

5611/

THE House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1961

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 28th February, 1961.

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at noon today.

PRESENT

His Honour Mr. K. N. R. HUSBANDS, (*Speaker*); Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, C.B.E., M.D., C.M., (*Premier*); Hon. M. E. COX, (*Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour*); His Honour Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P., (*Deputy Speaker*); Hon. R. G. MAPP, (*Minister of Communications, Works and Housing*); Hon. F. E. MILLER, (*Minister of Social Services*); Hon. D. D. GARNER, (*Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries*); Mr. C. B. SEARLES; Hon. L. ST.A. THORNE, (*Minister of Education*); Mr. J. W. CORBIN and Mr. G. E. S. STRAUGHN.

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that the Minutes of the Meeting held on 21st February, 1961, have been printed and circulated amongst hon. members and unless there be any objection, these Minutes will be taken as read and confirmed.

There being no objection, these Minutes are now taken as read and confirmed.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the following:-

The Customs Duties (Raw Materials for the Manufacture of Paints) Order, 1961.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the following:-

Annual Report of the Department of Science and Agriculture for the year 1956-57.

Twenty-first Annual Report of the Peasants' Loan Bank - 1st June, 1957 - 31st May, 1958.

Twenty-second Annual Report and Statement of Accounts of the Peasants' Loan Bank - 1st June, 1958 - 31st May, 1959.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following:-

Resolution to place the sum of \$9,450 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimate - 1960-61, Part I - Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1960-61, No. 39, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following:-

Resolution to place the sum of \$120,720 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1960-61, Part II - Capital, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1960-61, No. 40, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. L. ST.A. THORNE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that the Reply to Oral Question No. 1/1961 asked by the hon. senior member for St. Lucy regarding applications made for entry into Grant-Aided Schools in the current academic year is ready.

Also, Reply to Oral Question No. 20/1961 asked by the hon. senior member for St. Lucy regarding the remission of fees to successful pupils from private Secondary Schools in the recent G.C.E. Examinations is ready.

Also, Reply to Oral Question No. 28/1961 asked by the hon. senior member for St. Lucy regarding the wages paid Janitors at Richmond School is ready.

Also, Reply to Oral Question No. 33/1961 asked by the hon. senior member for St. Lucy regarding a Report on Teacher Training at Erdiston College by Dr. Walters and Mr. Hammond is ready.

Also, Reply to Oral Question No. 13/1961 asked by the hon. senior member for St. Philip regarding the acquisition of beaches for supplying sand for building and other purposes is ready.

Also, Reply to Oral Question No. 29/1961 asked by the hon. senior member for St. Peter regarding the contract for the Printing of the revised editions of the Laws of Barbados, is ready.

Also, Reply to Oral Question No. 31/1961 asked by the hon. junior member for St. Lucy regarding the financing of housing schemes for certain groups of persons is ready.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply at its next meeting to consider the money Resolutions of which notice has just been given.

215

QUESTIONS

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask permission to ask the following Question on behalf of the hon. senior member for St. Lucy.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is asking permission to ask a Question on behalf of the hon. senior member for St. Lucy, and unless there be any objection, permission will be granted.

There being no objection, permission was granted to the hon. member.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, the Question reads as follows:-

To enquire of the Hon. Minister of Education:-

Is the Minister aware that:-

(1) West Indian History is now being taught at G.C.E. "O" Level in some Grant-aided Secondary Schools?

(2) Some of the Teachers, though competent to teach it, have, nevertheless, little personal acquaintance with the other territories of the Federation?

2. Would the Minister, therefore, be prepared to explore, with his opposite numbers in other territories, the possibility of exchange familiarisation tours during the coming summer vacation?

3. If the Minister is willing to explore such possibility and if his exploration proves successful, will he give the earliest intimation to all the schools concerned?
12.25 p.m.

Mr. L. E. SMITH: To enquire of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries:-

Is the Minister aware that a notice has been affixed to the door of the garage at Tent Bay, Bathsheba, where the Government tractor is housed, stating that the tractor driver is ill, and that the tractor service would therefore be temporarily suspended?

2. If the answer is "yes", will the Minister state whether he authorised or was aware of, such notice before same was affixed?

3. In view of the financial losses which fishermen at Tent Bay must have of necessity sustained during the period of calm weather when the said tractor service was suspended, will Government take steps to provide such fishermen with *ex gratia* payments to relieve their plight?

4. Will the Minister instruct the Fisheries Officer that it is his duty to supply an alternative tractor driver immediately on every occasion when the holder of the office is unable to perform his duty?

5. Is it true that the supply of electricity available for the tractor garage and the illumination of the beach has been disconnected?

6. If the answer to question (5) is "yes", will the Minister state the reason therefor?

Mr. L. E. SMITH: To enquire of the Minister of Education:-

Is the Minister aware that harsh and cruel treatment has been meted out to school children of the Primary Schools in the parish of St. Peter on attendance at the dental clinic at the Speightstown Health Centre?

2. Is the Minister aware that complaints against such treatment have been laid before certain Head-teachers of these schools?

3. Is the Minister aware that some parents have been advised to accompany their children to the dental clinic at the Speightstown Health Centre for dental treatment there?

4. If the answers to the Nos. 1, 2, and 3 are in the affirmative, will the Minister make the necessary investigation with a view to remedying this state of affairs?

To enquire of the Minister of Education:-

Is the Minister aware that the lack of control of the sound volume of the speakers presently installed in Primary Schools makes it impossible for the pupils to appreciate this form of education?

2. Is the Minister aware that these speakers are seldom used by teachers for the purpose intended owing to this defect in the volume of sound control?

3. Is the Minister aware that the type of programme received through these speakers is regarded as unsuitable for local appreciation?

DOCUMENTS

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received a Report of the Accountant General for the month ending December, 1960.

ADDRESS re REPLY TO HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR'S SPEECH

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day is to resume debate on the Address in reply to His Excellency's speech at the opening of the Legislature.

On the last occasion, the hon. senior member for St. Lucy was addressing the Chair. The hon. member is not in his place.

The question that the words proposed to be deleted stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

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

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I beg to second that.

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

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

POSTPONEMENT OF ITEMS (a) AND (b)

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I am asking leave to postpone (a) and (b) of Order No. 2.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES, 1960-61, No. 38 HEAD VIII - LEGAL

Head VIII - Legal - was called.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, this is a supplementary vote asked for by the Legal Department for travelling allowance. At the end of September an amount of \$18.48 was outstanding, and this is a request for \$150.00 to be voted towards this item so as to enable the Department to carry through with expenses under this item until the end of the financial year. I beg to move that Head VIII stand part.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I just want to have things regularised. You said that you were postponing (a) and (b). What do you regard as (a) and (b)?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I regard the Resolution for \$5,273,878 and the Resolution to approve the Annual Estimates of the Port Department as (a) and (b).

Mr. WALCOTT: Is that what you postponed?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Yes. I postponed items (a) and (b) of Order No. 2.

Mr. WALCOTT: I think the postponement should be of the Resolutions as named. If you were asking leave for postponement of those two Resolutions, you should say so. You should name the Resolutions. Do not say that you are postponing (a) and (b) of Order No. 2 because there is no such thing as (a) and (b) of Order No. 2.
12.35 p.m.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: For the benefit of the hon. senior member for St. Peter, the Resolutions to be postponed are one for the sum of \$5 million.....

Mr. WALCOTT: You cannot say what leave has been asked to do. There is no Resolution designated "A", "B" and "C". The Hon. Leader of the House must ask leave that the Resolution for \$5 million and the other Resolution dealing with the Port should be postponed. You cannot give the interpretation of something which has to be postponed, unless you are an oracle.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am attempting to clear up the matter. The Resolution to be postponed is a Resolution for \$5 million and the.....

Mr. WALCOTT: That should be stated by the Hon. Leader of the House.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am stating it now.

Mr. WALCOTT: You cannot do that. If we are to have parliamentary procedure, then the Hon. Leader of the House must state what he wants done. If you are postponing this Resolution for \$5 million, then that should be stated.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: When the question was being put, the hon. member raised no objection. (Mr. WALCOTT: Because I did not have my Order Paper). I understand the hon. member to say that he wanted the matter cleared up, and it is quite simple to have it cleared. I am enlightening the hon. member as to what has been postponed; the term "A" and "B" was used for the purpose of designating the Resolutions listed under Committee of Supply.

Mr. BARROW: On a point of order. Mr. Chairman, I feel myself inclined to agree with the hon. senior member for St. Peter. On my Order Paper I do not see any designation "A", "B" and "C" or anything like that. There seems to be complete *en rapport* between you, Mr. Chairman, and the Hon. Premier on these matters, but we are completely in the dark. Therefore we must be acquainted with the nature of the Resolution being designated as "A", "B" and "C". It is a simple procedural matter which should be cleared up.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: In my opinion, it is a very simple matter. I do not see the need for this argument. However, I would ask the Hon. Leader of the House to make a motion naming the Resolution.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I shall do so at your request. I am always willing to obey and pay due regard to the ruling of the Chair. As you have already said, when this proposal was made, there was no objection to it; and therefore such a proposal is not properly before the Committee. However, since you have asked that the matter be made clear, and since the hon. senior member for St. Peter does not seem to appreciate what the position is, I am asking leave that the Resolution for \$5,273,878 and also the Resolution to approve the Annual Estimates of the Port Department annexed to the Estimates of the Island for the year 1961-62, be deferred or postponed in order to deal with the Resolution for \$213.

There being no objection leave was granted the Hon. Leader of the House.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES, 1960-61, No. 38

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution is one for the sum of \$213 under two Heads of the Estimates - Legal and Miscellaneous Services. I propose to take these Heads separately.

HEAD VIII - LEGAL

Head VIII - Legal - was called.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, as I said earlier, in respect of this Head, the sum of \$150 is required for the Attorney General's Staff which is called upon to travel to the Courts of the island. This was not unforeseen, but underestimated, in the Estimates. It is now estimated that the sum of \$150 will be required to carry on until the end of the financial year. I beg to move that Head VIII stand part of the Schedule.

Hon. L. St.A. THORNE: I beg to second that.

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

HEAD XXIX - MISCELLANEOUS SERVICES

Head XXIX - Miscellaneous Services - was called.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Under this Head, Mr. Chairman, there is a new item "Travelling Expenses for Local Government Central Tenders Committee". I think it is well known that a Central Tenders Committee has been appointed to consider tenders for contracts above a certain amount, and the Committee has to travel to the several Local Government Councils in order to award these contracts. That was foreseen, but no amount was mentioned in the Estimates to cover the travelling expenses of this Committee. This sum of \$63 is required to pay for the amount of travelling done by the Committee and to carry on until the end of the financial year. I beg to move that Head XXIX stand part of the Schedule.

Hon. L. St.A. THORNE: I beg to second that.

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

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I beg to move, Mr. Chairman, that a Resolution for the sum of \$213 do now pass.

Hon. L. St.A. THORNE: I beg to second that.

The question that this 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 one Resolution in Committee, the postponement of two and that the Committee had asked for leave to sit again.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

12.45 p.m.

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

LEASE OF LAND TO MESSRS.
CENTRAL FOUNDRY LIMITED

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 3 stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works: to move the passing of a Resolution to approve the lease by the Governor-in-Executive Committee to Messrs. Central Foundry Limited of a parcel of land known as Dock Site in the parish of St. Michael.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, as the Addendum to this Resolution explains, this seeks the approval of the Legislature to the lease of a parcel of land known as Dock Site to the Central Foundry Limited for a period of five years. For some time, Sir, this site has been leased to Central Foundry; the last occasion on which they entered into the lease was in 1955. The area involved is 33,975 square feet. The terms of the lease are \$960 per annum, plus a royalty of 12 cents per ton on the gross tonnage lifted by the Dock. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. L. St. A. THORNE: I beg to second that.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, we have to take it in the absence of any fuller explanation, that the parcel of land vaguely described as being in the parish of St. Michael which is referred to in this Resolution is the dry dock which is on the Pierhead. Central Foundry Ltd. occupies several parcels of land in the parish of St. Michael, and it is regrettable that the Minister did not think fit to particularise the specific parcel of land which it is contemplated should be leased to them by virtue of this Resolution.

This gives me an opportunity to raise the whole question of docking facilities in the Port of Bridgetown and the island of Barbados in general. The Central Foundry occupies premises on the Pierhead, a locality in Bridgetown which is well known to all who come into the island by boat or ship, and to the inhabitants of the parish of St. Michael. I wonder why the Minister should elect to be so mysterious on the parcel of land which the Central Foundry is now leasing. That dock on the Pierhead was originally built, as far as I know, and operated by a firm called Blackwood; and taken over more recently by the Central Foundry. The majority of the shareholders are local residents of Barbados.

What we on this side of the House would like to know is what provisions are being made in the new Harbour for the docking of vessels, intercolonial schooners and ships of various sizes and descriptions. The way the Resolution reads at present, it would be competent for the Executive Committee to lease a parcel of land anywhere in Bridgetown to Central Foundry; I am not suggesting it is so, but it may very well be. If I heard a rumour or had a suspicion I would say I had a suspicion; but I am pointing out the insufficiency of the Addendum which is attached to the Resolution. We may easily wake up to find that this is an agreement to lease a part of the new Deep Water Harbour site to the Central Foundry. Those of us who were born in this island, whether in St. Lucy like myself or in St. Michael like the hon. senior member for the City, have never yet heard the Blackwood's Dock described as Dock Site. I think I can say that without fear of contradiction. Here is a Resolution which says that they are going to lease a parcel of land known as Dock Site to the Central Foundry.

Now we know that the Central Foundry occupies a part of the Pierhead or Molehead, or part of both; we know they operate what was formerly known as Blackwood's Dock, but we have never in Barbadian common parlance, in business circles, in legal circles, or in the House of Assembly - although I cannot speak for what happened before I came into the picture here - heard this particular locality described as Dock Site. This Resolution as it is now worded is entirely unsatisfactory; it will now be competent for them to lease three-quarters of an acre of land anywhere in the parish of St. Michael and say that they brought it to the House and the House approved. I am merely pointing out the unsatisfactory Addendum and the

unsatisfactory introduction which has been given by the Minister.

If you are going to lease a parcel of land, at least you should set out the boundaries unless it is a well known place like Trafalgar Square, Palmetto Square, or Blackwood's Dock. If you are leasing Blackwood's Dock, say so, but do not say it is known as Dock Site. Is there anybody in this House of Assembly, apart from the Minister himself, who is particular about speaking the truth, prepared to say that he has ever heard of a place in Barbados called Dock Site? The only Dock Site any of us know about is in Trinidad.

We have never heard of a Dock Site in Barbados in ordinary speech. Why the mystery if it is the Pierhead or the land situated on both sides of the road formerly leased as Blackwood's? There is a new harbour; and we know the normal thing should be for Government to advertise for tenders for potential ship chandlers, and people like that who go in for dry docking of ships. Now suppose we find that Central Foundry moves on to 33,000 square feet of land at the Deep Water Harbour; we have approved of it, because we have not said that they cannot go there. 12.55 p.m.

