a bulldozer myself cutting a new road through the plantation which you have the good fortune to own, and down through the one which my colleague has the good fortune to own.

I also said that there was a tenantry some one and a quarter miles away which had a tenantry road done last year, which was confirmed by the Minister of Communications. The disclosure was then made that this road running through the plantations would cost the taxpayers of this island $15,000. Nothing that I said was founded on rumour.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is not a point of Order. 7.35 p.m.

Mr. BARROW: I am just correcting the honourable senior member for the City in saying that I made a statement which was founded on rumour. I would not be so irresponsible. As a matter of fact, my colleague has accused me of pimping behind a bulldozer.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I apologise if I use the word 'rumour'' uncharitably. My argument is strengthened tremendously by the statement which the honourable senior member for St. George made on the last occasion. He has told us that he went up there and saw the bulldozer working on the road. That is a statement of fact. During the week a letter appeared in the Press also to that effect. Yesterday the elected body of representatives of St. Joseph (of which you are a member and also one of the interested parties as an owner of one of those plantations), discussed the matter and decided that they are going to wait on the Chief Secretary to put this entire case. What is the entire case? It is that the Government is building a road there and is continuing it through a plantation which is owned by two of the members of the Government's Party? [A VOICE: That is not so.] The honourable senior member for St. George says so. I am not accusing the honourable senior or the honourable junior member for St. George, or anybody else. I am asking the House to say that with that statement made on the floor of the House, and with the honourable junior member for St. George categorically denying it, one would have thought that the Honourable Minister of Communications whose duty it is to say which road should be given priority, or who should say what road should be done, should have come in today with a statement backed up by the Director of Highways & Transport. One would have thought that such a statement would have been forthcoming. As it is and as it stands today, the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works has come in here and made that rather stupid and boastful remark that the work on that road should be continued. The honourable senior member for St. George made a statement and he went further and said he had seen the bulldozer on that road. The honourable senior member for St. John also said so. It is not anything which has come only from the Opposition; it is something that has come from a member inside the Government's Party. You have a member of the Government's Party who is saying, that for the sake of public morality you should at least make the position clear to the public.

Speaking for myself, everything might be above board and straight forward. Despite what the Hon. Minister for Communications said about Mr. Allan Cox and about somebody else in St. Joseph, the fact remains that six out of eight persons of the St. Joseph Vestry yesterday voted that a delegation of the Vestry wait on the Chief Secretary, and put the entire case about this road being repaired by the Government. Is it really decent in the face of that, merely for the Hon. Minister of Communications to get on the floor of the House and say "As long as I am Minister, it shall be continued." And he said so rather boastfully and bombastically. That is not the attitude which one should adopt. If I were in the position of the Hon. Minister for Communications, listening to the statement from the honourable senior member for St. George, and anticipating what the Opposition would say, I would have got up in here today and made a statement, fortified by the Director of Highways & Transport to the effect that there is no truth that I as the policy-maker, has anything to do with suggesting this road. These are the facts; the St. Joseph roads have been recently taken over by the Government; here is an abandoned road, and this road is being done by the Government. The inference therefore is, that the Highways Commissioners for St. Joseph refused to do that road, but as soon as the Government took over the parish roads, the Hon. Minister for Communications who is the policy-maker has reasons of his own or best, known to himself, to accommodate members of his party by deciding to carry the road through their land to increase the values of their lands. I think what has been said has really put the two honourable members of that party in a most awkward position. It really does put the honourable junior member for St. George and you, Mr. Chairman, in a most awkward position.

7.45 p.m.

I feel that you should not sit by and say that the Hon. Minister of Communications can take care of that; I say that it is bad taste for the honourable junior member for St. George to have to defend it. If I were in the honourable member's position, I would say nothing in the matter more than saying, that I have never asked anybody to carry a road along my land. There is nothing to be ashamed of in a road being taken along land belonging to the honourable junior member for St. George. The honourable senior member for St. John has told us what he saw there, and he draws his comparison to show that there are dozens of houses in this tenantry and what about it? The Hon. Minister of Communications has said that Mr. Allan Cox would not repair this road because he had an interest in Andrews. Now I am not among those who like to make such references to people; I would like to tell the Hon. Minister of Communications that I have heard him from 1944 ranting, tearing, ridiculing and condemning what he considered to be immorality, when members who were here dared to carry roads to their own premises. I say when the honourable member asked me to show him what is wrong, my reply to that is: "show us what is right." The Hon. Minister cannot deny the fact that the road is being done, because it is being done. The honourable member for St. John has said, having listened to the honourable junior member for St. Andrew, that there are eight land owners around this area. There might be very good justification for carrying through this road, but what I say to the Hon. Minister of

Communications is what I am asking the Government to say. There is a Labour Party in power; a member of that Labour Party makes a statement which he says is a statement of fact, and the honourable senior member for St. John a member of the Opposition says that what the honourable junior member for St. Andrew says is true. You see correspondence in the Press, and is it not time for this House to have a statement denying all these accusations? You can see from the statement in the Press that the public realises what the position is. If the accusations are not true and you may have justifiable reasons, because you can make allegations about somebody in the Vestry, I say that that is not good enough. If the Hon. Minister of Communications were in the Opposition and that had happened, he would have been demanding that the Government send down a Statement in connection with this matter. Let them make much of the time they have now; believe me when I say that I am not looking for any Ministerial Office or the money they are getting. Let them get that out of their heads. I warn them: it is not good enough to say "I shall see that it is done." Despite the fact that everything points to some suspicion, and you have the report of a public Board, and you have correspondence in the Press, and you have a member of your own Party and also a member of the Opposition making the statements which they have made, do you not think it is time that a statement be made by the Government in connection with this matter? It is the Minister's duty to go out and see these roads; I respect and admire that; but you have taken over from a Board which has been doing the job. You see that the Board is saying that it is a lie to say that this particular road had any priority; and, sir, if I were a Minister I would give the lie to that, because the Minute Book must be there. It is not enough just to say; "As long as I am in power, I will see it done."

Hon. M. E. COX: I do not know where the hon. member got the idea from that it was a question of priority. [Mr. BARROW: You said so last week]. I was not interested in whether it was a first priority or a last priority. [Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: That makes it worse. If it is not a question of priority, what are you doing it for?]

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I am sure that the honourable junior member for St. George would not say that that was not said. If you can prove that this was a priority, it is your duty to decide "We are doing tenantry roads and let us see where you are going to work." Can you say that it is a matter for the Director of Highways and Transport? Or will you say that it is a question of priority or that in working in co-operation with the now defunct Commissioners, that this road was selected for repairs. If I had anything to do with this matter and the accusations were made, I would have to satisfy not only this House but the general public.

There seems to be a tendency that if you criticise the Government in any particular matter, you will not get any roads repaired. I have not got to go cap in hand and ask that any roads be repaired; the Minister is in charge, and while Ministers are spending public money they are spending the money of the Opposition as well.

7.55 p.m.

You are not going to be always in the Government! Make much of your time now! Do not mind what boasts you make! I am not going to come to the Ministers cap in hand begging for anything. If you have a policy, you have a policy. There are no two ways about it. If there is a tendency for Ministers to do things only in parishes where people are prepared to kow-tow to them, I will criticise them from start to finish. If there is a tendency not to do roads where people refuse to vote for their members, let them do that. It will give me more ammunition to use against them.

I am not voting for this $2,000. I am going to move that this item be deleted for this reason; the Hon. Minister of Communications having heard the statement made by the member of his party last week, having heard what is happening, should have come here with a statement for presentation to the public before asking us to vote upon this Resolution.

I am not saying that there is any improper motive in doing this road; but you are dealing with public funds, and it is so soon after this road was taken over by the Government. I know that the Hon. Minister can rightly throw criticism on the now defunct Highways Board of St. Joseph, you could do that as regards any Board; but do not come along and say that because the Board has done so and so, show us what is wrong with doing so and so. You should show us what is right.

I am not going to vote for Item 53. There is no point coming here and making criticisms and then voting against the dictates of your conscience. I am moving that Item 53 be postponed in order to give the Minister an opportunity of making a statement to the House.

I am going further. If after this matter is reported to the Head of the Administration and he does not cause an investigation to be made into this matter, you will hear about it from the floor of this House; because a statement has been made by a member of the Government's Party that Government's members are doing something for the peculiar benefit of its own members, against the interests of the inhabitants of the country. That is a strong statement.

In addition to that, a civic body, (the Vestry) has said they do not agree with the Government on this. All these things are wrong. The Government must prove to us that it is right, despite the fact that the Hon. Minister has said that he is a paragon of virtue.

If it is right procedure, I will move that we postpone this Item so that the Minister can come with a statement from the Director of Highways and Transport which department has actually taken over the roads in St. Joseph. There is no hurry about having this Item passed. The money is there and it can always be voted. The Government must satisfy the public that this is a malicious thing brought against them. Make out to the public that the Vestry of St. Joseph are the worst people in the island, and that they had really given that road priority before the Government took over. If that is true, then the Hon. Minister is walking on lofty grounds. If it is not true then it is time for an investigation to be made into this matter.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution has given rise to a lot of statements outside the confines of the particular Resolution. The Minister is to be blamed for some of it; because I heard him today not only dealing with the road rolling equipment, but with the roads. I believe that it is difficult to justify getting the House to vote for repairs for road rolling equipment, unless you are prepared to tell them something about the roads that the roller is going to roll.