I am not suggesting that the Hon. Minister has done anything wrong; I am suggesting that he has not done enough. The second point which I would like to raise is this: The time has come when the Government has got seriously to consider whether in view of the improved facilities which we claim we are going to give to ocean-going vessels, and in view of the fact that every industry which comes into this island employing skilled labour is an asset to the community and likely to bring in more trade and other ancillary industries, the Government should not contemplate putting down a dry dock at the Deep Water Harbour site and leasing it out to a very competent person or firm after advertisement has been made. There is no point in building a Deep Water Harbour if your harbour is not going to be provided with facilities for dry docking.

The Central Foundry dock is one of the most ancient in the world, I understand that there are only two of its kind. There is this one in Barbados and one in Japan; there are only two of its kind; and antiquity is no recommendation at all. Ship-owners are not going to come to Barbados because we have the oldest dock in the world. We should scrutinise this Resolution quite carefully. I have heard many complaints against the Central Foundry, over the fantastic prices charged by them. I have heard ship-owners from as far as North America complaining about the prices charged by that company.

I am drawing to the Hon. Minister's attention that the Central Foundry Limited is the only firm in Barbados which, in its costing facilities, have a buying price for labour and a selling price for labour. They have the temerity to set out labour bought at such a price, and labour sold at such a price. I would like the hon. senior member for St. Peter, who is the Trade Union Secretary, to investigate this. I think it is reprehensible that in the twentieth century we should have such a system as the buying price and selling price of labour.

There have been several complaints about the prices and services which have been rendered by the Central Foundry. The hon. senior member for St. Philip has first-hand experience of this, when he was acting as an agent for a ship-owner, over the unsatisfactory way of costing which goes on at the Central Foundry.

The Central Foundry has enjoyed a monopoly in Barbados for over sixty years, and has been fortunate enough to be relieved of one of its old buildings for a very large sum of money from the Government; and up to now the Government has not been able to make a more productive use of that site, other than a parking place for vehicular traffic. As I have said, people who come to this island do not have any confidence in the prices charged them for repairs by this company. As regards the length of time taken by this company to carry out repairs, I have heard that some times

when you are promised a lifting you have to make an unnecessary trip here in that you may have to leave and come back again to Barbados.

We are now launching as a new venture the Deep Water Harbour scheme. We have to be very careful that we do not inadvertently allow the Central Foundry Limited to get the docking facilities without tenders being advertised for, and comparisons made between the services and prices which they are willing to provide, as against those prices and charges by other firms who are competent to do the job. I have sounded a note of warning. I do not think anyone in their right senses can deny that the Resolution as it stands does leave the door open for that kind of abuse. The Minister may not have intended it to be so, but we are legislators; and if we are here to make laws, those laws must be sensible and not for the instrument of fraud.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, in support of the line taken by my hon. colleague, I would say that in order to approve of a lease you must necessarily know in the first place the area of the land, the description of the land, and the parties to the lease. Of course, you know who are the parties; but the description of the area of the land and a proper definition of it is not properly set out here in the Addendum.

Mr. SPEAKER: The area is set out.

Mr. TALMA: Yes, but not in the Addendum. I am dealing with the Addendum. All of the material points of the lease should have been mentioned in the Addendum. No mention is made of the area. A full description of it has not been given, and the identity of the land is left undefined and uncertain.

Mr. Speaker, in order to comply not only with the Executive Committee Act of 1891 but also to establish a certain measure of *bona fides*, it may be advisable to amend the Addendum to clear up all doubt. For instance, after the word "land" in the Addendum, if these words were inserted; "on which the Central Foundry now stands and carries on its business," that would make it more explanatory. As it stands now, it is far from being satisfactory. In order to comply with the terms of the Executive Committee (Amendment) Act, 1951, you must set out all the particulars of the lease and the price even though it is a peppercorn rent.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would like to point out to the hon. member that this House has no authority to amend an Addendum.

Mr. TALMA: I am merely making a suggestion to the Hon. Minister.
1.05 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member would not hear me; I wish he would. The House has no power to amend an Addendum; the House might receive a modified Addendum. The Addendum is something which we receive from the Ministers through their departments; we have no power to amend an Addendum.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that; I am fully aware of that, having been a Minister myself. On the other hand the Addendum might not have been prepared by the Minister, and he might only have seen it now for the first time. Why should the Minister ignore a suggestion like this, which would satisfy everybody? It is only that the particular land referred to should be set out. I think that the words should be inserted: "On which the Central Foundry now stands and operates and carries on its business". That makes it clear which land is referred to.

As to the other aspects of the matter, I will not engage in them; I think that the Central Foundry has done its part and is helping in many ways.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I think I have an idea of what this is. It is only the renewal of a lease, and we are asked to approve of it. Surely there is nothing wrong if the Minister in charge of this Resolution makes everything as simple as possible for the benefit of hon. members. The expression "Dock Site" is colloquially known as the Central

Foundry's Dock. The Central Foundry has an area of land on two sides of the road, and the side on which you dock the ships is the place which the Government has leased. I think I am right in that. The Minister will put me right if I am wrong. It is by some Act or Statute that we have the site known as "Dock Site".

I am familiar with the expression "Blackwood's Docks" because I enjoyed sitting with Mr. McClean who will tell you that he held a job when Mr. Blackwood put down his first peg to lay down this dock. I do not want to suggest any extravagant rent because it comes back out of trade and income tax; on the other hand, I feel that this is a place which creates business in Barbados by having that dock there. The Minister should be able to tell us if the rent has been increased. I understand that the rent is \$960 a year. I cannot recall immediately what the Central Foundry site is capitalised at; I wonder if the Government is finding out the value of this 33,000 square feet of land, I am using round figures, at the Dock site. I wonder if, after the Minister has arrived at the value of this land and considers that this is a site which provides the amenities for repairing ships and so on, he thinks that the sum of \$80 a month is a reasonable rent for it. I should like to ask what was the price of the land at the last lease in 1955. Surely the Minister would like to inform us about that. I do not think we should make any undue fuss about the matter.

This Dock has brought lots of money to Barbados in the past; and even in the case of motor vessels, where there are no docks in the small islands, we got work for our men. I do not think that there should be any change in the idea of renting, but I should like the Minister to say what was paid in the last five years; and if the rent has been increased, whether he thinks that this is a reasonable rent, taking everything into consideration. I am not suggesting that the land be taken at its commercial value; it has other values as well. It is a site which is used for bringing work to this country. I may be wrong, but I do not think that this is anything to do with the Deep Water Harbour. This was a site at Blackwood's Dock which was bought by the Central Foundry and in which there was a case in the King's Bench division on which Sir Herbert Greaves made a ruling.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, I do not think that the hon. member who has just spoken was here when I introduced this Resolution. I repeat that this is a renewal of the lease. The entire area that is leased at present is the particular area which he has rightly named; that is Blackwood's Dock. I have looked into the files and, as far as I can see, this has been the particular area which has been leased to the Central Foundry. It was long before the hon. member, or myself, was born.

There should not be this accusation of secrecy. I do not think that the hon. senior member for Christ Church is aware that, previous to 1951, the Government did not come down here to enter into this lease. Section 12 of the Executive Committee Act, 1891, reads as follows:-
1.15 p.m.

"The Executive Committee are hereby authorised to lease for such terms and on such conditions as they shall determine for the purpose of making a Dock or for harbour improvements such portions of the Colonial Government lands as may be required."

In 1951, that was changed to read as follows:-

"The Executive Committee may, with the approval of the Legislature, lease, sell or exchange any lands which they may possess."

There is no secrecy about this. We do not have to come to the House with a map or a plan of the actual area of land; the House of Assembly is not entering a lease. Surely the hon. member who is an ex-Minister should understand the position. Why should we come down here with a plan and all the details? It is unnecessary.

Mr. TALMA: On a point of order. If the hon. member can understand, he will realise that I asked for a description of the land, and to say where the land is. The object of an

Addendum is to set out a full description of the land and the terms of the lease, so as to leave things clear to hon. members.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I would not worry to dispute what the hon. member said. As far as I remember, both hon. members said I should bring a plan and describe where the land is. This Resolution is only to renew a lease which has been going on for years. I explained in my second reading speech that it is the same bit of land. Why all this humbug? I say again, Sir, that this is purely an executive action and not a Legislative action of entering into a lease. Previously, this land was leased for five years, the rent was \$576 per annum, and before that it was \$360; it has now been increased to \$960 and there is a royalty of 12 ¢.

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

COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF FORDE'S PASTURE

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 4 stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Social Services; to move the passing of a Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of an area of land in Speightstown, St. Peter, for the purpose of Housing Development and the use as a Community Playing Field.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution is for the compulsory acquisition of an area of land at Speightstown known as Forde's Pasture for the use of a Playing Field and a Government Housing Scheme. It is a formal matter in which you must get the authority of Parliament for the acquisition of land. We have encountered a number of difficulties in acquiring this land on a peaceful treaty; and it was decided that we should take this action. With those remarks, I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. L. St. A. THORNE: I beg to second that.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, the Addendum to this Resolution says that, in accordance with the provisions of Section 5 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1949, the approval of the Legislature is sought for the acquisition of an area of land in Speightstown, St. Peter, known as Forde's Pasture, for the purpose set out in the Resolution.

I notice that hon. members over there seem to think that there should not be what you might term a little fillibustering, but recently, in the House of Commons, members went to sleep on the floor. If the hon. member for St. Peter was here, he would better be able to deal with this matter; but I thought that Government had abandoned the idea of purchasing Forde's. I went to have a look at Forde's, but I knew it before, though not as well as the Government. I can handle Forde's; but I would prefer to leave it to the hon. senior member for St. Peter who I think is *au fait* with the matter.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, this is just another example of political dishonesty. The Hon. Minister with whom I sympathised when he was sick and passed through a lot, should, on reflection, realise that this House has been awaiting and giving him, through his illness, an opportunity to recover to deal with this matter which is under his portfolio. So far as I am concerned, the compulsory acquisition of land in the parish of St. Peter is a controversial issue. I will not be as long on this occasion as I was on the former occasion.

I heard the Leader of the House talk about a mandate. Do you have a mandate for buying Forde's Pasture? If you have not got a mandate for buying Forde's Pasture, let us have an election on the basis of buying Forde's as against Heywoods and see who would win. Go to St. Peter with a referendum and see who would win. You cannot go to St. Peter even without that; so there is no question of talking about having a referendum. Did the people in St. Peter come and tell you that they wanted you to buy Forde's as against Heywoods? Because Heywoods belongs to rich people, you did not want to buy it; but Forde's belongs to Percy Whitehead, and you are trying to bamboozle his whole family. The excuse which you used for not buying Heywoods was that it

is agricultural land; but negotiations went on with a Canadian firm to buy the whole of Heywoods to use as a site for putting up a hotel and cabanas, and the Minister of Communications, as well as the Minister of Agriculture, were aware of this. Sandy Lane was sold out; I was there last Monday; and the agricultural land which formerly had canes is now used as a golf course.

Government has not produced a housing area that connotes something of a high standard of living. You always buy a housing area somewhere in the back; which is part of the slavish mentality which existed in this island since the days of slavery, especially permeating in the minds of the Government. As soon as there is talk about a housing area for working-class people, Government goes and buys back land; they cannot think of buying something decent for the people. What is wrong with Heywoods?

The people living at the front of Heywoods have been given notices to leave; and inasmuch as these people live on a main road with public services available, you are now going to put them on a site at Forde's. You are now going to make a road at Forde's and create all these services which they already have on the main road. You do not need Arthur Lewis to tell you that if you buy Heywoods, you would have one of the best beach outlooks. Why is it that our people cannot have the whole of Heywoods Beach? Why can't we build a "Jones Beach" in Heywoods?
1.25 p.m.

The Hon. Minister has visited the United States of America, and anybody who has been to the U.S.A., would know of "Jones Beach". Why can't we build a "Jones Beach" at Heywoods? There is not a stretch of beach land left to the people of Barbados on the Leeward Coast; not one which is as good as Heywoods. All the other beach lands which were available to the people of Barbados have gone. What is wrong with the people of Barbados acquiring Heywoods? The Hon. Minister on a former occasion gave me the "nancy" story that the people are not going to walk from the heart of Speightstown to Heywoods. The whole of Speightstown is a village. I have held a meeting at Six Men's a couple weeks ago, and the people came from as far as Road View which is near Gibbes.

If you were to ask the people: "Would you prefer Forde's or Heywoods," what vote do you think you would get? Surely, you would get a vote for Heywoods; and not only on the basis of preference, but also on the basis of development. Surely, for the future there should be a road leading into the Coleridge-Parry School from Heywoods. One of the sensible things which you have to do at some time or other, is to build such a road so that you can divert some of the traffic which has to go all around, and to prevent people having to make that long pilgrimage.

Imagine that the Government was going to buy Heywoods, and I told the Government that they should buy Forde's; what do you think the Government would tell the people? They would say: "We want to give you Heywoods but Frank Walcott wants you to live at Forde's in the back." Imagine my asking a man if he would not prefer Heywoods to Forde's. Do you think that he would not tell me he would prefer Heywoods?

The North Americans can come here and utilise Heywoods; but, for Barbadians, Heywoods is agricultural land. Is it that when the North Americans come here and put up their cabanas and hotels at Heywoods, breadfruits are going to come through the housetops? Members of the Government are still nursing the mentality of thinking that the back is for the workers.

The Hon. Minister of Social Services told me on one occasion — it may be only rhetoric — that he would like to see the preservation of the slave huts down there. Relics should be something by which we are establishing memorials of a struggle. You have to show me something like Shrewsbury Church. When the slaves started to rebel, there was a man here by the name of Rev. Shrewsbury who did quite a lot for them; and to perpetuate that piece of history, you have a church here named after him. It must be something like that; not the perpetuating of a slave hut which is a sort

of cowpen which you built at that time for the workers. You should preserve something of which you are not ashamed; therefore, when you talked of the preservation of a slave hut, it does not indicate any progress whatsoever.

Sir, I have bathed at Heywoods. I am not as fortunate as the hon. senior member for the City who is an affluent member of this Chamber; therefore, I hope that I will not have to make a pilgrimage from Heywoods Beach to his house to ask him to grant me the privilege of using his beach house alongside Heywoods. Both the Hon. Premier and the hon. member for the City have their own private bathing houses on that coast. As Your Honour knows, if you have your wife, it becomes very inconvenient for her to undress in comfort anywhere along the beach; and those of us who still have some respect for women folk know that while we can undress behind any leaf, the women must have privacy.

How can the hon. member say to us that Forde's is a better site for development? Mr. Speaker, it is not that Forde's is available to you and Heywoods is not. You are acquiring Forde's compulsorily; it is not a question of Hobson's choice. If you are acquiring a site compulsorily for development, what can be a better site than that of Heywoods?

The hon. junior member for St. Joseph jumped into this debate on the last occasion. I do not know if it is by accident that he is either the Chairman or a member of the Northern District Council, which caused him to think that he had a right to say what he did. I would only give him a little warning. Let him take his membership of the Northern District Council cautiously and without boast; so far as his membership is concerned, his days may be numbered. I, personally, do not have any liking for Local Councils; I feel that the work and the time they demand of you are too heavy for me. When the hon. member has reached the stage of debating with me the relative value of Forde's as compared with Heywoods, I would just like to tell him that it is purely a matter that he has not reached the stage of knowing what is best for the community.

Mr. Speaker, people are now living on Heywoods land, and they have been given notice to move; and Government says they are buying this land to accommodate them. I see such a wide development needed for St. Peter. That parish needs a Town Hall; and this is no better site than where the present building stands.
1.35 p.m.

Sometime ago, Government went to St. Philip and, as a political sop, bought the whole of Six Roads in order to ensure somebody getting back in this House. They went to the ridiculous point of building a market out of public funds, and there is no produce being sold there; the wages of the watchman employed up there exceed the sales in the market. In St. Peter, there is the second town of this island; and that town requires something being erected to the front in order to show that Speightstown is the second town. It is true that you see stores in Speightstown; and that that is the only other place you see stores after you leave Bridgetown; there is nothing in Holatown to demonstrate that there is a town there. When you see the Church tower in Speightstown, it is then that you begin to see that you are going somewhere. If we are progressive we should create life; where you have the population, you should raise the town to a proper status.

Mr. Speaker, as a matter of faith to the people of St. Peter, I have to vote against this Resolution. I cannot support a Resolution like this; and I have told the people that I am voting against it whenever the question comes up. I cannot see the idea of not developing Heywoods; it hurts me to hear the Government talk about beach control when they have an area of land which they can acquire. This area is yours already; you do not have to acquire it. Look what it means to Barbados when you drive along that part of the island to see that sort of development in the open space! Without that development, it makes you think that you are in a Latin American country where nobody builds on the seashore. As far as Forde's Pasture is concerned, there is no water service there; and you

have to carry light and all the public facilities up there; whereas right alongside the main road at Heywoods you have the services which only need to be attached.

In order to satisfy a man or prevent somebody from going to Prison for income tax, they bought land at Cave Hill out of Labour Welfare Funds. Some people should go to prison for their dishonesty. Cave Hill land was bought out of Labour Welfare Funds. Why can't they buy Heywoods too? When it is a question of helping your friends, you buy land and make a lot of excuses for buying it; but the truth will be out sometimes.

When you come to straightforward dealing, you have all of this beating about the bush. I can speak freely in this matter; nobody can come to me tomorrow and ask for borrowed money; I do not want any hush money or gift money; all these things are done when people can come back and get favours done. I ask no favours, and I am not doing any favours for anybody. You have people, when it suits them to do so, who will use the public purse; and it will seem to be the sort of nepotism you have in England in the boroughs where things are done under the guise of development.

There is the fact that the Director of Agriculture says you should not use agricultural land for setting up playing fields and community centres; the Town and Country Planner said that Government should not build a fish market in Bay Street, but they have built one. How long ago did the Director of Agriculture say that you can buy this land?

Sandy Lane has been sold, and that property has been made into a hotel, but was that not agricultural land? I saw some documents from the hon. junior member for St. John in which negotiations were going on with the knowledge of the Government. Is it anything short of being criminal for any member of the Government to say that Heywoods is agricultural land while negotiations were going on to acquire Sandy Lane, but now they are buying Forde's compulsorily? Who are they depriving of development? Are they depriving me, the community or whom? Let the hon. member say what is the full significance of buying Forde's.

I do not like to go by what members of the Housing Board say; the question of buying Forde's is nothing which the Housing Board has decided; it is something which the Government has decided. It is only a question of juggling with Labour Welfare money that they say they will use this money for housing. You did not have all the houses on the principle of the compulsory purchase of land; but it may be that you would buy all the land out of Labour Welfare money and we would not know that because you do not have to come here to make any statement in respect of Labour Welfare money. That is why I say that the utilisation of this money can lead to corruption.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I have borne with patience the hon. member's allegations, but I cannot bear them any longer. He puts himself on Mount Olympus. You hear about corruption and all sorts of things. I can put myself on Mount Olympus too. I have been in many negotiations and I challenge the hon. member to mention one case of corruption; I defy him to do that. The Housing Authority thought that Forde's would be suitable for housing, and it was on their advice that we agreed to buy Forde's, a part of which is to be used for housing and a part for playing fields.
1.45 p.m.

When the hon. member talks about juggling and corruption, let him understand that he need not put himself up on Mount Olympus or in an eagle's nest; others can be there too.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is not for me to let the hon. member understand that, I think the hon. member was speaking rather vaguely. His use of the second pronoun "you" had me guessing as to whom he was really referring. I waited to see whether a member of the Government would have thought that he had to defend the Government, but nobody

did so. I myself was not sure to whom that "you" referred. It was something rather rhetorical.

Mr. WALCOTT: The hon. member said I need not put myself on Mount Olympus. If you are honest, you are; if you are not, you are not. I can be specific. The Government of Barbados bought Cave Hill land out of Labour Welfare Funds, and that was no more than political juggling. They did that because certain people were associated with it. Do you want me to say more than that? Do you want me to call names? Go and ask Mr. D'Arcy Scott about his association with the Labour Party, and what funds he has given to the Labour Party to run campaigns. Do you want me to say more?

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order. Perhaps it appears as though the hon. member is drawing me out. I would like the hon. member to quote one instance, or any information he has received, which leads him to conclude and to express that view in respect of Cave Hill; that the person was a friend of the Labour Party, and that he did these favours for the members of the Labour Party. That land was bought when I held the portfolio of Communications. We did not only buy Cave Hill, we bought land from Bagatelle Plantation in St. Thomas. We bought land in St. Philip, in St. James, Sayes Court in Christ Church, and other places out of the same Labour Welfare Fund for housing the working-class people of this island. Let him state one case where somebody took any bribe from anybody at any time.

Mr. WALCOTT: Each time I say one thing, something else comes up. You bought *Grazettes* from Mackie Symmonds; you have now put Mackie Symmonds in the Legislative Council. That is the sort of reward you hand out to people. How many places do you want me to call? I called the place you bought from D'Arcy Scott, and I have called the place you bought from Mackie Symmonds. Do you want me to call more? You asked me to be specific, and you talked as though I cannot be specific.

Why did you not buy Rosegate when the then hon. member for St. John, Mr. Alder, was in the House of Assembly, and it was going to be sold? It was because he was not *persona grata* with the Party at the time. I can name every person from whom the Government bought something as a political move. Maybe when Mackie Symmonds had run for St. George you would not have bought *Grazettes*; he was in the wrong Party; but when you bought *Grazettes* it was a different story. He is now Chairman of the Transport Board.

Mr. Speaker, I have nothing against the individuals the Government bought from; I have nothing against Mr. Scott or Mr. Symmonds; but the hon. member should be the last to talk about drawing him out. I am a man of unimpeachable character. My political character was not the subject of public investigation in this island.

Mr. SPEAKER: That has just turned the debate into something personal.

Mr. WALCOTT: Whose public life has been the subject of public investigation? I have never used any name in the guise that this is not Frank Walcott, but in truth and in fact I am trading as Frank Walcott and using somebody else's name. (Hon. M. E. COX: Not every thief is caught.)

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. senior member for St. Peter need not be encouraged by an hon. member to go off the track. We should keep to the abstract of the Resolution and leave the personalities out of the debate.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I do not like the idea of the Minister saying that this House need not have heard anything about this Resolution to buy Forde's - if it could have been bought out of Labour Welfare Funds. I do not like the idea of the Cabinet in these circumstances having power; there can be political juggling with money. Why are you buying Forde's as against Heywoods? You are buying this land compulsorily; you did not say that the man is willing to sell and therefore this is a willing purchaser buying from

a willing seller. I say that you are buying it because you do not want to enter into the problem of buying Heywoods. Heywoods should be bought. I do not believe that that view is isolated; it has been mooted by several people.

Mr. Speaker, if the Government had decided to buy Heywoods and I had come and said that we should buy Forde's, they would have said that I am a crazy man. Could there be any possibility of developing Forde's as you can develop Heywoods? If you are talking about the stone you can get from underneath the District "E" Station, and how it can be utilised, you can get stone anywhere. For that purpose, you can go and buy a quarry, take out the stones for making roads, and see which is cheaper.

The Hon. Minister must bear in mind that these are matters on which the people have strong views. When I am accused of standing on Olympic heights and looking down, I am looking down on the things that are taking place; and if what I say is unpleasant to other people, it will have to be because I do not care. I do not have any political favour to ask of anybody in Barbados. The people who put me here do not ask me for any favours; they put me here to represent them; and part of my representation is to expose such things. This affects those who sent me here directly, since you are going into the area of which I have the honour of being one of the representatives. I have taken this matter up with them. It is a national issue in the sense that it does not apply to any political Party, but you have been trying to make it into a Party issue by this acquisition of Forde's.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that if I had told the Government to buy Forde's instead of Heywoods, maybe they might have bought Heywoods. I believe I should adopt the attitude like the old time politicians. When I first entered political life, there was a moot saying in this House that if a man comes in on the working class man's ticket and he is not sure how the vote is going, as long as he hears how the other side is voting, he can afford to vote the opposite way and know that he is right.

1.55 p.m.

It seems as if I say "Forde's", they will say "Heywoods"; and if I say "Heywoods", they will say "Forde's". They will build houses in Speightstown for the people of that parish and then find out that they will have to advertise in the newspapers for people to live in those houses, because the people in the country do not live in rent houses; and then you will have a man from Halls Road in St. Michael coming to Speightstown to live in the houses you have erected there.

I think the Hon. Minister knows me well. I have been with the Hon. Minister six years ago, in company with Your Honour, and looked at all the sites which they have to offer; and I do not think Forde's was looked at seriously at that time. I do not believe anybody who lives in Speightstown would seriously go to develop Forde's as against land at Heywoods. As I have said, people have been given notice to remove from Heywoods. It is not a question that people would not live anywhere; if you go to Melvin Hill in the parish of St. Joseph, you will see houses there which will make you very well say that people will put their houses anywhere. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to say that, though I agree with the development envisaged in this Resolution, I do not agree with the acquisition of Forde's for the purpose.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Speaker, I just want to say a few words on this Resolution. You are seeking compulsory acquisition of the land in Speightstown, St. Peter, known as Forde's Pasture, for the purpose of housing development and for use as a playing field. I understand that it is money from the Labour Welfare Fund with which Government is going to acquire this land. What I think the Government ought to acquire with this money is the very land on which these people's houses are at present sited. Let the people's houses remain there, and then go in the back at Forde's Pasture and put a playing field there for them.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. SPEAKER: It now being 2.00 p.m. o'clock this sitting now stands suspended until 2.30 o'clock.
2.00 p.m.

On resumption.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to draw to Your Honour's attention that there is no quorum and ask that the Bell be rung.

The Bell was rung and a quorum was obtained.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is Question Time.

APPLICANTS FOR ADMISSION TO
GRANT-AIDED SECONDARY SCHOOLS

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 1 asked by the hon. senior member for St. Lucy.

Mr. TUDOR: To enquire of the Hon. Minister of Education:

Will the Minister state the total number of applications made for entrance into all the grant-aided schools in the current academic year?

2. Will the Minister further state what percentage of these were unsuccessful?

Hon. L. St.A. THORNE: Mr. Speaker, the reply is as follows:-

1. The number of applicants for admission to the grant-aided schools for the academic year 1960-61 was 1,782. These applicants made a total of 2,791 applications as a number of them applied for entrance to more than one school.

2. The number of admissions to these schools was 582, 67.5% did not satisfy the examination pass requirements and were therefore, in that sense, unsuccessful.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, as the Hon. Minister stated that of the total percentage of applications placed in grant-aided secondary schools 67.5% were unsuccessful, does he not think that figure too high? Can he say what, in the view of the Department, is responsible for that?

Hon. L. St.A. THORNE: I do not know what is the view of the Department. This is my own view: The schools do not take a common test to decide Part II of the Entrance Examination, so it is very difficult to measure common standards of attainment.

Mr. TUDOR: Is it the intention of the Government to implement a common entrance examination to obviate this large number of failures?

Hon. L. St.A. THORNE: That is Government's intention as soon as it is possible.

REMITTANCE OF EXAMINATION FEES.

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 20, asked by the hon. senior member for St. Lucy.

Mr. TUDOR: To enquire of the Hon. Minister of Education:

"Will the Minister state whether it is Government's intention to remit the Examination Fees paid in by those pupils of Private Secondary Schools who have been successful in the recent G.C.E. Examinations?

2. If the answer is "yes", will the Minister state how soon will this be done?"
2.35 p.m.

Hon. L. St.A. THORNE: Mr. Speaker, the reply to the hon. member's question is as follows:-

The circumstances under which Examination Fees paid by private pupils taking G.C.E. (or other) Examinations may be remitted are now under consideration.

Should it be agreed that such refunds be made, they would commence with the Examinations following the date of such a decision.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that, from the Minister's reply, it appears that the Government is considering this matter, why does the Minister say that the remittance of such fees will be made as from the date of the decision? Why not remit these fees as from the date of the last examination?

Hon. L. St.A. THORNE: The answer to that question is that the remittance of these fees must begin from somewhere. The hon. member could well ask that all the fees be remitted. I feel that the starting point should be from the examination following the date of such a decision.

Mr. TUDOR: Does the Minister not see that equal hardship has been caused to persons who have just sat and passed examinations, as well as those who are now to sit? Since some people are taking examinations, why can't the Minister make the refund of these fees retroactive?

Hon. L. St.A. THORNE: In order to make the refund of such fees retroactive, and to try to be fair, it would have to be retroactive in connection with those pupils who took the examinations previous to the decision being taken to refund the fees. In my opinion, the refund of these fees should be retroactive from the time when the fees were paid for these examinations.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Will the Minister please state how long the Government has been considering this matter?

Hon. L. St.A. THORNE: This matter was under consideration in connection with the whole question of private schools. The hon. member will remember that there has been a survey of these schools conducted; and we are prepared to come to the House with all our decisions at one and the same time.

Mr. CRAWFORD: When does the Minister think he will finally decide whether or not this proposal should be implemented? He must have some idea in his mind as to that; he cannot go on considering it forever.

Hon. L. St.A. THORNE: I can only say that the proposal will be implemented as soon as the decision has been reached. I cannot say how long it will take.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Will the Minister tell us then what are the obstacles in the way of reaching an early decision?

Hon. L. St.A. THORNE: I thought I made the point abundantly clear. The question of the treatment of private secondary schools is under consideration, and when the decision is reached in connection with the treatment of these schools, recommendations will be brought down to the House in connection with all these schools at one and the same time.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Is the Minister aware that the phrase "under consideration" is a pet phrase which is used by a lazy, indifferent Government in order to put something in cold storage indefinitely? Does he consider that the phrase is one which we hear

Mr. SPEAKER: That is a speech; that is not a supplementary question.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Is the Minister aware that in the present context, the phrase "under consideration" signifies almost nothing?

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not a supplementary question.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Is the Minister aware that merely to say that something is under consideration gives the House absolutely no precise idea.....

Mr. SPEAKER: That is again not a supplementary question.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Neither am I finished yet. Does the Minister agree that the phrase "under consideration" may mean.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid that I will have to pass on to another question, unless another supplementary question is coming forward.

Mr. TUDOR: In view of the fact that the fees for these successful candidates have already been paid into the Treasury, does the Minister not think that it is only a matter of giving back to these people what they have paid into the Treasury?

Hon. L. St.A. THORNE: I feel that the implication is deeper than that. If you decide to give back fees before there is any such decision, we will have to indulge in something wholesale. Unless we start from where I have suggested, I cannot see how the proposal could be implemented. My idea is that as soon as a decision is reached, all children who qualify should receive the remission of fees.