I would be the last person in this Chamber to accuse any honourable member (and more so any member of the Government or members of the Government) of nepotism or corruption. I am a belligerent man myself and I like the belligerence

of the Hon. Minister; but in public life, you must be like Caesar's wife. The reason why I say so is, that there can be no self righteousness, no clapping yourself on the back and saying that you are not as other men are. You have to declare your public policy and prove that all you do is above suspicion.

Now I am going to support this Resolution because I believe the community wants this road rolling equipment. Because I am supporting it, I will not be unmindful of what has been stated in this parliament. This is not a rum shop; it is parliament. Serious allegations have been made, and any public spirited person must pay some attention to them. Sometimes Ministers have the idea that allegations like this made on the floor of this House, need not be paid any attention. But as I have warned the members of this Government on many occasions, I do not think they have read enough of what happens in the House of Commons. What happened at Crickledon brought about the resignation of the British Minister of Agriculture. It was not that the Minister was corrupt or that he did anything wrong; but his administration had done something wrong; and he had to pay the penalty of losing his post as a Minister.

What I want to say is this: I am public spirited enough to say that I will vote for this Resolution. I am also public spirited enough to say that all does not seem to be well in this matter. Why do I say that? I am not telling the Minister of Communications what to do. He is his own man. But if I were in his position, this particular road would have been the last, (from the point of view of public policy) that I would have attempted to do. I would have acted that way in the interest of my own reputation and the reputation of my Party. This Party has gone through the whole island for years criticising people for building roads that led up only to their own plantations, and their friends' plantations; we have so educated the people to that feeling, that they will frown on any case where it looks like you are helping a friend. A Minister cannot have a friend or foe. He must do what is right.

I will not make any analogies to embarrass you, Mr. Chairman. I will not try to make politics out of this issue. The Ministry of Communications, Works and Housing is a good ministry from a political point of view. When he does roads, puts in lights etc., people will say he is the great I am, who does these things and his will be the kudos.

8.05 p.m.

I would like to remind the Hon. Minister of this matter. In company with my colleague, (Mr. Speaker) they went to the Whim in St. Peter and had some discussion as to the construction of a road there. I do not know what he told the Speaker or what was the final decision over it. I mention that, because I feel this way about such matters; it is not for me to get something done in that parish because I happen to represent it; it is not for me to go cap in hand to the Hon. Minister. Those are things which I consider to be public policy; that is, you either do that road or you let it stay as it is. Of course, it is a fact that if you are *non personae gratia* with certain people you cannot get some things done.

However, sir, I am extremely sorry to see that an issue such as this has reached the floor of this Assembly. It is going to give the public the impression that the reason why this road was done or why priority was given to it, was because the honourable junior member for St. Joseph and the honourable junior member for St. George seem to have interest in the adjoining estates. I do not consider that such is good enough for the Party to which I belong. I want to say quite clearly that I know nothing of it. Unfortunately, the job which I have to do does not give me enough spare time to walk about and see these things myself; but it does seem strange from what the Hon. Minister for Communications said, that there was not a question of priority with respect to that road. If that is so, what has it been based on? It has been stated that there was not a question of priority or that it was not one of the roads which was set down for urgent repairs. If that is so, how did it come to be put at the top of the list? Why was it put on the Estimates of this year? I know in dealing with other questions, the Hon. Minister is tactful enough as to say it will be put into next year's Estimates. From what he has said on the matter, it makes the case infinitely worse. If there were no priority attached to this road being done, it means that it was done on an *ad hoc* basis. I do not want to say that the Hon. Minister put something over on somebody. It concerns the business of the Minister. He cannot say that it is the Director of Highways and Transport who is responsible for that road being repaired, because it is the responsibility of the Minister. The days are gone when the Director of Highways and Transport was responsible, so I would not accept any statement that the road is being done or was given priority for repairs by the Director of Highways and Transport.

What I would like to suggest is that you should have a consistent policy in all of these issues. I am not subscribing to the policy that because the honourable junior member for St. George is in any way connected with any interest in that road or you yourself, that the road should not be put into a proper state of repair. Both of you are citizens as well as anybody else. At the same time, neither of you have any right to say that anything should be done, more so than any other member of the community.

I heard the honourable junior member for St. George make a very strong statement on this question on the last occasion, and there were some personal remarks between himself and the honourable senior member for St. George. I will say this for the Hon. Minister for Communications: no one in this Chamber or outside has been more persistent than he over the manner in which roads should be done. As a matter of fact, there have been clashes between the Hon. Minister and myself about roads when I had something to do with them. In season and out of season, the Hon. Minister talks of Roads. Roads and water are things which I do not think any politician in the world has made more speeches on, than the honourable senior member for St. Michael. However, I do feel that the Hon. Minister must look upon this matter objectively; and not only he, but every member of the Government. They will be fooling themselves if they do not believe that the people are saying that this road is being repaired, because of the relationship which exists between the two honourable members who have an interest in this road and members of the Government. It is a fact that the Hon. Minister for Communications has his likes and dislikes; and very strongly too. We all know that. When it comes to my likes and dislikes, I also have them; I am not going to fool you that I am your lover when I am your enemy; I never make anyone say that I am a hypocrite. However, I do hope that in his own interest and in the interest of the Government and of the Party to which I still belong, that he will not push his head in the air on certain things. I do not want to belong to a Party in which members do such things. It is

the little things that count. We have to begin to realise that it is these little things in life, that sometimes can bring a community into a position where the people begin to disrespect their representatives. When we make the people in a community feel that we are in public life only to help our friends, it is a serious thing; because it kills all the confidence the community will have in you.

I will be failing in my public duty if I do not support this Resolution. Again, this item gave us the opportunity to debate this matter, and now it has been debated, I think the Government will be well advised to go warily in matters such as these Let the Government make a statement on this matter. So much has been said in parliament, that if a statement is not made, it will leave a belief in the public's mind that there is something done which must be hidden from them.

8.15 p.m.

Mr. LEWIS: I have a rather serious matter to bring to the attention of this Committee. When I heard the Hon. Minister make the statement that the funds for repairing this road are coming out of Capital Expenditure, I got the Estimates for 1954-55 and looked up the matter; I see here in these Estimates provision is made in connection with "Highways" —Reconstruction, Other Schemes which is Item 2 under the Head "Communications", (Capital Estimates) and I passed over these Estimates to the Hon. Minister who got up and read this note: "For widening and improving bends and corners and or certain Highways!" The Hon. Minister of Communications, a member of this Government got up and read that note just like that. Do you know how this note is printed? It says "For widening and improving bends and corners on certain Highways." The Auditor General, the Accountant General or somebody, if the money had been paid out in connection with this matter, has got to put it back in the Treasury. The Hon. Minister of Communications has deliberately misled this Committee, and he owes it to himself to say so. That is a habit of lawyers; and I do not know if it is fitting for him to read things improperly. When the Hon. Minister read that note I thought he had read it correctly; it is only in connection with the widening and improvement of bends and corners on the highways. You cannot shorten a corner and then do nothing on the highway. At this point I would like the Hon. Minister to know that in a matter of this sort, a vote of censure should be made on him. I am asking him to say now that he had no intention of misleading the Committee. He said "And or certain Highways."

Hon. M. E. COX: I do not know where the honourable member got that from. I did not say anything about and/or [Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: You did say and/or.] I apologise Mr. Chairman; it is just a mistake.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: In connection with this motion for the postponement I should just like to say this: [Mr. LEWIS. It has not been seconded.]

Mr. CRAWFORD: I got up simultaneously with the honourable junior member for St. Peter and the honourable junior member for the City. I am entitled to speak now, unless the Hon. Minister of Social Services is making a motion for the adjournment. As Chairman of this Committee, it is your duty to tell the Hon. Minister so.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I was under the impression that the Hon. Minister is making a motion for the adjournment.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: I was not going to make that motion. Enough has been said on this matter of the roads to cause the Government concern, and I want to assure the honourable member that this matter will be investigated. I will report the matter to the proper authorities and have it investigated to the satisfaction of everybody. [VOICES: Hear! Hear!]

Mr. CRAWFORD: Sir, I made it my business yesterday to pay a visit to the road in question and I went through it myself. I am therefore in a position to say that some of the statements which have been made here in support of this Resolution are incorrect. But since the Hon. Leader of the House has promised to give further investigation in the matter before continuing with this Resolution —

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I did not say that I would give further investigations to the matter before continuing with the Resolution; I said I will report the matter to the proper authorities and have it investigated.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The position is this: in actual fact what this Resolution calls for is the repairing of a road roller and whether we agree to the repairs of this roller or not, the fact remains that if this roller is not repaired, the road construction and maintenance cannot be carried out. If the roller is not repaired it is of no use. I therefore propose to vote the money for the repairs of the roller, but since it is not the intention of the Government to postpone the Resolution and at some future time conduct some investigation into the matter, we hope that a very high level public enquiry will be conducted. It is my intention to say what I feel about this matter.

8.25 p.m.

The note to this item reminds the Committee that the Government has recently taken over the roads in St. Joseph. Now one of the main reasons for the general clamour for taking over these roads from the parochial authorities, is because so much favouritism was practised in the past by the Commissioners in the selection of roads to be reconstructed or repaired. They were also charged with incompetence and what-not. But the biggest grievance we had against them was, that in the majority of cases, they selected roads leading to their own plantations or the plantations of their family or friends, and repaired them at the expense of the tenantry roads in the various parishes. It is therefore nothing to be surprised at if the granting of priority to this road by the Minister of Communications should give rise to so much condemnation.

Now you yourself, Mr. Chairman, and other honourable members have claimed that this road will serve a number of peasant proprietors in the area. I am at a loss to find out who these proprietors are and where they live. If you go to the site in question, you will see that this road is being started from the Cane Garden side coming up the hill. There is one house on the brow of the hill and after you pass that house, you will not see another one for over a mile. There is one single tenant almost at the beginning of the road; and after that the road passes through the estate land of the two plantations mentioned. I have not seen a single house until you get to the top of Melvin Hill.

Now the construction of this road can have one effect. You, Mr. Chairman, claimed that it will help peasants to get their canes down to Bruce Vale. Are we to understand that either you or the Government's Party have some vested interests in Bruce Vale? That can be the only reason for helping peasants to get their canes to Bruce Vale personally. What will happen is that the construction of this road will considerably appreciate the value of the two estates through which it passes. In view of that, I want to say this: for years the Labour Government has been

asked to construct the East Coast Road. This House has passed several Resolutions asking the Labour Government to construct the East Coast Road. It has been pointed out that the construction of this road will cause over 200 acres of land to be put into cultivation, land that is now lying fallow. It has also been pointed out that the cultivation of that 200 acres will put over $30,000 a year more into circulation for agricultural workers who work on the land, and it has been pointed out too that the construction of that East Coast Road would mean a lot to the economy of the country.

Well, the Leader of the Government, the honourable senior member for St. Joseph has repeatedly in this House, refused to construct the East Coast Road because its construction would appreciate the value of the land through which it passes. In 1944 and again in 1946 he said he was not prepared to do one single inch of the East Coast Road, until the Government had passed a law to ensure that the difference in value of the land which arises as a result of the construction of the road would accrue to the Government. The honourable member said that so much, that the honourable junior member for St. Andrew some years ago on the floor of the House got up and told the Government that he was prepared to give the Government any increased value which accrued to his land from the construction of the East Coast Road; only get it done.

Mind you sir, a road like that would put hundreds of acres of land into cultivation, would increase the sugar production and find work for people. It is a road for the construction of which, we actually had a free grant from the Colonial Development and Welfare Organization. But that road has not been touched for all these years through the stupid obstinate and foolish policy of the Government. A grant of £60,000 from C.D. & W. was allowed to lapse because the honourable senior member for St. Joseph claimed that he was not repairing that road to increase the value of the land through which it passes.

That land belonged to only two plantation owners; but there were forty-two small-holders concerned, and their holdings have not been worked since the railway was suspended, because they cannot get their canes out. So forty-two small-holders are idling and their plots are lying in abandonment. They cannot cultivate them at all, because the East Coast Road is not constructed; and the Government meanwhile allowed a free grant from the British Government to lapse because of their idea not to construct the road and increase the value of any one's land.

Where is that idea today? Why is it that this policy of refusing to construct a road to increase the value of any one's land is effective when it comes to forty-two small holders and two plantation owners, but does not apply when it comes to two members of the Labour Party? It is common knowledge that the construction of the road through Big Spa and Little Spa must considerably appreciate the value of those two estates; but we do not hear the Government saying that it will pass legislation to make sure that increased value of the Spa will accrue to the Government.

I am deeply concerned in this matter, because nowadays the construction of the East Coast Road will cost us nearly £200,000. It could have been done eight or nine years ago for £60,000 or less than that; and we had a free grant to do it. In order to do it now, we will have to use the taxpayers' money that could be put to some other purpose; and everything is dearer. Cement, steel and labour are dearer; and for all these years the Government has allowed acres of land to remain idle, and to allow erosion to become more effective, because the land lies uncultivated and wind swept day after day. The Government as I said, has done nothing about it purely because of its foolish policy that they must pass a law so as to see to it, that the Government benefits from the increased land value arising out of the construction of the East Coast Road.

8.35 p.m.

Sir, this is a road which the ordinary observer believes does not benefit anybody but the two plantation owners. I would like honourable members to take this matter seriously. I would like them to go to the spot in question, because the Government is sheltering behind the excuse that this is a public road. I am not in a position to say whether or not this is a public road, but if it were a public road, why was it allowed to fall into disuse like that. In my opinion it was allowed to fall into that state of disrepair because of the cost of its annual maintenance. If honourable members will go to the spot, they will see that this road does not lend itself to easy maintenance because of the terrain. That road goes up through winding hills almost for its entire length. Far from that, there is not a single house on either side of it. Even if it were a public road and it has been allowed to fall into disuse, there are other public roads which demand more urgent attention, and the construction of which must be of greater advantage to the people of St. Joseph. It is not to say that there is no other road for the people to get down to Melvin Hill. This road which is being done must be of greater advantage to the two plantation owners than to the people at the top of Melvin Hill or the people at the bottom of Cane Garden. Does Bruce Vale pay more for canes than Andrews Factory, or can it pay more? Even if it pays more, the cost of transporting canes from that area to Bruce Vale would negative that. In any case, I say there is another road which can be used.

One can well understand if we were constructing the East Coast Road, or if we had paid attention to all the numerous tenantry roads which serve hundreds of people in other parts of the island, then we could be extravagant by doing plantation roads which serve one or two peasants to the surrounding plantations; but we should not start on a road which to the ordinary observer, were it a public road or not, must be of greater advantage to the two plantation owners than to the other people. It is reassuring to hear that the Government proposes to investigate this matter further. The only excuse that can be given is that it is an abandoned public road, and the Hon. Minister of Communications knows that because he admitted that it was not repaired because of the question of priority. I strongly suggest in view of the statement which has been made, that the Government is merely repairing a road which existed in the past from God knows when, though public opinion in the area is (although they would benefit from it) strongly opposed to its being done, because it will be a great cost to the country annually. It is a fact that this road cannot last. Before the next crop begins, we can expect to see a lot of money spent on it again.

As I have said, I am voting for the Resolution because the money is for repairing a road roller belonging to the parish. If the road roller wants repairing, let us repair it. Since the country wants the road roller to do the road repairs, let us give the Government all the equipment it wants. In order to express the dissatisfaction of a Committee over this

question, and to indicate how it feels on this matter, and to remind the Government of its pledge to make further investigations, I am going to move that the amount be reduced by $1; which cannot interfere with the purchasing of these supplies, but will indicate the resentment and the dissatisfaction which the House feels on this matter.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: In view of what the Hon. Leader of this House has said relative to this matter, the suggestion which I made for the postponement of Item 53 under Head XXXII, (although it has been seconded) I am going to withdraw that motion. I will now second the motion moved by the honourable senior member for St. Philip—that the amount be reduced by $1.

8.45 p.m.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: At this stage, Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that you do now report progress and ask for leave for the Committee to sit again.

Mrs. E. E. BOURNE: I beg to second that.

The question that the Chairman do now report progress and ask for leave for the Committee to sit again was put and resolved in the negative, the Committee dividing as follows:—

Ayes: Mrs. BOURNE, Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS, Hon. M. E. COX, Hon. R. G. MAPP, Messrs. HOLDER, MILLER and VAUGHAN—7.

Noes: Messrs. LEWIS, BARROW, TUDOR, CRAWFORD, BRANCKER, ALLDER, E. K. WALCOTT, GODDARD, E. D. MOTTLEY and HAYNES. — 10.

The question that the amount of Item 53 be reduced by $1.00 was put and resolved in the affirmative on the following division:—

Ayes: Messrs. LEWIS, BARROW, TUDOR, CRAWFORD, BRANCKER, VAUGHAN (Cheers) ALLDER, E. K. WALCOTT, GODDARD, E. D. MOTTLEY, and HAYNES—11.

Noes: Mrs. BOURNE, Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS. Hon. M. E. COX, Hon. R. G. MAPP, Messrs. HOLDER and MILLER—6.

The question that Head 32 as amended stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that you do now report progress and ask for leave for the Committee to sit again.

Mrs. BOURNE: I beg to second that.

The question that the Chairman do now report progress and ask for leave for the Committee to sit again was put and resolved in the negative, the Committee dividing as follows:—

Ayes: Mrs. BOURNE, Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS, Hon. M. E. Cox, Hon. R. G. MAPP, Messrs HOLDER and MILLER—6.

Noes: Messrs LEWIS, BARROW, TUDOR, CRAWFORD, BRANCKER, VAUGHAN, ALLDER, E. K. WALCOTT, GODDARD, E. D. MOTTLEY and HAYNES — 11.