Mr. TUDOR: Can the Minister separate this problem from the general problem of private schools? This is something which cannot affect any other policy.

Hon. L. St.A. THORNE: It cannot be possible to do what the hon. member says.

Mr. TUDOR: Are we to understand that the Government agrees in principle that fees to successful candidates in private secondary schools should be remitted?

Hon. L. St.A. THORNE: As soon as that is the case, I will make such a statement.

Mr. TUDOR: When does the Minister think that will be the case?

WAGES TO JANITOR EMPLOYED AT RICHMOND SCHOOLS

Mr. SPEAKER: The next question ready to be dealt with is question No. 28, standing in the name of the senior member for St. Lucy.

Mr. TUDOR: To enquire of the Hon. Minister of Education:

Will the Minister state -

1. What wage is paid to the janitor employed at the Richmond Schools?

2. Will he also state whether such janitor or janitors are paid during vacations and what they are paid?

3. Will he further state what amounts are paid for scrubbing whenever this is done?
2.45 p.m.

Hon. L. St.A. THORNE: Mr. Speaker, the Reply is as follows:-

Four part-time Janitors, two at each school, are employed either before or after school hours to sweep at the Richmond Schools. They are paid, by the week, a total of \$55 each per term.

They are not paid during the holidays.

The amount paid for scrubbing the entire Boys' School is \$25 and the Girls' School, excluding the Domestic Science quarters, \$20. Partial scrubblings are paid for according to the number of rooms done.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, will the Minister state on what basis he arrived at the payment of \$55 per term,

presumably of thirteen weeks, as remuneration to each janitor?

Hon. L. St.A. THORNE: The basis in common use, is to calculate where small or medium sized schools are concerned, at four cents per square foot of floor space; and where we have a school of a bigger size, say, a school accommodating 700 or over pupils, a fixed sum decided on by the Department of Education is allocated. That sum of money is divided or disbursed in monthly amounts. An agreement is reached between the janitor and the head teacher of the school as regards disbursement. I presume that if the janitor wanted the money weekly, or monthly, he could get it, as well as termly.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, would the Minister say at this point what duties, other than perhaps watching at night, if that is one of them, are performed by the janitor?

Hon. L. St.A. THORNE: Mr. Speaker, as far as I know, the janitor is required to sweep the floors, dust the furniture, and in some cases tidy up the yards. There is never the obligation of doing a watchman's job.

Mr. TUDOR: I thank the Hon. Minister for that information. Now I would like to know from the Minister whether he thinks that for the duties described by him, cleaning the school and the yard, \$4.23 per week only in term is adequate remuneration.

Hon. L. St.A. THORNE: Where that matter is concerned, I am to say that I would be very glad if a greater amount of money could be paid. The matter of an increase in pay is being dealt with by my Ministry. I have a faint recollection that I may have dealt with this subject and recommended an increase; but I would not be so sure. I know there has been a complaint about this small pay. It is being looked after.

Mr. TUDOR: Does the Minister think it fair for a Labour Government to pay anybody in this island \$4.23 a week? Does he think it adequate for that kind of work?

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think that the hon. member, in asking the question of the Minister, need put any adjective before the word "Government".

Mr. TUDOR: I will repeat the question. Is it fair for this Government, for that kind of work, to pay \$4.23 a week apart from the fact that they are not paid during the holidays?

Hon. L. St.A. THORNE: Where this matter of non-payment during holidays is concerned, as far as I know these people are not expected to do any work during holiday time. With respect to whether the pay is fair or not, I would be prepared to say that any Government can only pay according to its revenue; I do not feel that anybody could work for too much money in this job.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, would the Hon. Minister explain in respect of the duties of the janitor which include the cleaning and sweeping of the building, and also of the yard, if the payment in respect of the building is 4¢ per square foot, what is the rate of payment in respect of the yard?

Hon. L. St.A. THORNE: Mr. Speaker, I do not know really what is the rate of payment for the yard. The practice varies from school to school. Not all schools, I presume, require their janitors to clean up the yard. As I said previously, this entire matter of remuneration for this sort of work is being looked after. I sincerely hope in the not too distant future that satisfactory arrangements will be arrived at, and that there will be no complaints.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, will the Minister state whether the janitor is expected to be on the premises for the entire day? I would like to know what hours he starts, what hours he has to be on the premises, as well as how many days?

Hon. L. St.A. THORNE: In giving my original answer I said these four janitors were part-time employees; and

they may be employed either before or after school hours.

Mr. TUDOR: Is the Minister in a position to say when is the last time such employees had an increase?

Hon. L. St.A. THORNE: Shortly after I entered the Ministry janitors and cleaners had a 33 1/3% increase; that is to say, when I entered the pay was at the figure of three cents per square foot. I contrived to get it up to four cents per square foot; so that the last time would be two years ago.

Mr. TUDOR: Would the Minister then further contrive to pay them during the vacation, and not only at the present rate, but at an increased rate?

Hon. L. St.A. THORNE: That is a matter for the financial department; I am not really the keeper of the purse. Where I am concerned, I would like to pay as much as possible.

Mr. TUDOR: Would the Minister then in his capacity as Minister of Education recommend to the Cabinet or the appropriate authorities substantial increases for these people and also a change in the system whereby they may be paid during the holidays? Would he be prepared to do that? 2.55 p.m.

Hon. L. St.A. THORNE: I said that the matter is being dealt with. The janitors do not work during the vacation period as far as I know.

Mr. TUDOR: Can the Hon. Minister give comparable figures for janitors similarly employed in grant-aided schools?

Hon. L. St.A. THORNE: I am afraid that I cannot.

PUBLICATION OF REPORT ON TRAINING OF TEACHERS AT ERDISTON COLLEGE

Mr. Speaker, Question No. 33 asked by the hon. senior member for St. Lucy.

Mr. TUDOR: Before I ask these questions, there is a slight change of name which should occur in the question. Instead of "Petter", it should be "Hammond."

To enquire of the Hon. Minister of Education:-
1. Will the Minister consider releasing for publication the Report of Dr. Walters and Mr. Hammond on Teacher Training at Erdiston College?

2. Will the Minister state -

(a) whether the former Principal of the College was asked to submit his views on their findings;

(b) whether he did so; and

(c) whether he (the Minister) will consider publishing these as well.

Hon. L. St.A. THORNE: Mr. Speaker, the reply is as follows:-

1. An inspection of Erdiston Training College was conducted in April, 1958 by Dr. E. Walters, Senior Lecturer of the Department of Education, University College of the West Indies, and Mr. S. A. Hammond, C.M.G., formerly Educational Adviser of Colonial Development and Welfare and at the time Government's Director of Training. In view of the following considerations: (a) that this was a routine inspection such as is undertaken periodically for administrative purposes at any educational institution; (b) that it is not normal practice to publish the report of such inspections; (c) that this inspection took place nearly three years ago and its findings therefore no longer reflect present conditions at the College, I do not propose to publish the report.

2. (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) Yes, Sir.

(c) In view of the reply to the first part of the question, this does not arise.

Mr. TUDOR: Can the Hon. Minister state whether it is true that the greater part of this review was conducted in the absence of the former Principal?

Hon. L. St.A. THORNE: I cannot say that. The Principal was then in office.

Mr. TUDOR: Can the Hon. Minister state whether it is true that the former Principal was dismissed, or his services dispensed with, by the Government around that time?

Hon. L. St.A. THORNE: Well, Sir, that does not follow this.

Mr. TUDOR: Will the Hon. Minister state why the former Principal left the College?

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not a question to be dealt with now.

Mr. TUDOR: Can the Minister state whether the former Principal was at the time present when an interview was carried on for interested persons?

Hon. L. St.A. THORNE: I do not know.

DIFFICULTIES EXPERIENCED IN THE PROCURING OF SAND

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 13 asked by the hon. senior member for St. Philip.

Mr. CRAWFORD: To enquire of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries:-

Is the Government aware of the considerable difficulties experienced by the public and the comparatively high costs involved in the procuring of sand for construction and other purposes? Will the Government take steps to acquire a number of beach spots in accessible places in order to make sand available to the general public free of cost?

Hon. D. D. GARNER: The replies are as follows:-

The Government is aware that by prohibiting the removal of sand from certain beaches under the authority of the Beach Removal Act, 1890, as amended by the 1958 Act, it has become more difficult for persons to obtain sand for construction and for other purposes but not for domestic purposes. Apart from any other reasons this limitation in the sources of supply and the increase in the haulage distance for supply to some destination will naturally tend to cause an increase in the price of sand to the purchaser.

2. Owing to the considerable building programme by the Government and by private enterprise, an excessive amount of sand is being removed from certain beaches in a very indiscriminate manner, thereby denuding some beaches of surrounding trees, and in other cases such as Foul Bay and Crane Beach both in the parish of St. Phillip, the sea has as a result undermined and even washed away part of the road. Until the removal of sand was prohibited from Silver Sands sea water was flowing freely through the land of some of the nearby residents causing damage to their crops and to their houses. Fishermen too have been complaining of the difficulties which they experience in finding suitable spots for beaching their boats especially during high tide owing to erosion caused by the removal of sand from some beaches.

3. The Government's policy is aimed at preserving the beaches of the island primarily for its inhabitants to continue to enjoy the right to a sea bath. In determining what areas should be declared prohibited areas for the removal of sand, the Government takes into consideration the best interests of the island as a whole including the build-

ing public. In the exercise of his powers the Governor-in-Executive Committee is advised by a Committee which visits the areas in question and a regular system of inspection is carried out by an inspector. The purpose of prohibiting the removal of sand from certain beaches is not to create an unnecessary hardship on the building public but to protect the island's coastline from the erosion caused by the removal of sand.

4. The Government does not propose to take steps to acquire beach spots for the purpose of making sand available to the general public free of cost for the reasons that sand is a commercial commodity in the same manner as cement and other building materials and adequate supplies are available in areas which have not been declared prohibited areas. Furthermore, if certain areas are reserved to the general public for free use, the consequent heavy demand and concentration on those areas will tend to hasten their deterioration. Sand for domestic purposes is available at all beaches free of cost.
3.05 p.m.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Is the Minister aware that, after the removal of sand was prohibited from a number of places and sand was only procurable at Foul Bay and the Crane, St. Philip, the price of sand was considerably increased by the person who owned the sand?

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I really did not hear what the hon. member said.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I will repeat it. Is the Minister aware that after the removal of sand was prohibited by the Government from areas where it was procurable before, and only made available at Foul Bay and the Crane, the owner of the sand at Foul Bay on more than one occasion considerably increased the price of the sand?

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Speaker, I do not know anything about the selling price of sand. The Crane Beach is a prohibited area now, and Foul Bay is an open area. The price which people charge for sand is no concern of ours. We have made inspections, and when one beach is used considerably, then we find an alternative. As far as the Crane is concerned, we cannot alternate that. It has been out of production for a long time.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Has the Minister received any personal complaints with regard to the inordinate and continuous increase in the price of sand from Foul Bay?

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I will repeat that we do not know anything about the price of sand.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Have complaints reached the Minister about the inordinate and continuous increase in the price of sand from Foul Bay?

Hon. D. D. GARNER: It is one thing to talk about an increase in the price of sand, but nothing has reached me officially.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Will the Minister say the precise form in which these matters should be addressed to him?

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not a supplementary question.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Will the Minister say how these matters should be addressed to him?

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not a supplementary question.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Will the Minister please state whether complaints have been made to him of the continuous and inordinate increase in the price of sand in order that, in his capacity as Minister, he should take some steps about it?

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I cannot answer that question. The matter has not yet reached me.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Is the Minister saying that no complaints have reached him with a view to his taking steps to

improve the procuring of sand at Foul Bay at cheaper prices?

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Emphatically no. If you want me to elaborate on the matter I can do so, but it will not do the hon. member any good.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Will the Minister state whether it has reached his ears that the price of sand was increased because he said it should be increased?

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minister is not answering that question apparently.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Is the Minister not replying to that question?

Mr. SPEAKER: There is no sign of it.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Will the Minister please state publicly what he means by saying that it will not do me any good?

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not a supplementary question.

Mr. CRAWFORD: That is his answer. In view of his answer will the Minister make a public statement? Let him get up and state what he means, because I will state what I mean.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is making a speech.

Mr. CRAWFORD: In view of the Minister's declaration that it will do me no good to explain, God in heaven knows what, will he state what he means by that statement?

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not a supplementary question.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Will the hon. member clarify it then? Will the hon. member please state if, as a result of his instrumentality, the price of sand at Foul Bay has been increased?

At this stage, it being 3.15 p.m. of the clock,

Mr. SPEAKER: It now being 3.15 p.m. of the clock, that is the end of Question Time.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Well, it will go on from there.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

RESOLUTION re SINGLE MEMBER CONSTITUENCIES

Mr. SPEAKER: It is now time for Private Members' Business. On the last occasion of Private Members' Business, the Hon. Leader of the House was speaking on a Resolution re Single Member Constituencies and the appointment of a Commission in respect thereto.

Hon. M. E. COX: On the last occasion when this matter was under consideration, I said that the hon. Mover has made a complete somersault on the last Resolution he brought here similar to this. In going through and noting the remarks made this Session, and the difference between the speech which the hon. member made this Session as compared with what he said in December 1960, hon. members will see that the hon. member and those who supported him, especially the hon. senior member for St. Lucy, made a farce of the whole affair. What does the hon. member say now on this Resolution? This Resolution is an invitation to the Government to avail itself of the services of some qualified person for the purpose of instituting single-member constituencies; in other words, to make it lucidly clear that the parish of St. Lucy, like every other parish or constituency in this island, provides for representation by two persons.
3.15 p.m.

The hon. member went on to say that it is unfortunate that other members of the Chamber, particularly the Ministers, do not possess memories photographic like yourself; the Resolution we discussed last Session was no different from this Resolution so far as that is concerned. This will

do nothing to interfere with the present number of members of each constituency.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member quoting from a speech made in this Session?

Hon. M. E. COX: If I remember correctly, the Rule says that you cannot quote from the official document. I am not quoting; these are notes that I made when the member spoke. This is not the official debate. You will see that I have quite a few notes, not only from what he has said, but from other members.

Mr. SPEAKER: In that case they cannot be regarded as authentic.

Hon. M. E. COX: The House has already published the speech.

Mr. SPEAKER: What the hon. member is reading cannot be regarded as authentic by the House.

Hon. M. E. COX: However, I think it is permissible for us to read from notes. He goes on to say that all this will do, is to divide each constituency into two, whether St. Lucy West and St. Lucy East, or St. James North and St. James South; and that which, perhaps, Mr. Speaker, might not find disfavour in your own eyes - the parish of St. Peter being on the one hand the town of Speightstown and on the other hand the rural area of that parish. One could not imagine anybody invading that parish of St. Peter if it was so divided. That is all that would result from the passing of this particular Resolution and the putting into operation of it. This is the most important part of it: there would be the same number for each constituency and the same total number of seats. That would have nothing to do with the retrograde move which one hears mentioned every now and again of having a nominated Speaker.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. May I say that what the hon. member is reading is, word for word - I would not say he is reading word for word - what appears in the House of Assembly Debates, Official Report, Session 1961. It may well be that he takes shorthand and that his notes correspond with those exactly of the Official Reporters and as they are printed in Hansard.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, there is absolutely no Rule against that. The Rule says you cannot quote from the Official report of the same Session.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has not mentioned any Rule yet.