8.55 p.m.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head XL—stand part.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I beg to second that. [A MEMBER: The sixth Minister].

The question was put and agreed to without division.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I beg to move that Your Honour do now report the passing of the Resolution in Committee.

Mr. BARROW: I beg to second that.

The question was put and agreed to without division.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: I beg to move that the Resolution which was amended do now pass.

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

The question was put and agreed to without division.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, this other Resolution —[A MEMBER: No! No! We are adjourning now.]

Mr. BARROW: On a point of Order, Mr. Chairman. I would like to point out to the Hon. Minister that we have already made a motion to report the passing of a Resolution in Committee.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: What is before the Committee?

Mr. BARROW: I have risen to a point of Order. The Hon. Minister of Communications must sit.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: What is before the Committee?

Mr. BARROW: I am on a point of Order. I was merely trying to assist the Chair, by pointing out that the motion before the House was that we report the passing of the Resolution in Committee. I do not think the Minister would be in order to introduce another Resolution before we put the substantive motion which is before the Committee.

Hon. M. E. COX: The honourable junior member for St. Lucy made a motion that Head XLi — stand part. It was seconded.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable junior member for St. Thomas moved that a Resolution do not pass.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I made a motion that you report the passing of this Resolution in Committee. That motion was seconded. The Hon. Minister seems to be saying that that is not so. I think you will have to call Mr. Speaker.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, I distinctly remember the motion being made, that we report the passing if the Resolution in Committee with an amendment. I would like to say that the Committee would stultify itself if the motion just ends there. I am suggesting that the proper addition would be "and the Committee asked for leave to sit again." Otherwise you will have to break the Rules to get back into Committee again.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I accept that.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, I am amused at the whole affair. First of all I do not know that members of the other side of the Table can move a money Resolution. I thought that only laid within the province of the Government. Is that not out of order? In any case that is my opinion.

Secondly, when the honourable senior member for the City made his motion, that was also out of order. The Resolution that I moved after should have been passed first, before we could report the passing of that Resolution in Committee.

Mr. LEWIS: The whole situation is that the honourable member moved that the Resolution for $24,751 do now pass. That was carried. One honourable member moved that we report the passing of these two Resolutions in Committee. [Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: Before I moved it? Did the Clerk hear that?] I do not care if the Clerk heard it or not, that is what I heard; and that is the only thing I can tell you. I would also like to say that as far as anything about the Resolution is concerned, there is nothing wrong with the other side doing what they did. They are not initiating the Resolution, nor are they attempting to increase it.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I move that you do now report the passing of these two Resolutions in Committee and ask for leave for the Committee to sit again.

Mr. TUDOR: I beg to second that.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: I will have to ask the Speaker's ruling on that.

Mr. LEWIS: This motion has to be reported to the Speaker, and if it is out of order the Speaker will say that it is. The motion is that you will report something to the Speaker. You cannot call him to take over until you put the motion.

9.00 p.m.

The question was put and agreed to without division.

Mr. Chairman reported to Mr. Speaker, and Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair, and reported accordingly.

9.00 p.m.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, before you go any further, I am asking whether that motion is in order.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is anything incorrect about it? The motion was that I report the passing of two Resolutions in Committee and ask for leave for the Committee to sit again.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: I was asking for your ruling on this point: whether honourable members on the other side are in order to move a motion of that sort; the motion not coming from the Government.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the House has asked for my ruling on the question whether or not a money Resolution can be introduced or finalised other than by members of the Government. I cannot give my ruling on that off hand. I therefore suspend my ruling on that point until later.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LEWIS: I beg to move that the House do now adjourn for three quarters of an hour.

Mr. TUDOR: I beg to second that.

The question that the House do now adjourn for three quarters of an hour was put and agreed to without division, and Mr. Speaker adjourned the House accordingly.

9.15 p.m.

On resumption,

RESUMPTION OF COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

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

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, my reading of what took place on the adjournment is that a motion will have to be made for the House to go back into Committee. The Chairman reported the passing of two Resolutions and asked for leave for the Committee to sit again, but that does not mean that we will go back into Committee immediately. There was a question from the Committee before the House, and I think that a motion must be made for the House to go back into Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER: A question having arisen as to the validity of the passing of a Resolution which engaged the attention of the Committee before the adjournment, in order for the House to resume Committee, a motion will have to be made to that effect. I think it is just a matter of formality.

On the motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. Cummins seconded by Hon. M. E. Cox, Mr. Speaker left the Chair and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. Smith being in the Chair.

Supplementary Estimate No. 34 Admiralty Property at Six Roads and Library Equipment

Hon. M. E. COX: The next Resolution, Mr. Chairman is a Resolution for the sum of $448 to be placed 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.

Before I go further I should like to make a slight correction in the Addendum Part I, paragraph two. The amount stated in the Addendum is $169.74. Although the Addendum does not form any part of the Resolution, I will point out that the amount should have been $169.49. I am making this correction because the error might catch the eyes of the honourable junior member for the City. [*Laughter*]. I think that the Addendum explains the position quite fully. As honourable members will remember, a property was purchased by the Government from the Admiralty on the 18th March, 1954 and the House voted the sum of $81,000 to pay for that property. The Addendum says this:—

"For some time after the operation of the HF/DF Station had ceased, the Admiralty had retained the services of a Caretaker/Mechanic, whose duties inter alia were to maintain the motor generators which were housed in one of the buildings. The Caretaker/Mechanic lived on the site and received wages at the rate of $19.94 per week. An amount of $169.74, representing wages for the period 18th March to 15th May, 1954, has actually been paid on behalf of the Admiralty. In addition, an amount of $36.25 has been paid on behalf of the Admiralty for telephone service charges for the period 18th March to 31st May, 1954. There is therefore a refund of $205.74 due to the Admiralty for wages and other expenses for the period 18th March to 31st May, 1954, and supplementary provision is needed to meet this refund."

I think that this Resolution is pretty straightforward. During the negotiations for the purchase of this property, the Caretaker/Mechanic was paid at the same rate as that at which he was originally employed by the Admiralty. The Admiralty had asked the Government to pay the expenses from that time but the Government refused to do so, on the ground that it was not liable for these expenses until the Conveyance was actually signed and the property transferred from the Admiralty to the Government. These wages were paid by the Admiralty from the 18th March, 1954 until the 15th May 1954; and this Resolution is for the purpose of reimbursing the Admiralty for the amount which they paid to the Caretaker/Mechanic, which was from the time he became a servant of the Government.

As regards the other item of this Resolution, as other honourable members will see this is in connection with the Public Library. The explanatory note says this:—

"During the financial year, 1953-54, expenditure of $241.18 was incurred in respect of equipment, etc. for the Public Library against the provision of $2,000 included in the Capital Estimates, Head VII, Miscellaneous, Item 3. Through an oversight, funds were not included as a revote in the current Estimates to meet the account which was unsettled on 31st March, 1954. The unexpended balance against this Item at the end of the financial year 1953-54, was $244.31. A revote of the amount of $242 is accordingly requested to meet the outstanding commitments."

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

10.10 p.m.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, I would like to know if at any time during the presence of the caretaker, any one went there to plant canes on any of this land without the permission of the Government. I wonder if the caretaker was held responsible for that. I heard that before the House was told about the exchange of land, someone went to this land and planted canes on it. People from St. Philip told me so. I want to know if the caretaker did it or if the Government authorised it, and if it is true that manure which has been stored there under the supervision of the caretaker has been put into the lands which belong to Foursquare Ltd. I have been told that in August or in September last year, manure has been taken and applied to canes on the Foursquare land. If that is so, and if the Minister knew it, why did he not make it known to the House when he had an opportunity to do so.

I think it would be remiss on the part of any caretaker to allow anyone to do what they liked to do with the Government's land, because of the rumour that it was to be exchanged. That has been reported to me as a *fait accompli*. I have been told that it happened in August or in September, while the House has only been apprised recently that this land is to be exchanged. I would like to know if it has been done; and if it were done in the interest of the Government. If it is not a fact the second question does not arise. I have heard that this land has been cultivated. We were told on the last occasion that the land is out of cultivation; so someone must have gone there when we had a caretaker, or unknown to the caretaker.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I would like to know what has become of the powerful generators which were stored there before we acquired the land and the house on it. [A MEMBER: The generators were taken to Seawell.] Apart from that, I see that the Government has been scrupulous as regards the salary of the caretaker and the mechanic. I am wondering why they were not so scrupulous with regard to cultivation expenses on the land, the acquisition of which from Foursquare, the Legislature has not yet even ratified.

According to the Resolution recently discussed here, you are acquiring ten acres of land from Foursquare in exchange for sixteen acres.

Perhaps the Minister in charge will tell us why the Government undertook to assist with cultivation expenses of Foursquare land and why they manured it before the Legislature had been apprised of Govenment's decision to exchange the land.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I am afraid that the points raised by both honourable members are news to me. As far as I remember, the caretaker was caretaker of the whole place including the generating units on that site. I do not remember any lands being cultivated; and even if they were, I do not think it would come under the caretaker's care. What I would promise the hon. members is that I will have an investigation made, and make a statement in the House as soon as possible.

With regard to the question of manure being carried to this site, I presume that the honourable member is referring to the bit of land which is to be exchanged with Foursquare. This is the first time I have heard of this manure being stored at this place in Six Cross Roads; but perhaps, the members of the Government might be the last persons to hear about these little things.

Mr. BARROW: As far as I remember, the particular Resolution comes under the portfolio of the Minister of Agriculture, and perhaps that is one reason why the Minister of Communications is subdued in the answers given to honourable members. I would be the last person to cavil or to be churlish when the moment is inappropriate; and I will like to compliment the Minister for the way in which he dealt with the question raised by the two honourable members. I hope that he will continue in the future to answer honourable members in the rather polite way he had done on this occasion.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I do not know if the honourable member has stolen my thunder, but I would like to say that the flogging which the Minister has got today has done him some good. It has brought him to know his place.

Hon. M. E. COX: I must object to the remarks made by the hon. member.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: It has made him to know his place. As a Minister, it is his duty to answer us politely. I think that this improvement is due to the honourable senior member for St. John. I associate myself with the remarks made by the honourable senior member for St. George, and I hope that at least in future the Hon. Minister will adopt the policy of the Hon. Minister for Social Services, and not the policy of the Premier. I am sorry that the Premier is not here.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Is that anything to do with the Resolution?

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: One has to respect the Leader of the House, the Minister of Social Services, because when he tells you he will investigate and make a statement, you can swear that he will do it. The same is not the case when another Minister tells you that. Members of the Government always promise to make statements when they see the odds are against them. I remember the Premier promising to make a statement when I criticised the sending of 12,000 school children to the Garrison to a rally. The Premier said he would do this and that and the other, but the whole thing has gone through as it was.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman, the Hon. Minister of Communications seems to be again beyond his depths, and he is acting much more calmly on this occasion. I think he has learned by his adventure on Sunday.

10.20 p.m.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, I would like the honourable member to bear this in mind: if he cannot find out if this manure was stored up there or not, but merely applied to the other lands, he should still let us know.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: On the last occasion, I made the statement that the Government had no right to undertake the carrying out of any preparations on any lands until the Legislature had approved of this. There is nothing in the Executive Committee Act to give the Government the power to carry out the exchange or to go on with the preparation of the land. I was a member of the Executive Committee, and I know that the Executive Committee has not the power to do so. By what the Government has done it? Government will go as far as to pay out money out of the public Treasury even if it does not get the approval of the Legislature. The Government had no right to spend any money on the preparation of that land. If the Attorney General advised that, let us know what section of the law he quoted. It is the people's Government, and the Legislature is the supreme body. You cannot be a Minister unless you are first a member of this Chamber. There is too much of the idea that you owe more allegiance to the Crown than to the people of this country. It is the people of the country that put the money into the Treasury which pays the Ministers, and which does all the things that accrue and which the Government has to control. This smugness which Ministers get on with, that they did not care how they act has gone on too long.

Mr. LEWIS: I was trying to hint that this question was raised in here before. It was raised in here two or three weeks before. Now the Minister is going to say he did not hear anything of it. He was asked to find out if it were true. We have been hearing that so far as the Government is concerned with the exchange of this land, it has taken place already. Just fancy the exchange has taken place already-Money has been taken out of the Treasury, manure has been put into this land, and they have come and told us that it is not out of cultivation. I have heard from members of that parish that this exchange has already taken place. That is too serious a charge for a Minister to hear and then when the question comes up again, the opportunity has not been taken to say that that statement is not true; or if it is true, it was done because of this or that reason, and we will benefit from it on account of that reason. That is how we want to be treated.

Mr. BARROW: I think what the honourable junior member for the City has overlooked, is that it goes much further than he is at present urging upon the House; and that is this: the whole rationality of the disparity in the price of the land which belongs at present to Foursquare and that which the Government proposes to exchange was that the Government land was undervalued, and that the land which was taken from Foursquare was arable land. It seems to me that it is going to be a serious position for the Government to manoeuvre themselves out of, if it transpires that both parcels of land are not arable and both were put under cultivation, (and at the expense of the tax-payers of this colony) before the money was properly voted by the Legislature.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I am not going to excuse the Minister or the Government. As a matter of fact, the Government cannot make any excuse. They know as well as any one knows that they cannot back up a vote like this. You are now dealing with a Resolution which deals with the same land that you gave consideration to by a Resolution which passed this House a few weeks ago. I am protesting against this method: and the Hon. Minister should be in a position to say something. If he is not in a position to say something, it means that he does not care anything of the debate which took place on the same question on the last occasion. The Hon. Minister should have realised the importance of that debate; and that the Government was challenged on the question that here it is, you have made the exchange of the land already. and the preparation of it has been carried out, which calls for certain expenses. The laws of the land do not give the Executive Committee the power to make these exchanges. Who has given them the authority to exchange this land, and carry out preparations on those lands? I want to say that any Minister or Government when something like this happens, should be in a position to tell me something on the matter. The Hon. Minister must be prepared to say something on this matter. There can be no excuse that the Minister is not aware of what has taken place, because he must see all the information on these matters.

There is nothing in this Resolution which we are against in substance, but what gripes me is that the Minister is not in a position to give an answer on this matter of some importance. It is not going to speak well for this country or for the system which we look forward to for more action. No one should be carrying out anything on that land unless the instructions came from the Minister responsible. Where are we heading to if the Minister cannot say that anything which comes from a department under his control, does not come from his pen.

Mr. CRAWFORD: As a matter of fact, the Minister has very convenient memory or he has a memory like a sieve. He sat here and took elaborate notes on the last occasion.

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: The honourable member is wrong in his statement. The appropriate Minister who can answer the questions is not here today.

10.30 p.m.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The honourable member is wrong and more than wrong, because the appropriate Minister did not reply for the Government at all. He was too nervous to reply; he sat quaking in his boots after the remarks which were made by the honourable senior member for St. John and he has been sick home ever since then. The hon. senior member for St. Joseph, the honourable senior member for St. Michael and the honourable senior member for St. James appeared to make the defence for the Government, but the appropriate Minister did not say anything at all in explanation of the matter. I accuse the Government bench of undertaking the expenditure of manuring the land belonging to Messrs. Foursquare Ltd., before we had ratified the Agreement. The honourable junior member for St. Peter also referred to it, and since the honourable senior member for St. Michael took on the Government's spokesmanship he must have listened to what had been said.

Mr. LEWIS: I apologise to the honourable senior member for St. Philip; he was the honourable member who first raised the matter.

Hon. M. E. COX: If I remember correctly what I said, I confined my remarks to the remarks which were made by the honourable junior member for the City about manure being stored and applied, and about the Caretaker being in charge of the property up there. I know that the land was being cultivated. I am sure that honourable members will appreciate the fact that as to the question which was raised on the last occasion about the exchange of land, well I do not want to say anything about that, because one cannot reflect on a vote of this House unless he is making a motion for the rescinding of the vote. The honourable junior member for the City enquired as to whether this manure was stored, and whether the Caretaker was in charge and so on.

On the question as to the cultivation of the land, the honourable member spoke about Ministers not caring as to what honourable members say, and I am sure that that is not correct. As the Hon. Premier has said on more than one occasion, these matters are discussed and then action is decided on by the Government. While it is true that under this set-up it is left to the Ministers to take notice of what is said, what somebody has said about the Permanent Secretary writing something is not correct. There has been an oversight on the part of the Government; and I will go further and say that honourable members will agree that the only person who does not make a mistake is the person who does nothing. However investigations will be made in the matter.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, I asked two questions. One was whether any cultivation had been carried out, and the other was whether any manure had been stored and applied. The honourable member elects to tell me what he did not know; but he did not tell me what he knew about it.

Mr. BARROW: I heard the Hon. Minister of Communications acknowledge that the Executive Committee had actually exchanged this land, which means that the Queen's Solicitor, (who has just been given an honour in the New Year's Honours List) exchanged this land before permission had been obtained from the Legislature. My hearing is not quite so good after dinner as before, but I seem to have understood that. However, that is a serious matter, because neither the Letters Patent nor the Act of 1951 which was sent back by the Secretary of State for the

Colonies for amendment, gives the Executive Committee power to exchange lands.

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of Order, sir. The Secretary of State for the Colonies has nothing to do with this; so it is unkind to say that the Secretary of State saw the error made by us and sent back the Bill for amendment.

Mr. BARROW: They had the example of Mrs. Zephirin's land in Bay Street. They knew that the honourable junior member for the City had time and again pointed out that they had no right vesting powers in the Executive Committee to dispense with Government land without the sanction of the elected representatives of the people. The constitutional position is, that they ignored the warnings of the people's representatives and the Secretary of State sent back the Bill and asked that it be corrected.

At this stage of our political development, they are saying that the Crown Law Officers in their wisdom, by an oversight, actually disposed of Government land without coming to the House for permission to do it. My hearing was not incorrect, nor have I misinterpreted the Minister. They are saying also that it is not on the instigation of the Secretary of State for the colonies, but of their own true will and volition, (after they castigated the honable junior member for the City for pointing it out) that they brought down the amending Bill. Is it true that the land was exchanged, and that they came to the House some months after for the money to exchange it?