Hon. M. E. COX: I am not breaking the Rules; I know them better than anybody else. I adhere to them more than any other hon. member, except the hon. member who has just sat down.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what is the point of this exercise if we are not, as the member says prepared to increase the seats, or to deprive any of the smaller parishes of the right which that parish now has? Have we got money to throw away there? That money could be better spent to improve the lot of the people of this island. If, as the member says, we are not going to increase the number of seats, we are not prepared to take away from these parishes now which have two seats, but are going to give them back the same two seats, what is the point of having single member constituencies?

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, on a point of explanation. When the Hon. Leader of the House says that we are not prepared, that is not correct. I said that so far as the particular Resolution is concerned, it makes no mention of increasing the number of representatives. The Resolution does not say that we are not prepared to increase the number of seats; but it does not speak of increasing the number of seats.

Hon. M. E. COX: Must I understand then that the speech which the member made is contrary to the purport of the Resolution?

Mr. BRANCKER: On a point of order. The speech is in support of the Resolution. The speech explains that the Resolution says nothing about increasing the number of seats.

Hon. M. E. COX: We have to accept the speech as proposing the intent and purpose of the Resolution. I think I am correct in interpreting it that way; I think my concept is right of the speech *vis-a-vis* the Resolution. If he says that the Resolution has nothing to do with increasing the seats or depriving any other parish out of the present representation which it now has, what conclusion must I come to? Surely the speech has to indicate the purpose of the Resolution. Is he saying that the Resolution is one thing and the speech is another? He tells us in no uncertain manner that there is absolutely no intention so far as he is concerned, of depriving St. Lucy of two seats. Further on he said in his speech that he would fight to see that St. Lucy maintains its two seats although, as the other hon. member for St. Lucy said last week, St. Lucy only has below 5,000 votes.

Mr. Speaker, what I am trying to say is this: It is a different speech altogether; and a complete reverse of what he said in December last year when he was piloting a similar Resolution through this House. I remember well, and the hon. member for St. Lucy made it clear, that by re-aligning these boundaries, you would have some of St. Peter and some of St. Andrew coming into one constituency. What does that mean? Does it mean that, although you bring in these three parishes into one constituency, you would have each parish which is brought in with two seats each? That is nonsense.

The hon. member further made the point that there was no question of increasing the seats in the island; but he said it was not fair for St. Michael to send two representatives on 30,000 votes and St. Lucy to send two representatives on 5,000 votes. I am not ashamed, or afraid of saying, that this was hatched by the Conservatives of this island: they have said on several occasions on public platforms, and in this House, that their trade is not represented in this House. The *Advocate*, the mouthpiece of the Conservative Party in Barbados, has on several occasions put forward that in support of single member constituencies and that sort of thing.
3.25 p.m.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us deal with what the hon. member for St. Lucy said about the inadequacy of the representation. One of the things which the hon. member lost sight of is the fact that, when a member is elected to this House, the member is no longer a parochial politician; a member is elected as a member of the General Assembly representing the country.

That was in practice many years ago, since 1639. After 1843, the City of Bridgetown was taken off from St. Michael, and two members were elected to represent the City, and they made up the twenty-four members of the Assembly. It was divided like that as a means of convenience; but when a member is elected to this House, he is elected as a member of the General Assembly representing the island of Barbados and not St. Lucy, St. Andrew, St. Peter or as the case may be. You do not have parochial politics in the House; you deal with the country as a whole.

Every now and then, questions are asked by hon. members about water and such things in their constituencies. Not long ago, the hon. senior member for St. Lucy asked questions about water in Richmond. If he was not a member of the Assembly, he would not have any right to ask that question. Quite recently, the hon. member asked the Hon. Minister of Education about the erection of a school in Delamere Land. When we had the hurricane in 1955 - I do not know if it was because the people of St. Lucy were not stricken as the people of St. Michael....

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Why is the Hon. Minister misinterpreting me? The very question which I have put shows that I have the concept that I represent the whole island.

Hon. M. E. COX: I know that the hon. member understands it that way; but he wants the people to know that he

knows - but he is not prepared to let them know what they should know.

Mr. TUDOR: I rise on a further point of order. I did not rise to say that I misunderstood what he was saying; I rose to let him understand that he is arguing against himself.

Hon. M. E. COX: That is not a point of order. So well does the hon. member understand, as I was saying, he went up to the St. Michael's Girls' School on the occasion of the hurricane and did very good service, in so far as preparing meals for the people who were sheltering there. I also understand that he did a similar thing at another place for people who were housed in the Ministerial Buildings. I was also made to understand that the meals served there were not up to the standard of those which he is famous for preparing.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Will the Hon. Minister repeat what he said both in substance and purpose? The Hon. Minister said something about my going to the Ministerial Buildings and St. Michael's Girls' School.

Hon. M. E. COX: I said during the hurricane of 1955. During that time I was moving around myself, and I must confess that I did not have the time, neither am I competent, to be an expert in preparing meals. I heard of what the hon. member did; and indeed I welcome it; and that shows in no uncertain manner that the hon. member realises and appreciates that he was not only representing St. Lucy but also St. Michael and other parts of the island. If that is so, why all this talk about confining yourselves to St. Lucy, as though you could not pass the boundary of St. Lucy?

The hon. member said that here is St. Michael with 10,000 or 12,000 voters, and he has only 5,000 down there; and that is putting St. Lucy at an advantage over St. Michael because the value of the vote in St. Lucy is more than that in St. Michael. The hon. member went on and quoted from Professor Sir Ivor Jennings from which, as you will remember, I also quoted last week. I have it here, and I will give the Hon. House the quotation to see what was said by Lord Morley on this question of one vote, one man.

I shall quote from Sir Ivor Jennings, but, before doing so, this is what the hon. member read from Jennings:-

"If the Colonel's lady and Judy O'Grady were sisters under the skin each ought to have one vote: but until 1948 some people had two votes, though in different constituencies.

"Moreover, the idea of political equality necessarily implied that each vote should have the same value. If Bath and Bristol, Lancashire and Rutlandshire, each had two seats, the votes were obviously of unequal value. If there were four times as many electors in Bristol as there were in Bath, each vote in Bath was worth four times as much as a vote in Bristol. The idea of the representation of communities had therefore to disappear. The largest counties and boroughs had to be divided into single-member constituencies.

3.35 p.m.

"This process was begun in 1885 but it was not completed until 1948. Since then the principle of 'one man - or woman - one vote, one value' has been carried out almost - though not completely - logically."

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to labour that point because I know that the hon. member knows it. As long as he is satisfied that the people, some of them who listen to him being gullible no doubt, know that he knows, he is not prepared to let them know what they should know. I have taken the trouble to follow the modern political trend and with your permission, Mr. Speaker, I want to quote from this authority, Mr. C. F. Strong. Before I quote Mr. Strong, I would like to refer to what he says in the preface to his book so as to convince the House that this authority is as good as any to be found in any part of the world dealing with the question of Constitutional History. There is a man whose

name is Maitland who was regarded as the greatest constitutional historian of his time. This is what Mr. Strong said:-

"My debt to the earlier giants of Political Science - Dicey, Maitland, Sidgwick, Lowell, Bryce, and the rest - will be apparent throughout to those who know anything of their superb writings..."

A little further in his last paragraph, this is what he says:-

"The responsibility for any weaknesses and shortcomings in the book is wholly mine; yet I cannot refrain from recording my thanks to my friends and colleagues who have helped me in the preparation of the various editions, and especially to the late Professor F. C. J. Hearnshaw, the late Philip Guedalla, and Professor H. J. Laski, all of whom placed their unrivalled knowledge and experience ungrudgingly at my disposal when the book was first in the making; to Professor Herman Finer, who read and criticised the Introduction to the second edition; to Mr. W. J. Bennett, formerly Director of Public Libraries in Tottenham, and to his successor, Mr. A. W. McClellan, for their generous help with books...."

Everybody will agree that Laski, Bryce and all of these people were great authorities on constitutional history. I would like the House to bear with me because this is a long quotation, and I intend to read every word of it. This is what Mr. C. F. Strong says on the question of the single member constituencies:-

"From the point of view of electoral problems, states are again divisible into two classes according to the type of electoral area or constituency that they possess. The constituency in a modern constitutional state is arranged so that it returns either one or several members. Generally speaking, when representative democracy was in its infancy, the normal constituency arrangement was the division of a country into a number of electoral areas, urban and rural, each returning a single member. But this territorial division was a mere convenience, and with a rapidly fluctuating relationship of population to district, constant redistribution of seats was necessary. In an expanding industrial epoch, however, it was not possible in most cases thereby to keep pace with the never-ceasing increases and variations of the population. Nor was this the only objection to this flat system of territorial division into single-member constituencies. A second, and even more urgent, problem was that of securing a system of voting which should result in the elected representatives forming an Assembly that should adequately reflect the balance of opinion in the electorate.

The system of single-member constituencies is the one in force in Great Britain and the United States. In all constituencies, except one or two, in Great Britain one member is returned and in no constituency are more than two returned. All re-distribution Acts have perpetuated this system. The House of Commons at the election of December, 1910, for example, was elected in 643 constituencies, of which only twenty-seven (including three of the University constituencies) returned two members. The Representation of the People Acts of 1918 and 1928 did nothing fundamentally to change this situation, though the Representation of the People Bill of 1948 proposed the abolition of the University seats and all other remnants of plural voting. In the United States all constituencies for both Senate and House of Representatives are single-member constituencies. It is in these two countries, therefore, that constituency reform has been most urgently advocated, for it cannot be said that in either case the electoral system has achieved the end of the adequate representation of the views of the electorate.

It has, on the contrary, led to the most glaring anomalies, at any rate in Britain, for thereby it is not even assured that the majority party in the country will gain a majority in the House of Commons, while a very large minority may be quite inadequately represented there. At the General Election of 1922, for example, the Conservatives won 296 seats with 5,381,433 votes, the Labour Party 138 seats with 4,237,490 votes, and the Liberals 53 seats with 2,621,168 votes. This means that the Conservatives polled only 18,180 votes per seat, the Labour Party 30,706

votes per seat, and the Liberals as many as 48,540 votes per seat....."

I pause here to ask the hon. member where is this equality of voting, or equal value of the vote about which he talks?

Mr. TUDOR: On a point of explanation. The hon. member seems to be misinterpreting my speech.
3.45 p.m.

I rose to say that the strictures which appear in the quotation he is making on the electoral system in Great Britain are not strictures on single member constituencies; these are strictures on the system of distribution of seats; a different thing altogether.

Hon. M. E. COX: I will deal with that later. On the last occasion when they spoke about proportional representation, I heard the hon. member say.....

Mr. TUDOR: That has nothing at all to do with what we are discussing; it is a different thing altogether.

Hon. M. E. COX: I am definitely sure that a member of the Opposition referred to proportional representation on the last occasion. This is what Mr. Strong goes on to say:

"Again at the General Election of 1924 the Unionists won 382 seats with 7,450,990 votes or 19,505 per seat, the Labour Party secured 142 seats with 5,483,088 votes or 38,613 votes a seat."

This, Mr. Speaker, is dealing with single member constituencies. The quotation is from page 171, Part 5 "Single Member Constituencies" as obtain and exist in Great Britain and in the United States of America. I do not know if the hon. member wants to change these great and renowned authors, and reduce them to his own thinking; but I am sure that people who happen to read anything about political history will know that these are people who, compared with the member, are like jets to people with donkey carts.

Now, Sir, this is what he goes on to say:

"The Liberals obtained 34 seats with 3,008,097 votes or 88,473 votes per seat. At the same election, in seven counties of Southern England the Unionists secured 84 seats with 1,456,702 votes, the Liberals one seat with 445,726, and the Labour Party no seats, though actually polling more votes than the Liberals, viz. 483,873. In Scotland at this election the Unionists (36 seats) secured ten more seats than the Labour Party (26 seats) while actually polling 8,755 votes less than the Labour Party. (Unionists had 688,298; Labour 697,053.) Further to illustrate the chaos of electoral chances under the existing system, we may add that while at the election of 1923 in Manchester the Unionists secured one seat with 104,027 votes, at the election of 1924 they obtained six seats with 136,195 votes, and the Liberals having in 1923 won five seats with 71,141 votes, secured not a single seat in 1924 with 50,350 votes."

Now we go a little further. "In the General Election of 1935 in the United Kingdom, the Government supporters polled 11,570,179 votes against a total opposition vote of 9,930,460, and yet the number of seats secured by the Government was 428, while those secured by the Opposition numbered 184. In other words, though the Opposition polled over 80% of the number of votes polled by the Government, they secured only 30% of the seats. The result of the election was that the Government had one member for every 27,000 votes cast for them, the Labour Party one for every 53,000 votes, while the Liberal Party had only one member for every 85,000 seats. In the election of 1945 the Liberals obtained only eleven seats with two and a quarter million votes, while the Liberal Nationals won 13 seats with only 750,000 votes. Labour gained 392 seats with 12 million votes and the Conservatives gained 189 seats with 8 1/2 million votes. In other words, the Conservative vote was more than two-thirds of Labour's yet they gained less than half the number of seats gained by Labour.

From the United States come similar illustrations of the shortcomings of the one-member constituency system. For example, at the Congressional Election of 1924 the Republicans in the State of Pennsylvania secured the whole of the 36 seats with a total poll of 1,322,070, while the Democratic Party with 481,400 votes secured no representation whatever in the House of Representatives. In the eight New England States, again, the Republican Party secured 28 Congressional seats with 1,330,585 votes, whereas the Democrats obtained only four seats with 804,473 votes. At the same Election, eleven Southern States (the "Solid South") returned 76 Democratic Congressmen with 1,144,007 votes, while not a single Republican was returned, though that party's total vote reached 336,076."

These are the countries that had elections under single member constituencies for all the years.

"In the Elections of 1938 in the United States for the Seventy-Sixth Congress the Democrats secured 262 seats and the Republicans 170 seats in a House of Representatives with a total of 435 seats. Thus over the whole Union, the Republicans secured only 39% of the seats. Yet in 24 (mostly Northern) of the 48 States they scored 51 percent of the total votes cast. Again at the Congressional Election of 1944, the Democrats secured 243 seats with slightly less than 23 million votes and the Republicans only 190 seats with slightly more than 21 million votes. In other words, the Republican aggregate vote was nearly equal to that of the Democrats yet they secured only 43 percent of the seats.

All the parties in both countries are alive to the injustices of this system, but how they are to be overcome is a moot question."
3.55 p.m.

Mr. Strong goes on to talk of a Royal Commission on Electoral Commission which sat in 1909-1910, but the only positive recommendation for change made was not adopted. Then the chapter goes on to deal with multi-member constituencies. He quoted France and all those places to show that there is no guaranteeing that, under single member constituencies, there is equal value of the vote — as the hon. member trotted out just now. I gathered from what the hon. member said that Jennings said that it was foolproof. The hon. member said: "This process was begun in 1885 but it was not completed until 1948. Since then the principle of "one man — or woman — one vote, one value" has been carried out almost — though not completely — logically."

When the hon. member talks about equality and the equal value of a vote, one would have thought he had proof for what he says; and when he referred to Great Britain, the place which this thing has been practised for all these years and so on, one would have thought that Great Britain had had a foolproof system. The contrary is true, and you can see that from what this gentleman has written; I am sure that the hon. member is not going to dispute what this gentleman has written.

Mr. TUDOR: I have interpreted it differently. The inference is not as the Minister puts it.

Mr. SPEAKER: This is no.....

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The Hon. Minister is continuing to misinterpret my point of view with the quotation which he has made. What he has quoted was not meant by me to be taken as an argument against single-member constituencies; it was meant to show the difficulty of the proper distribution of seats.

Hon. M. E. COX: The hon. member knows that one of the highest authorities on the subject is Sir Ivor Jennings. I have also quoted Sir Ivor Jennings; have pointed out that one vote, one man, is not in reference to single-member constituencies. The hon. member's concept is not in keeping with the concept of those persons who write on constitutional matters. The hon. member is misleading the people.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I must take objection to that remark. Why should I be misleading the people?

Hon. M. E. COX: Last week, I quoted from Jennings; from page 179. This is what the last paragraph states:

"Lord Morley's account is said to have been the work of Mr. Gladstone though in Cabinet all its members stand on an equal footing, speak with equal voice and on the rare occasions, when a division is taken, are counted on the fraternal principle of one man one vote."

I was told that I should not quote South Africa by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition last week, when I said that the Commonwealth Socialist Government Review, No. 4, 1960, pointed out that in South Africa, Dr. Steytler said that his party did not subscribe to the doctrine of one man, one vote. Dr. Steytler is a Member of Parliament and he does not subscribe to that; and, as hon. members know, South Africa has for many years been divided into single-member constituencies. To show what he does mean, Dr. Steytler says: "I believe that every responsible person should be permitted to take part in the Government of the country." Dr. Steytler does not believe that every individual who reaches the age of 21 years and is no idiot, and is not suffering from other things, should have a right to vote. He further says that if you are a responsible person — and I do not know what interpretation to put on responsibility as he says it; I know what interpretation they put — you should have the right to take part in the Government of the country.

How do you square this one man, one vote, with the statement which is made by the Leader of the Opposition in the South African Government, and by what was said of it by Sir Ivor Jennings and all those people? I believe the hon. senior member for St. Lucy knows better than to say that it means what he says; but he believes that there are a lot of people to whom he can tell that nonsense. The hon. member had the opportunity of getting a good education; and the danger rests whereby when an individual having had the opportunity of getting a good education, says a thing, the people will generally say that since he says it he is right. It is just the same as what the only daily newspaper of this country does. Because the people believe that he knows, they accept what the individual says as correct; whereas, in many cases, the individual who passes on this information or makes these expressions from time to time, may do so to deceive those who do not have any better understanding.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I must object to the remarks of the Hon. Minister. It is difficult to answer him, or even to insist that he be accurate. Why does he infer that my point of view is an attempt to mislead and confuse the people, but that his point of view is not an attempt to mislead and confuse? That is what I object to.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I do not claim to have had the opportunity of as good an education as the hon. member. This is my policy.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Are you dealing with the hon. member, or the substance of the Resolution?

Hon. M. E. COX: Sir, what little I know, I will pass it on unstintingly to those who do not know and those who know.
4.05 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, there are many instances which I could quote in order to convince the House that, in so far as this question of single member constituencies is concerned, it has nothing to do with the question of one man, one vote. The principle established is the equality of persons in so far as the voting is concerned; it means that if Mr. "X", however wealthy he may be, has the right to one hundred votes, then Mr. "Y", however poverty stricken he may be, has the right to the same hundred votes.

As I said on the last occasion last year, I accuse the hon. member who brought down this Resolution of doing something which has for its object the deprivation of the rights of people especially those in the country districts, which rights they have enjoyed for many years. I am not ashamed or afraid of saying that; I know that for a long time

the Conservatives of this island have been clamouring for an extension of the number of seats in the St. Michael and the metropolitan areas without any increase in any other places. What they were saying is that we should re-align boundaries and thereby, inasmuch as St. Michael has two-fifths of the population, we should give that constituency two-fifths of the seats. As I have said on several occasions, it does not matter to me whether there are single-member or dual-member constituencies; I feel that I will still get a seat in this House.

Here you have people in the country for all of these years having the right to send two representatives to this House of Assembly, and by one stroke of the pen, without even putting the matter to the people, you come into this House and say, on the eve of an Election: "Let us have single-member constituencies; let us have Mr. 'X' to come to Barbados immediately and delimit these boundaries so as to provide for a redistribution of seats".

I have great regard and appreciation for the work done by the people in the early days. It was the people in the country, the people in St. Joseph, who gave us the man, however much people may abuse him at this stage, who is responsible for the complete political, social and economic transformation of this colony. All the people in this island know that that is true. Not many of the people who represent the country areas today could ever win a seat in this metropolitan area; they would go to the country areas first if they wanted to come into this House. They would go to areas like St. Philip, St. John, St. Joseph and St. Lucy; they never thought of getting a seat in the metropolitan area. It was the barefooted man who wears a pants in which you do not know which was the original bit of cloth, who supported this Socialist cause.

This proposal to have single-member constituencies was a stab in the back; it was a sinister move in order to deprive these people out of the rights and privileges which they had for all of these years. When the hon. junior member for St. Lucy first came out from England as a Barrister, he went to the parish of St. Lucy in order to get a seat in this House, and the father of the hon. senior member for St. Lucy also went to that parish when he wanted a seat in this House; he would not dare come forward in the parish of St. Michael. Now, today, in respect of the very people who have laid the foundation and who are responsible for that glimmer of hope and transformation in so far as the rights and privileges of all of us are concerned, hon. members over there are saying that we should deprive these people of those rights and give them to the people of this area. I would be the last person to sit here and support any such thing.

What is wrong with this system? I am told that in modern days there are places which have single-member constituencies and therefore we should have single-member constituencies. If they have done that, nothing has gone wrong. When you talk about 30,000 electors in St. Michael and compare them with 5,000 in St. Lucy, if you talk about the equal value of the vote, what about our being in a Federation today?

In Jamaica, there are over one and a half million people, and how many people represent them in the House of Representatives? Forty-five seats to represent a million and a half people. In Barbados, you have not even got one quarter of a million people and you have twenty-four seats. In Trinidad, you have approximately 900,000 people and the last constitutional improvement is for thirty-two seats. They have almost three times as many people as we have in Barbados; and we are all in the Federation.
4.15 p.m.

There is no criterion, or no hard and fast rule, laid down that there should be so many electors or persons per representative. What did we do on the occasion of Federal Elections in Barbados? We made the whole island, in so far as it applies to the Federal Elections, one constituency. All the people of Barbados who had had the right to vote could have voted for five people at a time. What harm has it done? Is it not more democratic to allow all the people of

the island to vote for the five people whom we were sending to the Federal Parliament to represent Barbados, than to say cut off part of St. George and have a member there, or cut off part of St. Philip and have another member there?

Ask the hon. member what used to happen in France before. The whole island had an opportunity to vote for the representatives they wanted to go to the Federal Parliament. What was wrong with that? All that was wrong is that neither of them on that side had an opportunity to be elected, or the people never elected them. As a matter of fact, one of them ran last. It showed that the island as a whole did not want them.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not pertinent to the Resolution.

Hon. M. E. COX: Oh yes, Sir.

Mr. TUDOR: On a point of order. I would like to correct the hon. member. It showed, if it showed anything at all, that the island did not vote under their system.

Hon. M. E. COX: I do not know what he means by "under their system". The hon. member for Christ Church will forgive me if I say that, even in his own parish, he ran last.

Mr. TALMA: On a point of explanation. That is untrue. In my own parish, I came fourth. The Hon. Premier was first, Mrs. Daysh was second, Mr. Walcott was third, and I was fourth. If the hon. member is trying to say something, he does not know how to say it.

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER took the Chair.

Hon. M. E. COX: I will check on the figures again, but what the hon. member got up to tell me is that he did not run last in Christ Church; he ran fourth in Christ Church, but last in the whole election.

Mr. TALMA: I thought the hon. member knew what he had asked. He said that in my own parish I ran last. I ran fourth. All the arguments adduced simply prove that in the first place he made out a case for a greater number of seats in certain places. To suggest that the whole island, from the chapters he has read, should vote for five persons is not at all democratic or convenient; it debars a poor candidate from canvassing island-wide in order to put forward his claims. A poor candidate loses and a rich man wins.

Hon. M. E. COX: I am sure, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the member will appreciate that the members in the Labour Party are or were not rich; and yet our candidates won.

Mr. TALMA: On a further point of explanation. Inasmuch as he has asked me what percentage of the electorate voted at the Federal Election, I would tell him that people showed no interest whatever. It was the capitalists who voted.

Hon. M. E. COX: If ten percent voted, they voted for the Labour Party. If one hundred percent voted, it was the same thing. Whoever voted returned a Labour Party majority. We lost one seat in five.

Mr. TALMA: On a point of explanation. The results of the election showed that the capitalists of this island had a certain amount of confidence in the Labour Party; so the capitalists' votes sent their group to the Federal Parliament.

Hon. M. E. COX: I am sure I can handle that... What I am saying, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is that there is no criterion that there should be so many electors to a representative in Parliament; whatever is fixed is fixed arbitrarily. Every territory has fixed its constitutional set-up, in so far as the number of persons voting in the areas, arbitrarily. Let us take Great Britain which the hon. senior member for St. Peter and the Hon. Leader of the Opposition know very well. What happened in the City of London when you talk about one vote, one value, one man? 70,000 electors elected one man as against an average of between

40,000 or 50,000 in other constituencies. In Barbados 30,000 people elected two members, and in Trinidad I think under the new Constitution 12,000 electors are to elect one person to the House. Wherever you go you will find that there is a different system obtaining. Electoral lists vary from territory to territory. So when you come here and try to make out that we are depriving people out of something, that we are not falling in line with modern days, and that we are afraid of having single member constituencies, that is the height of nonsense.

When we first came to this House in 1944, we had seven seats, another Party had nine seats, and the third Party had eight seats. At the following elections we had nine seats, another Party had eight seats and another Party had seven seats. In 1948 we had twelve seats and the rest of seats were divided between the other Parties; so indications have always been that, as we went on from time to time, we got more seats. What should we be afraid of? We are not afraid of anything.

4.25 p.m.

We can see no tangible benefit for the people of this island by changing this system. This system has worked satisfactorily; there is nothing wrong with it; and you have not proven to us that something is wrong with it. We can say that there are many other things in which we are unique, and with which we have not fallen into line; why then should we fall in line with this when we do not believe that it is in the interest of the community?

Sir, I will have to resume speaking on the next occasion of Private Members' Business because I have not yet dealt with the speech made by the hon. senior member for St. Peter. I have quite a lot to say on what he has said. I will not attempt to start on what he has said, because I cannot finish today.

I would like to say again, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that it is the result of the clamour made by the Conservatives that this motion is before this House. I am so convinced in my own mind. I am sure that the public is also so convinced; and if they were not convinced, they would be bound to be convinced when they read all the trappings in connection with this motion, long before the motion was before the House, in the *Advocate* which is the mouthpiece of the Conservatives and the handful of wealthy people of this island, and which does not represent the views of the masses of this country. Every now and again, the leader-writer at the *Advocate* talks of single-member constituencies, but at the same time, the two hon. members who have moved and seconded this Resolution, will have me to believe that it is hatched out of their fertile brains.

RESUMPTION OF GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is now 4.30 o'clock. This House reverts to Government Business.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND IN SPEIGHTSTOWN

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: On the suspension, the hon. junior member for St. Andrew was speaking.

Mr. CORBIN: When the House adjourned I was speaking on the Resolution to acquire land at Speightstown for the purpose of housing and for use as a Community Playing Field. I was saying that I did not see the reason why the Government should not acquire the land on which the people's houses were, so as to allow them to remain there.

The Government has power today to allow people from the outside world to come here and purchase land, and I do not see the reason why the present Government cannot now acquire the very land on which these people are living; they have the Labour Welfare Fund from which they can purchase such land. It means that if you do not purchase this land these people will have to remove their houses from the front of the road and live in the back; and by so doing, you would allow strangers to come here and live in the

front. Let this Government prove its power and show the people that they believe in fairness for both black and white. Let us see what you are going to do with these poor people at Heywoods. I say to let the people remain there. If you fail to acquire that land for these poor people, it is not a fair deal for the community at all.

Sandy Lane Estate was sold. Heywoods is to be sold now - if it is not sold already to people from outside. I have met people who lived at Hometown and they have told me that they lived along there for 50 and 60 years, but because Sandy Lane was sold for hotel purposes they had to be removed from there. Perhaps they have been removed to some far away place, may be down in a gully.

Sir, all these things are not fair to the community. Now, these poor people of St. Peter are driven from the main road to go and live in the back. They are leaving the front so as to give foreigners all the facilities which you get from living on the front road. These poor people have helped to build up the colony of Barbados and they have a right to possess some of the facilities of the country. I have already warned the Government not to sell estates to people of foreign countries. Barbados is a small place, and if that sort of thing continues, we soon will have nowhere to put our people. That is detrimental to this country and to this community.

I hope that one of these days this Government will have the power - they do not seem to have it now - to place houses alongside the road for poor people. I repeat that it is unfair to move these people now from the front to the back. I can see with the hon. senior member for St. Peter when he says that they have the right to live on the same land on which they have been living for years.

I hope, Sir, that in time to come that the whole lot of people of this island would see differently. As far as I can see it, later on, I do not think that you will have a place open for them to go on the beach. Let the people see that you are not unfair, and then we will say that you are working on their behalf. Let your work praise you. Help the poor as well as you help the rich.
4.35 p.m.

This Government can stop any man from coming in here and purchasing land, and they can acquire land in any part of Barbados. They should let the people have the benefit of the land. If you exercise your power we will know that the people will be in your favour, otherwise they will be against you.

Mr. STRAUGHN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am sorry that the hon. senior member for St. Peter is not here because I am speaking relative to the reference which he made to me in the previous debate which took place in 1959. His remarks are partly wrong as usual; I took part in the debate, and it was in connection with a Resolution which the hon. member had tabled saying that Forde's pasture was not a suitable place for this purpose.

I did not attempt to compare Forde's with Heywoods; I was saying that the Government Scheme for developing Forde's could be a creditable one. As a matter of fact, I was intrigued when an hon. member said that he could handle Forde's.

The Resolution which the hon. member for St. Peter had in his name was saying that Forde's was unsuitable; and I was submitting that, with the plan which the Government had for the development of the area, it would be an extension of the City. The complete picture of Speightstown would have been changed according to the plan which was adumbrated to us in this House. Forde's could have been developed along the lines which the Government was showing, and I was speaking against the tenor of the Resolution when the hon. member was saying that Forde's was not the correct place to be acquired.