I want to make it absolutely clear that I have no desire to hold any legal post under the Government in this colony or any other colony in the British Empire. If what we have heard is true, the Crown Solicitor should be taken away in the same way that you drum people out of the Salvation Army, and the Attorney General should be asked to seek an appointment elsewhere.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I do not know which is worst—the admission by the Minister that he knew nothing, or the statement that the exchange and cultivation of land was an oversight on the part of the Executive. Those statements are very surprising. Do you mean to say that a body of supposedly responsible men like the Executive, would take it upon themselves to perform an action of this sort and then come here and say it was an oversight? That cannot be an oversight. It is a deliberate attempt to treat the Legislature as being of no account. It is a deliberate attempt to ignore both branches of the Legislature and to assume the controlling rights and powers on the part of the Executive. Either they have a false sense of their own importance or they are all going mad.

Is it because we have Ministerial Government and the Ministers are responsible for the formulation of Government policy, that they have assumed all this power to themselves? Is it that we are in a totalitarian state so that the Legislature does not count at all, then they come with the silly excuse that it was an oversight? At least the Government could say that they were wrongly advised by their legal advisers; but do not expect us to believe that a supposedly responsible body of men like the Executive could act in such an irresponsible manner as to take up land and cultivate it and manure it at Govment's expense, without a single word to the Legislature, and then come and say it is an oversight.

It would have been better if the Minister had confined himself to his original excuse, (ignorance of the matter) rather than saying it was an oversight. To say that, is to add insult to injury and to make it absolutely clear that they are not sufficiently responsible to be entrusted with the conduct of affairs in this colony.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, this is one occasion on which I have to come to the assistance of the Minister. On the other hand I would say "What else can this House expect?" I am saying that in all seriousness. I can hear fairly well, and I hear a little better in the night than in the day; but when the Minister said it was an oversight, which of us do not make mistakes? I am in sympathy with the Minister; most of you come here and say these things and you will still vote. I am in sympathy with the Minister for this reason: I can appreciate what happened. If Foursquare Directors or anyone else want to exchange land, all they have to do is to go and see the Premier. If the Premier says "yes" it is so in spite of all the other Ministers. With the exception of the Minister of Social Services, all of them have to depend on the Premier for a living. I am not taking back that. He is not only the Premier, he is a dictator. It is not surprising that he has dictated to a lot of you, because you cannot work for $60 a month without him. The Minister of Trade could not work for $60 a month, if he disobeyed the Premier, [Hon. R. G. MAPP: That does not worry me.] I will step on anyone's corns.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I think it is time you pointed out to the honourable senior member for the City that this House does not contemplate granting the Minister of Trade $60 a month or any other salary. That is not in the Resolution.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am speaking to the honourable senior member for the City.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: And I am listening.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am appealing to the honourable member to keep to the Resolution, and not to be personal.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I was hinting to you long ago to stop honourable members over there. You have a way of saying that so and so is nothing to do with the Resolution. When the Hon. Minister said it was an oversight, I said you could expect nothing else. It is as sure as night follows day that if the Premier agrees on something, all you have to do is to see the Queen's Solicitor to make the exchange and get on the Executive Committee and discuss it. If I had to depend for my living on the salary they get on the Executive, I would have to do the same thing.

It is not surprising to find that only at this late moment, that the Minister has intimated to us—I would like to say that the Minister knew everything that we were talking about; but I have always paid him this tribute: if there is one man whom you can bank on for loyalty to the Premier especially when they are doing things that are not always above board, it is the Minister of Communications. 10.15 p.m.

The honourable senior member for St. Michael would not have said that this was an oversight in the presence of the Premier. He would have eaten all ten fingers of his before he said so. We all make mistakes. I am a real estate broker. It was published in the *Beacon* that I opposed the way this thing was exchanged because I was not called in the deal.

I know, Mr. Chairman, that you are going to stop me; but what I am surprised at is that you have bought Avalon, you have bought Enmore, you have bought Blackmans, you have bought Cave Hill, and also The Garden, and the House does not know what you have paid for any of them. This Government is virtually a dictatorship. It is so because you

get honourable members saying, that it is wrong and you yet adhere to it. Of course, you have party system; but anybody in the party who exerts his individuality will be kept out. I thought the St. Lucy bye-election would have taught the Labour Party that collectively they build a party, and that the power which one man thought was vested in him is on the wane. For the good of the country, it would be better if members of the Government were a little more independent, but as that is not so, I say to them: "make good now, it will not be long ! Make hay while the sun shines." I will even go as far as to threaten you to call an election now.

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

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I knew Your Honour would stop me.

Hon. M. E. COX: It is not correct to say that when "Avalon" was purchased the House knew nothing about it before the Resolution came before this House. When Enmore was purchased, it was also put to the House. It should be remembered that when the negotiations for the purchase of it broke down, Government came to the House with a Resolution saying that Government wanted to purchase it compulsorily. [A VOICE: What was it purchased for?] The honourable member referred to The Garden. That comes under Labour Welfare. The Government paid £7,000 for it. [A VOICE: £7,000? Has the Government paid £7,000 for Mr. Laddie Challenor's property?]

I do not want to waste the time of the Committee, Mr. Chairman, but anyone hearing that statement by the honourable member might not know that it has already been explained, and they might say that the honourable member has scored something on the Government. With respect to the property in Country Road, that was purchased out of Labour Welfare Funds under the Housing Loans Organisation. The House of Assembly has given the Executive Committee the exclusive right to administer that Fund.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: The honourable member seems to pick out "Avalon". I wonder if anybody knows that the Government gave £7,000 for the house in Country Road. You did not tell us what you paid for these properties. What we are saying is that we should know these things. Never mind that we have passed legislation giving you the right to do these things, you should still tell us something; you should treat us more kindly.

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: What I deprecate about this matter is that when certain honourable members get up to speak about properties purchased by the Government, there is an undercurrent which seems to have the effect that there is something corrupt about Government's dealings. The honourable senior member for the City referred to the Hon. Minister on my left. He said that there is no more a loyal member to the Premier than the honourable member on my left, when we are doing something which is not above board. I deprecate those words. The Premier is not in his place and nobody should say that sort of thing behind his back.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: No one wants to say anything questionable behind the Premier's back. I think that throughout the island I can be picked out as the one member who is not afraid of the Premier. I said the honourable senior for St. Michael said that it was an oversight. If it were an oversight, I said, you can count on him for being loyal; especially when everything is not above board. To buy land, to exchange land, to work land and to spend money on that land—

Hon. M. E. COX: That is not before the Committee.

11.00 p,m.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: What else would it be but not above board, if they do these things and then come to the House of Assembly.

Look around this country; I am one man who was never afraid of anybody. I owe no seat to him.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: There are a lot of people who do not have to blow and blast out so as to kowtow; but sir, let us try to feel that there are other people who are honest besides ourselves. As regards "Enmore", the Hon. Premier knew nothing about "Enmore". [MEMBERS: Shame !] I repeat, the honourable member knew nothing about "Enmore" until I brought the matter before the Executive Committee. Therefore, you cannot include "Enmore" in this. On a previous occasion I told the House the price that was paid for "Enmore".

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I challenge the hon. member on that; I challenge him to say that he mentioned on the floor of this House the price that was paid for "Enmore".

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: The House was told the price of "Enmore" on a previous occasion.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: With the greatest respect to the Hon. Minister of Social Services I will say, that he has never told us what was the price paid for "Enmore". We are entitled to know how you are spending money. Do you impute dishonest motives to us when we enquire about anything? There are hon. members to whom I would impute dishonest motives.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE NO. 35

Leave Pay for Casual Employees

Hon. M. E. COX: The next Resolution, Mr. Chairman, is a Resolution to place the sum of $1,800 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. 35 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

The Addendum explains quite fully what this Resolution is all about. It says this:—

"The amount of $5,000 provided in the 1954—55 Estimates for payment of leave pay to casual employees has been expended. The number of casual employees eligible for leave with pay has increased with the heavier programme of works operated by the Department of Highways and Transport during the years 1953 and 1954. The average monthly expenditure for the present financial year has been $550 and supplementary provision of $1,800 is now requested to meet anticipated requirements for the remainder of the financial year."

I should like to inform this Committee that on the previous occasion hon. members felt that these employees were not informed as to whether they were qualified for leave pay, and I issued a directive to the various works departments informing them that they should set up a notice on a board drawing to the attention of their employees, the Regulations under which they worked, and which qualify them for leave pay. Since then, these employees have been taking full advantage of what was rightly theirs. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. LEWIS: The Hon. Minister has worse than understood the last debate. It was I who asked that a directive be given; but not a directive to tell the

workmen that they are entitled to leave pay. These workmen know better than any Attorney General, Solicitor General or the Lord Chancellor of England about this matter. The position is that these workers know about these Regulations, but when they are in regular employment they are afraid to go on leave. I asked that a directive be given to the effect that if a man is working on this building and the period for which he qualifies for leave pay is up, and he goes on casual leave, the person who is acting for him must understand that when the man who has gone on leave comes back, the man must get back his work. Otherwise, what are you going to do with that man when he comes back and finds that another person has taken his place? The position is, that the man who is in regular employment is afraid to go on leave, because he will have his two weeks holiday and then he might have to wait for three weeks before he gets work again. When I read this Resolution in my bed, I drafted this question to ask the Hon. Minister:—

"Have any instructions been issued regarding the re-employment of these workers after casual leave?"

The workers who are now coming in might not do like the others, and although they might know, it would be a good idea to issue this directive. I am saying that a man should not be given casual leave and then French leave. I would like to know if that is being done, because the workers will not take the leave to which they are entitled. If they do not get this leave, they will not be able to do a full day's work; they want to be able to get a respectable holiday and recoup their strength so as to be able to work properly.

11.10 p.m.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, as far as the fears expressed by the hon. member are concerned, I want to tell him that those fears are unfounded. I want to assure the hon. member that I did take up this matter, and no one is afraid to take his leave. Some time ago the hon. senior member for the City made the point that I am referring to. He actually implied that the Government were hiding this matter. I remember that at that time it was written in the Addendum as a privilege. The hon. member said it was not a privilege.

After the hon. member made the point about the departments concerned telling them that they were qualified for this leave, I issued a directive to the departments concerned telling them that they must issue a notice telling these people that if they worked for so many days they were qualified to have their leave.

Up to now, sir, no one has reported to me that he has lost his job as a result of taking leave. No workman that is worth his salt will have to be afraid, because there is always room for good workmen and they will hold their own against anyone.

I repeat, sir, that I have investigated the matter and no case has been reported to me; neither do I know of any case in which a workman has lost his job by taking the leave for which he has qualified.

Mr. LEWIS: The Hon. Minister seems to have misunderstood what I said. Government on the last occasion brought in a Resolution with an Addendum which said that these employees are reluctant to go on leave if they are continuously employed. I was not the person who initiated the talk about fear. It was in their own Addendum. The position is that when a man goes on two weeks leave with pay, he fears that when he comes back out someone may be doing his job and he may be without work and without pay, for another three weeks or more.

I am going to tell the Hon. Minister that after I said what I did on the last occasion, not only the workmen but people high in the Government Departments told me that I was the only person in the House who understood the situation. The situation is as clear as a pikestaff. [Hon. M. E. COX: State one case.]

The Hon. Minister is asking me to state a case. How can you state a case. How can you state a case on something that you are preventing from happening? The next thing is, that you cannot talk about a casual employee losing his job. He comes out this morning and you tell him that there is no work. If a man is working on the Fire Brigade Station and it is the last two weeks of building operations, he fears that if he goes on leave during those last two weeks, when he comes back he will have to wait until you start the Ministerial Buildings before he works again.

If you had 5,000 employees and you could keep them employed continuously they could afford to take holiday; but when there is no room for 1,000, do you think that a man can afford to take a holiday?

Hon. M. E. COX: There are casual employees who work for over 250 days a year and who are qualified for leave, just as the men on the established staff. I cannot see how such a man would be afraid of losing his job. Out of 300 cantoneers only 150 may be on the permanent roll, but the others are regular employees who work and get paid for working every day except Sundays and Bank Holidays. They also get pension rights and gratuity rights. Therefore there is no question of a man being afraid to take his leave when he is a regular casual.

I would like to tell the hon. member that I have known two members of the Established Staff who have boasted that for years they never took a holiday.

Mr. LEWIS: The number of casual employees has been increased, because you have been taking on more to cope with the amount of building that is going on. But before that, there were less jobs and more people for them.

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

11.20 p.m.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE NO. 36

Trade and Industries Fair

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, the next Resolution is the one of which notice was given earlier and which is in connection with the Trade and Industries Fair. The Resolution is as follows:—

Resolved that the sum of $1,000 be granted from the Public Treasury and placed at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates, 1954—55 Part I—Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimate, 1954—55, No. 36, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

This Resolution is for the purpose of paying workmen to build two booths and to provide material for a live show at the Barbados Trade and Industries Fair. We are having two booths at the price of one; and the idea behind it all is to boost our handicrafts and to have at the show people doing these things: basketry and straw work, turtleshell work, decorative pottery, coral stone work, needlecraft. All these things will take place at the show. Instead of having the people who make these things bringing them in for display, the idea is to have them making these things at the show.

Earlier in the day it was said that we knew about this thing months ago and have only just come down with this Resolution. I wish to say that the idea was not explored until very late in November, and after that different people had to be interviewed.

We had to go to see them and to see whether they would come. We also had to select the best workmen possible; and all that took time. They had agreed to a certain extent to come and make the things without cost to us, but then they came back to us with the idea that the things which they make may not be sold and so the money would be lost. The details are as follows:—

Site (2 Stalls at price of 1) 10ft. x 20ft.	$ 30.00
Erection and dismantling of steel frames for booths	120.00
Materials and labour for walls of booths	120.00
Electrical wiring of booths and electric current	50.00
Transport	50.00
Interior decoration and furnishing ..	150.00
Wages for workers (2 in each craft) 5 crafts at approximately $3 per person per day	100.00
Watchman ($1.75 x 3) plus C.O.L. $1.05	6.30
Materials	250.00
Incidentals and unforeseen items ..	123.70
Total	$1,000.00

We are hoping to make a good show of it. I beg to move that the Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I did not object to this Resolution as a Resolution earlier today. The Hon. Minister said that this matter was not fully explored until November, and after that the people who make those things had to be consulted. However, this is merely a gesture of goodwill more than anything which the Government is going to profit by. All that you can say is that the Government will be paying out $1,000 for exhibiting these things at the Trade and Industries Fair; and the sum is going to be in excess of what anybody who is exhibiting at that Fair is going to pay. Government will be paying $500 for a stall at the Fair, and it will not be gaining anything from it. All you can say is that this is another thing undertaken by the Government on advice by somebody; and the person who gave the advice knows that the Government is a first-class contortionist because it does not matter how the money is spent. Is this another employment project? There must be a 'live' exhibition; you do not only want to display the articles; you want to show the people making them. You are advertising those people. At Motor rallies which we read of, do they bring in all the engineers to show how the cars are put up? I have no objection to this token of goodwill to these people, but that is the most that you can say for this Resolution.

As I see it, $1,000 we will be paying to put up these two stalls and to exhibit these things in Queen's Park. I wonder if this will be the rate which it cost other merchants to run a stall at the Fair. The reason why it is going to cost us $1,000 for these two stalls, is because you are going in for an elaborate affair. Those of us who run fairs in Queen's Park know what it takes to run a stall. We admit that the Government must be more elaborate than anybody else. However, this certainly must be an employment project, because I see something set down for a watchman. Maybe, it is for somebody to watch the stalls. Watchmen will be in for a good time if every stall has a watchman. As you know, sir, Queen's Park has watchmen employed there. I do not know of any reason why you must pay an additional watchman. I am against the idea. That is an indication to show you that sometimes you can be too elaborate.

Morally you erect a stall in Queen's Park. There is nothing wrong in putting up a regular wooden building and doing these things because you have money. However the Government has a lot of money, and I hope that on another occasion we will not hear the regular excuse that the Treasury is not bottomless, and therefore they cannot provide more schools and things of that sort. I have no objections to this matter; my objection was that these things should not be pushed on us so suddenly.

11.30 p.m.

Mr. GODDARD: I think hon. members would agree that it is wise for the Government to partake in this Fair. This Fair is being well organised by some of the merchants in Bridgetown and it is hoped by the success of this initial effort, that this Fair will become an annual event. This idea was started in Trinidad some three or four years ago; it has been very successful and why should we sit back and see these things happening and not do something in the matter. Let the public see what is happening.

As regards the Agricultural Exhibition which is held in Barbados, everybody knows how that is being run. The Government will have two booths at this Fair and the steel frames will be for these two booths; the walls will be filled in, and you must have a roof for these booths. I may say that the merchants expect that they would be spending on their individual booths anything from $500 up per booth for decorations, electric wiring and so on; and I am sure that some of them will spend as much as $1,000 depending on the type of display which they will have. I think that this estimate which we have here will cover these items. The employment of a watchman for three days is a small item; the Fair will be held only for three days, but you will want a watchman for longer than that. I am not pleading for having watchmen in the same way as the Government is having constables when the Princess comes here. This Fair will find employment for many people; it is at the right time, it is during the tourist season, and it is at the beginning of the crop and I wish it well. I am glad that the Government has seen fit to join in this matter; and I repeat, I hope the success of it will be such as to make it an annual event.