When I was in the Social Welfare Department, we thought that places like Gibbes and Heywoods were wonderful places, and that they should be developed along cer-

tain lines; but if a plan is there for development of Forde's, it does not mean that Forde's is not a suitable place for anything to be carried out according to development. I want to say that reassurance has been given to this Government time and time again that the seashore land would not be changed, except for the better, from what it is now and it would be within access to the general public. If you are talking about the drive along Heywoods Beach and you have the assurance that there is complete general access as far as Heywoods is concerned, I do not see why heavy weather was made about that. I was drawn into the debate because of the reference which was incorrect although it might not have been made mischievously.

As far as the beaches and beach lands for the public are concerned, I will remember that the first speech I made in this Chamber was on the Beach Protection Bill, which was brought down by the Hon. Minister of Agriculture. There are two hon. members who are colleagues of mine in the Northern Council and they know the strong representations which I made with the Town and Country Planning Officer as far as access to the beaches on the Western coast is concerned. Those are some of my strongest feelings pertaining to land development and the acquisition of beach lands in Barbados. I am sorry that the hon. senior member for St. Peter was not here to hear what I said, but he reads the debates, and so he will be able to read the correction which I made. His reference on the last occasion to Gibbes and Heywoods as compared with Forde's is an incorrect one.

Mr. TALMA: This Resolution which is before us now is different from the one which we passed earlier today, in that it clearly sets out what land is being acquired. It is well known that the Sandy Lane scheme has been established; rumour has it that there is a similar scheme for Heywoods; that is to say, that Heywoods has been sold for the establishment of a scheme somewhat similar to the Sandy Lane Factory with all the concomitant factors, the diversion of the road and so on. If a similar scheme has been agreed to by the Government, well then why not tell us so? It may be possible to see the reason for removing the present tenants of Heywoods plantation.

If it is the case that Heywoods plantation has been sold and the object of the purchase of Forde's is to resite the houses which are at present sited at Heywoods plantation, then we could probably see the object of this compulsory purchase. It is well known that the price of the front land would be more expensive than that of the back land. If it is that the owner of Heywoods has made an offer of the land, on which the workers' houses are at present sited, to the Government and the Government did not see fit to buy it for one reason or another, then that is a different matter.

The people of Barbados, and the residents of Speightstown in particular, are deserving of even better treatment than the purchase of a pasture or back land for resiting their houses. There are many houses sited all along the main road at Heywoods, and the people are granted free and easy access to the beach at Heywoods; and not only the residents of Speightstown but of the island as a whole.
4.45 p.m.

So while Government is coming down with this Resolution for the compulsory acquisition of thirteen acres, three roods, three perches of back land, which is Forde's Pasture, and described in the Resolution this way: "Resolved that the House of Assembly approve of the compulsory acquisition by the Governor-in-Executive Committee of all that certain parcel of land situate in the parish of Saint Peter known as Forde's Pasture containing thirteen acres, three roods, three perches or thereabouts, abutting and bounding on the lands of sundry small owners on two sides of Heywoods Plantation and on a road-in-common called the Major's Walk or however else the same is abutting and bounding, the property of Mr. Percy Whitehead," there is no mention there made of seashore. That means that Forde's pasture does not abut on the seashore.

If the Minister in question had the interest of the residents of Speightstown in general and of Heywoods at present

in particular at heart, he would see to it that an adequate portion of beach land was included in this Resolution in order to maintain and retain free and easy access to the sea. If on the other hand the residents of Heywoods Plantation - I speak of the small owners - have been denied the privilege of getting access to the sea, then this Resolution is not complete; and on that basis I may be tempted to vote against it. If I vote against it, I will give you my reasons for so doing.

I could not vote against the people of St. Peter having a playing field and a housing scheme; but in giving them those facilities, you should see that they retain an adequate portion of land to have free access to the sea which they at present enjoy. Unless you give the assurance that you will do that, the Resolution is not complete; the interests of the taxpayers of St. Peter have not been protected; the interests of the residents of Barbados as a whole have been shunted to allow virtual foreigners or strangers to be granted all the facilities and amenities which Barbados provides.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I certainly did not want to be drawn into this debate, but there is one thing I want to correct; it is the statement made by the member who has just sat down relative to beach rights. He is trying to give the impression that the people living along that coast who may be removed to Forde's would no longer have access to the sea; that is absolutely incorrect. As a matter of fact, as long as this Government remains in power, there will be no beach rights granted to anybody in Barbados. The promoters of Heywoods have already been told, and have agreed, that the beach rights will remain. Even the fishermen who beach their craft there will continue to do so. I just wanted to correct that statement, Sir.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have not been given that assurance by the Minister who introduced the Resolution. As a representative of the people of Barbados I have to hear some fit and proper comprehensive explanation given to that particular point. That is the whole point.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I shall be very brief, I cannot allow the remarks of the hon. senior member for St. Peter to go unchallenged when he accused us on this side of the House of corruption and all sorts of dishonesty. The hon. member, during the course of his speech, referred to the land purchased at Cave Hill some time ago by Government out of Labour Welfare Funds. He pointed to me and said that we bought this land for friends, inasmuch as we expected to get certain considerations.

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not want to worry the hon. member.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: On what is the hon. member speaking?

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order, if you did not hear, I believe your hearing is affected. I do not want to stop the hon. member from making his speech, but he said that I said something pointing at him. I never mentioned his name in relation to the point I made. If he draws that conclusion, it is he who has it in his own mind. So far as I am concerned, I did not mention his name at all.

Hon. M. E. COX: I accept the challenge. He pointed to me because as he went on His Honour had to stop him. I am not attempting to reply for the Minister, but I think that during my time of office as the Minister of Communications, Works and Housing, this and other bits of land were bought for the purpose of housing the workers as well as for the playing fields, pavilions and things of that sort. I think I am correct in saying that when the playing field at Hothersal Turning was purchased out of Labour Welfare money, the member was a member of the Executive at that time. (Mr. WALCOTT: And I objected to it.) We all agreed to the purchase of that land. (Mr. WALCOTT: I never agreed; I said you should use Waterfords.)

Mr. Deputy Speaker, in 1953, I think it was, during the time when the member was a member of the Executive

Committee, the sale of Cave Hill came up to Executive Committee. (Mr. WALCOTT: And I disagreed too.) The House will recall that a Committee was set up for the purpose of sponsoring aided self-help housing schemes in Barbados. 4.55 p.m.

That Committee was comprised of Mr. D. Wiles, Miss Betty Arne, the Director of Agriculture, the Director of Highways and Transport, the Architect - I think it was Mr. Crowe or somebody like that - and your humble servant, who was Chairman of that Committee. That Committee unanimously agreed to recommend to the Government the purchase of the Cave Hill area. The Government in its wisdom purchased that land, and was not only able to provide a permanent measure of security for those persons who were living on that land, but was also able to build some of the finest cottages that can be found in this island for the working class. Cave Hill is the best of sites.

The hon. senior member for St. Peter was a member of the Executive Committee at the time when this land was put up for sale. I, as Minister in charge, after the Executive Committee agreed to the purchase of this land and to the purchase price, authorised the Permanent Secretary to pay for this land. This land at Cave Hill, 21 acres, was sold for \$50,222. I just got this file so I am unable to calculate at what price per square foot it was sold; but if I remember correctly, this land was purchased from Mr. D'Arcy Scott, who was the agent, at 6 1/4 cents per square foot. Everybody agreed at the time that it was reasonable, that it was a good buy when compared with the 36 cents and 46 cents per square foot that land was sold for, or the 60 cents and \$1.00 per square foot asked for land in Kensington. This land was purchased in 1954.

Where is the corruption and the dishonesty of which the hon. member spoke? We did not stop there. During my time, we also bought some land from Bulkeley Plantation at Ellerton; it is now a housing area. I do not know up to now who was the agent for it, or to whom the money was paid. We also bought some land at Sayes Court on which you can see those terraced houses which were built soon after the hurricane. We built three blocks up there. We also bought land from Colleton Plantation, St. John; and I do not know from whom that land was bought up to now. We also bought some land at Bagatelle, St. Thomas, for a housing scheme and playing field; and I do not know who is the agent for it. All I know is that we paid for it.

We also bought land at Thorpes, St. James; and Silver Hill, Christ Church; as well as land at Gall Hill, Christ Church. You only have to go up there and see some of the lovely houses built there for poor people. I think the land at Gall Hill was bought at between three cents and three and a half cents per square foot.

Those, Mr. Deputy Speaker, are some of the bits of land which was purchased when I was Minister in charge of that portfolio. It is a very easy and simple thing for anyone to come along and say that you are a thief, that you are a crook, that you are dishonest; any old person can say that. It is an easy thing when your enemies are in a bad mood, when they are suffering from a worried spell, to say so and so.

Let any person come forward and say that I have ever in my political life suggested - I go as far as to say suggested - that I proposed something dishonest or crooked. I say that in all seriousness. I have always opposed crookery, dishonesty and corruption, because I know, especially in a little country like this, that if you have a country run by crooks and dishonest people whose only desire is to get as much as they possibly can for themselves and their families alone, that you are bound to have on the one side, a superabundance of wealth concentrated in the hands of a handful of people, and abject starvation and poverty existing on the other side. This island is too small to have crooks at its helm. The hon. member and I have worked together for years in Executive Committee, and I am challenging him to say that, at any time, there was any such suggestion of dishonesty made to him by me. If he can say it, I am finished; I do not want this seat.

We can come to this House of Assembly if we hold different political views and speak strongly against each other's views, but we can still carry out the business of the community in a manner becoming to the dignity of this House. It is only weak people, who have the mentality of vultures, who have to resort to abuse and things of that sort in order to make people think they are working for the people.

5.05 p.m.

I have been associated with the hon. member for years. It is on record here in 1955 that the hon. member said this: "I know the hon. member; he and I have worked together and I know he is an honest and straightforward man." What has happened in recent years to bring him to the conclusion that he should be throwing mud in my face? I could not be like the hon. member for one moment; I know of a lot of things of which the hon. member has been accused; and I have had to defend him on several occasions when people have come to me talking about the Union this and the Union that. (Mr. WALCOTT: All over the world they say that Secretaries of Unions carry away the money.) I am going to live above these things. The hon. member knows of nothing irregular going on; he just gets up, plasters hon. members, and makes allegations. He will not stop at anything in order to plaster hon. members of this House now that the Elections are near.

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order. The hon. member referred to the Elections, and he also referred to 1955. I have been taking this thing very calmly. The hon. member said that I have plastered him, but what I have said, I have said in a general way. I will repeat it. I referred to the purchase of Cave Hill, to the purchase of Grazettes; and at the time when Mr. Symmonds ran as a candidate for the parish of St. George, the Government might not have bought Grazettes because they had regarded Mr. Symmonds as a political enemy.

Hon. M. E. COX: We bought land from Miss Rock and she is an opponent of the Labour Party. As long as land suits our purpose, and we want it for our people, we are not interested in who owns the land. To the hon. member who talks about people in Heywoods being to the back and so on, I would like to put this question: Is the Bay Estate, the Pine, St. Stephens, Cave Hill, Grazettes or any land like that back land?

If the hon. senior member for St. Peter thinks that by slandering us whenever he likes, he is going to appear to be the Pope, the infallible on all occasions, the all-righteous and the all-just in the eyes of the people, that is not going to be so. He will get his share too. What you sow you will reap. I have absolutely no intention of saying what I heard about the hon. member concerning his administration or anything like that; I will not stoop that low at all.

In this Assembly we meet to do the work of the people in the best possible manner and to the best advantage for the people who cannot be here to represent themselves. Cursing, abusing, slandering, lying, being malicious and all of that sort of thing will not get us or the people to any place. In the Good Old Book this is written: "Let him that standeth take heed lest he fall".

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, reference is made in the Addendum of this Resolution to the protracted efforts in completing negotiations with the owner of this land on the part of the Government. In view of the fact that the owner of the land was not willing to sell it, that negotiations were going on indefinitely and they became protracted, would it not be more reasonable for the Government to contact the owners of Heywoods, to find out what was their attitude with a view to getting this land for the people? Heywoods site is more attractive to the people of the parish than the site which it is proposed to acquire at present. We know of the unsuitability of Forde's for one of the purposes mentioned in this Resolution; it says that the remainder of the thirteen acres should be used by the Housing Authority for housing development.

The point of view has been expressed that this land is far from being suitable; it is certainly not an ideal site for

housing development. It would have been a different matter if Forde's pasture had been readily available and the Government had said that instead of calling off the community centre and playing field, they had decided to buy land which is available, and which is not ideal, but which is obtainable right away. It would have been a good thing to travel around that constituency and say that we had bought that thirteen odd acres of land for a community centre and a playing field, and the remainder was to be used as a housing development. One cannot understand why the Government should engage in protracted negotiations with the owners when without any effort they might have secured Heywoods. If it is a question of protracted negotiations, why not choose the land which is more attractive in view of the proposed Housing Development Scheme?

The Premier has given an undertaking in this Chamber in respect of the beach at Heywoods, as a result of a deal which is to come about or which has been put through, that the fishermen will still be able to use the beach. I would like to get an understanding as to how far up the beach, or how close to the main road, will the fishermen be guaranteed access to Heywoods.

5.15 p.m.

Will they continue to grant the poor people access to the beaches at Heywoods, and particularly the fishermen of the district after the sale is completed? Would they tell us about the Heywoods road, if firstly a diversion was ever asked for, if a diversion was promised by Government, and if a promise has been given, whether Government's promise depends on the results of the next General Election to put it into effect?

Mr. Speaker, I would like to know also whether the remainder of the land which is to be used for housing development is for the siting of those dispossessed persons in this part of the area, the people from Heywoods particularly. It is important to know why the land of which the people who are now at Heywoods are being dispossessed, was not the subject of these protracted negotiations instead of the land before us. It is surprising to know that the Forde's Pasture owners were putting up a show and being reluctant to give up their property. It may well be that they were just putting a sharp move on the Government pretending to be reluctant, but really hoping thereby to get a much better price than they would ordinarily get otherwise. I do not see the justification when you could not get this land easily and readily on the market, and you knew you would have to fight for it, why you should not have used that amount of energy in securing a much more popular place and more in demand by the people.

I would like the Premier, or some other Minister of Government, to put it on record for the Hansard of this House, and as we have been assured that fishermen will continue to beach their craft there, how much of that beach will be available — whether it means below the high water mark or above the high water mark. In spite of everything, we know that they are entitled to use the beach up to high water mark. We want to know how much more protection will be given them than what the law normally would provide; and whether the dispossessed people from Heywoods would be afforded this land for the purpose of resettlement.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, before the Minister replies, there are a few observations which I would like to make on the Resolution. The last time the Minister for Social Services spoke on this Resolution, when some fears were expressed that the land in question — I would not like to say under dispute — was unsuitable for human habitation, the Minister assured the House with his usual air of aplomb, with an air of perfect assurance, and with his most oily unctiousness, that the water could be pumped out. He said it does not matter that the land is below sea-level, the water could be pumped out; and they had investigated that. (ASIDES). I am talking about the Minister of Social Services, the hon. junior member for St. George. It should not have been difficult to identify him by the description I had given.