Mr. LEWIS: The Government is obviously setting up these booths for people. The Girls' Industrial Union may be housing straw work and if that is so, they are advertising themselves. The Government is really assisting people to get the opportunity of having a booth, and I think that they should make a contribution in this matter; because at the same time, they are advertising themselves. Pottery making was started in this island for a long time; it has just been expanded and those people should have a booth of their own. The Government had better be careful about this pottery business because every kiln they have ordered, has been blown up. Now we are spending $1,000 to advertise the blowing up of a kiln. As a matter of fact we should be told who is coming here, because the Government might be taking Mr. "A" and advertising his turtleshell work. I hope that they are not helping any of their friends. We should be told who are doing this work; if Mr. "A" has turtleshell workmen, why should the Government show off his work and not mine? I feel that the hon. junior member for Christ Church knew more about this matter. However I take it that this is a splendid gesture on the part of the Government on this occasion to have a booth of their own, but are they assisting themselves? Do people want to advertise themselves and not make some contribution to this Fair? We should really be told something more about this matter; whom are they interviewing? Are they assisting the Girls' Industrial Union or the Boys' Clubs or what? This Resolution does not say that we are assisting these people and why should they sit down and be wet-

nursed. I hope there will not be any charge made against the Government that they have discriminated against one handicraft workman as against another. Although this is a very laudable proposal here, it can be a very dangerous thing as well.

11.40 p.m.

Look at the amount of Needlework we see at the exhibition without the Government having a booth. We have not been given details which will explain this matter properly. The Minister said that these people had to be interviewed. Are they persons or institutions? I know some of this work is done at the Boys' and Girls' Clubs and certain other centres. I am saying that at least the names of some of these people who will use this booth should be told to the House.

I would have preferred to have seen the caning of chairs and the making of brushes and things like that, rather than sponsoring someone who will work for some of the stores. If you have "A" what about "B"? The Government must know because this is the eleventh hour. They must know that persons, such as Messrs. So and So, will use the Booth for items 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5. The Government has gone as far as to say that there will possibly be two people in each craft who will be coming in. Will they take the Dominica Handicraft articles and advertise them in this Government's booth? I hope that this project is not one in which the Government will show favouritism, and probably bring down criticism on their heads.

The next question I want to ask is whether this material will be of any use to any departments after the Fair is over, or whether any department of Government does not have in their possession at present, any of the material which could be used on this occasion. If this is something that cannot be used again, what will the Government do with it after the Fair?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, you should appreciate democracy sufficiently to know that if as a representative of the people I asked these questions, some opportunity should be given to the Minister to reply. If he does not reply I will know how to deal with him. But at least you should give him time to reply. If you think I was asking nonsense you shoud have stopped me.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: The hon. member spoke about brush-making and chair-caning and things of that sort. But the idea is to make things which tourists will be interested in buying; as we expect that there will be quite a few tourists visiting these booths. They are interested in basketry, straw work, needlecraft, pottery and things like that, while brush-making and chair-caning would probably apply only to the local market.

As far as the names of the people are concerned, I do not know them. [Mr. LEWIS: You interviewed them]. I did not say I interviewed them; I said they had to be interviewed. I do not know who they are. I hope the hon. member does not expect me to go around interviewing everyone. Their names have not been told to me.

Mr. LEWIS: If the Hon. Minister did not say that these people were to be interviewed, I would not have asked what I did. I do not think that the Minister should say or imply that the names have been kept secret by some person in the Government service. It is a sad state of affairs to say that you were interviewed, but you are not interested enough to find out who they are so that their names could be mentioned for public approval. The taxpayers' money is being spent on certain people. If there were institutions concerned and not people, you would have had some excuse.

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

On the motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS seconded by Hon. M. E. COX, the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of three Resolutions in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS seconded by Hon. M. E. COX in each case the Resolutions were read a first and second time and were agreed to.

11.50 p.m.

LEAVE TO TAKE ORDER NO. 9

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, there is one little Bill which is an amendment to the Immigration Act. I would like to have that Bill passed to-night. It is causing some inconvenience to tourists who come to our shores. It is No. 9 on the Order Paper.

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

BILL TO AMEND THE IMMIGRATION ACT, 1952

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Social Services: second reading of a Bill to amend the Immigration Act, 1952.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: Sub-section 12, of the Immigration Act, 1952, provides that immigrants to Barbados who are not natives should be allowed a stay of three months. A right is also given to the immigrant to renew his permit. This is causing a nuisance to people who come to stay a little longer. They do not like to go in and renew at the end of three months; and in the interest of tourism it was thought that the Act should be amended from three to six months. Therefore we are asking that the word "three" in subsection (1) of Section 12 be deleted and the word "six" be put in its place, so that the period will be six months instead of three months as the law now stands.

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

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

Mr. GODDARD: I am very glad for this, because I have heard at the Airport myself, many people questioning the Police who is in charge of immigration about it. Some of them have been coming here for a number of years, and are known to the Immigration authorities. They have to make this application for three months, and then an extension has to be made if they want to spend four, five or six months. This is one of the things which I have heard complaints of for quite a few years, and I am very glad it is being rectified now.

I would like to draw attention to another thing in connection with immigration. There is a number of school children who come from the neighbouring islands and even Venezuela, and as the law stands they have to buy return passages before they are admitted into the island. Today, with transport not as good as it might be, many of those children (particularly those from the small islands) come up by plane, but want to return by boat or *vice versa;* yet their parents are expected to buy a return passage. It is really to satisfy the Immigration authority at the time that this is done, because these people buy the return passage and then come in town and cash

it. I have already drawn this to the Government's attention. As I see it, it is a waste of time in demanding from certain people a return passage, because those people come here every year or three times a year, and are well known to the local authorities. We should not ask that type of person to buy a return passage when they do not know whether they would return by air or by boat. I think that category of visitor particulary school children, should be exempted from having that trouble.

I am very glad for this Bill because we are at the beginning of our tourist season. It is a great annoyance to an elderly person who on arrival at the Airport is told, that they can only come for three months and if they wish to stay longer at the end of that time, they will have to make an application to the Police department. They get worried and upset.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, I do not know what is the procedure with regard to the person making an application for a longer stay in the island, but certainly it cannot be so burdensome. After all, the person will have three months to say whether he decides to stay longer. I am not saying that this burden should be put on them unecessarily, but I do not like the idea of your making out that this is a tremendous burden; all that they may have to do is to send their passport in and have the extension put on it. I do not know if there is a regular form of application, that they can write it out and send the passport in along with it. As far as the school children are concerned, all they have to do is to deposit sufficient money to send them out by plane or boat. I am very surprised to hear that they come into town and cash these things; because, the shipping or airways offices have no right to refund anybody without the consent of the Immigration Authorities.

If they are doing this sort of thing, there is slackness somewhere. I am hoping now that the hon. member has drawn it to our attention, it would be investigated. Let me say that when we were asked to bring our immigration laws up-to-date, we were told that they would not be used as a political weapon; and the very first opportunity after they were used for a political reason. When we passed them you said they must have nothing to do with politics. Now, somebody has come in and told the Government that they are inconveniencing a few tourists. All that they will have to do is two weeks before their three months' stay is up send and tell the Immigration authorities they want an extension. I am sure any hotel at which they are staying, there are people who come into town every day — and will get that matter done easily for them. I do not agree that it will interfere with tourists. People who want to stay four months should go in and get an extension, the same as some persons who come to stay three weeks and then find they have to stay three weeks and a day.

The reasons given are not good enough. What is the trouble? The Hon. Minister has not told us what is the trouble. After all, when you the Tourists eat out of plates they have to be washed up, and that is a trouble. I cannot see that this is a difficulty.

The Immigration authorities are not going to interfere with any one of them if they overstay the time. They can go two weeks after their time was up, and nobody would say a word to them. I did not know that this was a difficulty, and I would really like to know the real reason for this Bill. This Government has been too gullible and is convinced too easily.

The hon. senior member for Christ Church should have said that the same school children have to fill out too many forms. Why not try to exempt them from that?

Mr. Speaker, the trouble here has been magnified and we have been too ready to accommodate these tourists; whereas, on the other hand, we have prevented from passing through here, people who wanted to go somewhere else because we want to aid and abet people in hunting down or cornering somebody. I hope that this Act will not be used for political purposes. Perhaps this period will have to be extended for a year.

12.00

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I do not want to keep you back after midnight but the reasons which are given for this Bill are milk and water reasons; you are here making provisions for tourists to land on carpets! Like the hon. junior member for the City I do not agree with this Bill; and all that this is helpful for, is to show that we are just making fun about Federation of the West Indies. There seems to be some reservation here among some Governments about Federation. However I agree with what the hon. junior member for the City has said; you can go to Great Britain at any time and all this nonsense which is in operation in the West Indies does not exist there. The laws here are more restrictive than they are there. I believe that one of the gestures which the Government is showing in this Bill is that they are helping the tourists, but this does not help the tourists at all. What is wrong in a tourist asking for an extension of his stay for three months? If they want to stay longer at the hotel, they have to give the hotel proprietors an indication of their intention. The Immigration Act was passed in order to keep out the undesirables; well when we go to Trinidad they will say "We do not want any paupers to come down here." All this will harm West Indian unity and Federation at which we are aiming. If you want to give the tourists the green light, you should give them the green light and let them overflow.

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. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS seconded by Hon. M. E. COX, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair, the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. SMITH being in the Chair.

Two Clauses of the Bill were called and passed.

On the motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS seconded by Hon. M. E. COX, the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Bill in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

ADJOURNMENT

The Order Paper for next meeting was fixed.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next, the 25th instant at 3 o'clock p.m.

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

The question that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next the 25th instant, at 3 o'clock p.m. was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

12.10 a.m.