I understand that since this Resolution was last before the House a couple of years ago, in the interval of the time

which has elapsed, technical people and people who have knowledge of building sites have turned their thumbs down on Forde's Pasture as a suitable place for housing development. One would normally ask why the Government should want to pitchfork this Resolution to the prominence which it now holds on the Order Paper, and ask members of the House to approve of this Resolution for compulsory acquisition of the thirteen acres, three roods, three perches of land next to Heywoods Plantation for use as a housing development and a community playing field for the parish.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the hon. senior member for the City comes in and holds a private discussion of his own. Between the hours of 4.30 p.m. and 6.30 p.m. members regard the Legislative Chamber as a political platform for themselves. I find this particularly offensive and I hope you will be able to control it. If the members would only listen they would learn something which is of vital interest to this community. Mr. Deputy Speaker, if the hon. member for St. Michael is telling the Minister of Agriculture to listen to what is coming, I will advise him because the member for St. Michael well knows

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order. I thought that a member in addressing the House used to say the junior or senior member as the case may be. Which member is he referring to?

Mr. BARROW: If the hon. member is ignorant, let him remain in the dark. He is entitled to rise if I make a personal reference to him; but if the cap fits him, he can draw the string. You will find if you check back the debates and see that the Minister of Social Services, the hon. junior member for St. George, introduced this Resolution at a time when a Canadian Company was trying to buy Heywoods Plantation from a gentleman called Mr. Bininger who resides in the United States of America. The attorney for that plantation was Mr. Robert Challenor, popularly known as "Lad-die" Challenor of cricket fame.

I am submitting, Sir, that this Resolution had absolutely nothing to do with any altruistic desire on the part of the Government to house people in Speightstown or in any other part of this island; the hon. member for St. Peter knows that. I have said that on several occasions, even at the risk of being accused politically that we in Barbados should be concentrating on clearing the slums at Cats Castle and Jordans Lane. Since 1937 you will find debates in this House on slum clearance; the Goodland Housing Scheme was initiated with the idea of removing some of these slums from Bridgetown. I would say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that if I were in the Government and I had wanted to remove the hon. senior member for the City, I would have removed the conditions which exist down there; conditions which mean that he has to pay out \$1 million in dole every year to the population in St. Michael. I would start a clearance there as political strategy.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order. The Government has more sense than him, Mr. Deputy Speaker. The Government removed people to the Pine, but I still got the votes in the Pine.

Mr. BARROW: This is a serious charge: that we are not interested in the plight of the people and their overcrowding conditions. You may be shocked and surprised to know of the tenancies the hon. member for the City controlled and sold out. I am only stating facts. The hon. member is a good friend of mine, but I cannot see eye to eye with his political and sociological ideas at all.
5.25 p.m.

I mentioned these things to show that there is an unholy alliance between the Vestry and the Government. I do not care if the hon. senior member for the City is offended. In Kensington New Road.....

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I must rise on a point of order. Why should I get offended? People must live somewhere; people cannot live in the air; they are not going to live in cages. I am not going to bandy words with the hon. member but I will tell him that I am no lawyer. What

he says is not the law. He said something about no wooden houses must be put up in Bridgetown.

Mr. BARROW: Give me three minutes and I will read the Act for you.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member has got from St. Peter down to Kensington Road. Will the hon. member keep to the Resolution?

Mr. BARROW: The reason why I have got so far is because the Act under which those regulations were passed was called the Bridgetown, Speightstown and Holetown Act of 1891. I am going to read it out.

One of the most valuable pieces of land in this island — Kensington — which is valued between \$2.00 and \$10.00 a square foot, is a place that we have slums; and it is right in the centre of Bridgetown; yet the Government goes up in the country — where a man likes to have his one and half acres — and for pure political and financial reasons, puts up housing schemes although the people up there are more interested in securing land for agricultural purposes rather than having the Government put the land into new slums. You can ask the hon. senior member for St. Andrew, when Government put up a housing scheme in St. Andrew, if they did not have to invite people from Bridgetown and Christ Church to go and occupy these houses in order to show His Excellency and other people that they had people living in them. If you want to set up a housing scheme, set it up because of the deplorable conditions in which some people are living. Speightstown is one of the most beautiful cities next to Spanish Town. There is French Colonial architecture there, as well as other forms of architecture, which we should preserve as historical interest.

What I am blaming the Government for, is not spending this money in the right direction. The whole *rationale* of a housing scheme is to remove people from conditions which generate tuberculosis and crime. When you come to Forde's Pasture, let us examine the reasons why Government wants to acquire it.

A company from Toronto, which I think is named the Canadian Development Company, has bought Heywoods Plantation, thus throwing 300 acres of land out of agriculture. I have a file here over this whole matter. Hon. members can check anything I say with the Director who is in the island for a few days. We have already thrown 380 acres of land at Sandy Lane out of cultivation, and a factory has been put out of operation. Numerous engineers, factory workers, sugar boilers, and all of those people, have been thrown out of work as a result of this so as to provide employment for a handful of domestic servants. I have said before that this Government has a domestic mentality; we set up centres to train domestics, while you hear nothing of training people to be atomic scientists.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair.

Now, Sir, I will cite facts and quote documents. I have been given the authority to state these facts. I will show Your Honour any of these documents because I have been given the authority to show them.

I was saying that already 380 acres of land have been thrown out of cultivation at Sandy Lane around January, 1959; and even when this Government had no authority, every single Minister over on that side was anxious about getting into the Heywoods deal. Everyone of them was being interviewed, and was interviewing; and when one of the promoters was on his death bed, not long before he died, the Ministers were clustered around his bed.

Hon. M. E. COX: I rise on a point of order. (Loud Asides).

Mr. SPEAKER: Let me try to get this House in order before the hon. member makes his point.

Hon. M. E. COX: This is the second time that the hon. member has said that. I want to say categorically that it is an unadulterated lie.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I want the hon. member to withdraw that remark.

Hon. M. E. COX: Well, Sir, it is untrue.

Mr. BARROW: This happened the night before Mr. Corbin died; I will give you the date of his death in a minute. What I am stating is a fact. I have not specified the people who were there, but if the Ministers want me to call names I will call them. What I am pointing out is that, at that time, no Minister could stop a foreign corporation or company from owning land in Barbados; or stop any person from buying Heywoods estate.
5.35 p.m.

The deal was only closed when it was discovered that the Ministers had no legal authority to hold up the negotiations; and then, subsequently, they introduced the Aliens Land Holding Bill. I have chapter and verse for all of that; I have certain copies of letters written to the hon. senior member for St. Michael on this question.

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order. I repeat that that is an untruth. The hon. member just cannot help that; that is a deliberately misleading, untrue statement.

Mr. BARROW: We will be able to judge in a few minutes whether I have spoken an untruth or not; we will soon find out. It is the same Minister who wrote Mrs. Corbin a letter of condolence when Mr. Corbin died. (*ASIDES*)

Mr. SPEAKER: I would like hon. members to allow me to hear what the hon. member is saying.

Mr. BARROW: Government gave out to the public that they were sheeting this island with housing schemes; they knew the feelings of the members of this House as to the unsuitability of Forde's pasture for the purposes for which they are acquiring it. I intend to prove the statement which I have made, but I must set a trap for them first. (*Laughter*)

You will be surprised to know, Mr. Speaker, that they are inviting us to allow them to spend the taxpayers' money to purchase Forde's pasture, and the purpose of doing that is to give sites to the tenants who will be dispossessed from Heywoods Plantation. That is a statement of fact. But the remarkable thing about it is that Mr. Bininger, in a letter written to the Minister, said that the Canadians themselves would re-settle the peasants; they told the Government that they would re-settle the peasants themselves on a corner of Heywoods at no cost to the Government.

As I said before, Speightstown is one of the most beautiful cities in the West Indies; you do not have overcrowding in Speightstown; as a matter of fact, Speightstown is crying out now for inhabitants. I wonder why more people do not go down to Speightstown inasmuch as Speightstown has a more congenial atmosphere in which to live than Bridgetown. I am willing to issue a warrant that you should conscript people from up here and put them down in Speightstown. Government has even imported crime into the parish of St. John inasmuch as they have taken undesirable elements from the metropolitan area and carried them up to Colleton, just to say that they have people living in their houses. The average man wants to own land. If Government had been interested in the people of Speightstown they would have told the Biningers that tourism is a good thing, but that Government did not want you to throw this land out of cultivation.

Now the Minister of Social Services who cannot even stop the rats from going into the Hospital, will stop the water from flowing into the low-lying land at Forde's; he is going to stop a natural spring from springing. You have this remarkable phenomenon, in an island where you have so many acres out of cultivation, for the purpose of satisfying tourism; you have factory workers out of work, and you have peasants living on these places, so as to satisfy

whom? There is a scheme afoot for the settlement of two hundred Canadian families at Heywoods.

I understand that they have discussed the question of diverting the road through Heywoods Woods behind Forde's pasture and everywhere else, so that these Canadians can disport themselves without fear of being contaminated by the natives of Barbados. Are you going to turn Barbados into another Bermuda? Tourism is all right in itself but when tourists bring in money, it does not percolate to all classes of society. It is true that the hon. senior member for St. George and the hon. junior member for Christ Church may get some money, but they already have enough of it. Do you think that this Canadian money percolates to all strata of society in this island? The underprivileged section of the community cannot even benefit by the present demands of the social services.
5.45 p.m.

A lot of the investment capital is capital from outside as this Heywoods Company is going to be. The people are anxious to get on with the development, so they want the people off of Heywoods Plantation. Why couldn't the Minister come and say he wants the people moved off Heywoods Plantation?

Mr. Speaker, no suggestions have been made as to overcrowding in Speightstown. You are faced with the fact that no slum clearance - I am certain of what I am saying now - certainly within my life-time, has been effected in Bridgetown; it is true that they have built housing schemes in the Pine, at Grazettes, the Bay Estate and places like that, but one would have thought when they built these housing schemes they would have had a few bulldozers through Cats Castle, Jordan's Land and Jessamy Lane and clean up that whole area, and redesign and replan the City of Bridgetown. The position then is that in Speightstown where they want a housing development and a community playing-field, if there had been a place needing development though not in that sense, it certainly would have been Speightstown; because they can use a few industries and matters of that kind down there; the population of Speightstown is largely clerical and agricultural.

I am certain, without arrogating to myself the right to speak for people in Your Honour's constituency or that of your colleague, that the people, from what I know of them, would more have appreciated a sizeable portion of Heywoods, lots of one acre of Heywoods Plantation, rather than little doll houses. It is a very laudable thing to put up houses which can resist hurricanes, storms and termites in preference to the dilapidated wooden structures which the merchants of Bridgetown were allowed to make profits on by way of importation of lumber. I am all for improved housing standards; but if you are going to destroy these dilapidated buildings and set up new blocks and flats and things like that, or use the area for commercial purposes and resettle the people elsewhere, what is the use of putting down housing schemes and then inviting applications, when you do not get applications, or as many as you would like, as happened in the case of the three tenancies at Christ Church, St. John and St. Andrew? A lot of people from Bridgetown have now gone to Christ Church because the people at Sayes Court were not interested in living in these houses. The people at Sayes Court would like a piece of land from Chancery Lane Plantation or Gibbons; they do not want to live in a congested community with asphalt yards and nowhere to plant a little seasoning. It is not necessarily the aim of the average agricultural worker to live in the kind of house in which the people in the Pine live; his aim is to own a piece of land. Through the Labour Welfare Fund set up by Imperial Statute in 1947, and its general application to all the Colonial territories, the agricultural workers can improve the houses they have on their land - but they want their land first.

Mr. Speaker, there is over \$5 million of Labour Welfare Funds which you are allowing the Commercial Banks to make 6% off, while there is a waiting list of thousands of agricultural workers. That is the kind of situation we enjoy in Barbados at present. They now claim, Mr. Speaker, that their protracted efforts and negotiations with the own-

er of the land in question have failed to produce any results. I am not in a position to say whether or not the owner of the land has been co-operative in this matter; I suppose the representatives of the parish would be in a better position to state what is the position.

When they say that the Resolution is in order that the development of the area for the purposes set out in the Resolution might be effected as soon as possible, what they really meant - and I am saying this without any fear of contradiction - is that Mr. Hough and company have called upon the Government to move the people off Heywoods Plantation. The people on Heywoods Plantation have all received notices to quit; and these notices, being agricultural notices, normally expire on the 31st May. By the Security of Tenure - Agricultural Holdings - Act, 1956, I believe the notices normally expire on 31st May. As far as I know, one set of notices expired since last year; but since they have held over and the Government has not done anything, it is now possible that the new notices will expire 31st May; and that appears to be the hurry here.

Mr. Speaker, why don't they have the courage of their convictions? If Government feels it is justifiable in an island like Barbados to throw 300 acres of land out of cultivation, and if they feel that despite the fact that the purchasers of the land would have been willing to resettle the 38 or 40 families - I have their names as well - who occupy Heywoods Plantation tenantry, when they should pay for that rather than expect the purchasers to resettle these people, why not have the courage to say they feel they should resettle rather than let the purchasers who are heaving them off the premises resettle them? Why come here in the guise of a scheme to carry out this great socialism of setting up slums all over the island, of setting up housing schemes for people who have not asked for them? Why not give the people what they really want? Why give a Canadian man what you are not prepared to give the people in Speightstown? There will be 200 Canadian families and five hotels established there by the Canadians. What for? For the Ministers to hold lunches?

Is it important for us in Barbados at this stage of our political, and other growth, Mr. Speaker, that we should have a lot of people coming down here from Canada partitioning large areas of land? Are we afraid to get up and say we are not against tourism, but that we are against subordinating the best interests of the people of Barbados to the people who come here saying they are setting up hotels? If it is said that I am scaring away capital from Barbados, then I would be very glad if all the capital gets scared away.
5.55 p.m.

There is tourism, and there is tourism. When you allow 200 Canadian families to settle at Heywoods, you may only be employing 400 domestics; and that will be so provided that these people have no modern cooking and cleaning facilities. If they do you may only be employing 50 domestics. Is it worthwhile dispossessing 40 Barbadian families for that? To me 40 Barbadian families are more worthwhile than 200 Canadian families to this island.

I have no opposition to Canadians as Canadians, having lived in their country for eighteen months; I cannot be ungrateful to all the hospitality which has been extended to me when I was residing there; but that does not mean that I must be prepared to throw the land of Barbados out of agricultural cultivation just to extend a hand to Canadians. They are not doing it to us. We have to go through all sorts of formalities, including F.B.I. investigation and so on when going to Canada or America; in other words, we are making ourselves doormats for other people.

There is a limit to which we should go as regards tourism. We must consider the overall factors; we must weigh one thing against the other. Do not throw agricultural land out of production and have estates and plantations taken over by foreign people. Let them be taken over by the people of Barbados. The average peasant of Barbados is quite anxious and willing to pay a reasonable price for a piece of land; and, as a matter of fact, he would deny him-

self of quite a lot of necessities of life in order to get that piece of land. No Barbadian wants you to play Communist and expropriate anybody's land. The average peasant, his father and grandmother and grandfather have been working on these same estates, and now they have to be relegated and put on Forde's Pasture which is a place below sea level, a thing that the Hon. Minister of Social Services has admitted. Why do you not put them to live in the sea?

As far back as 1891, the Commissioners of Highways for the parish of St. Michael had power to make regulations regarding building within the city limits, within St. Michael, and within the towns of the other parishes. The Commissioners were authorised to make regulations for the erection, altering or repairing of any building and the use of materials in those buildings and all other matters of that kind. Now, they also had power to serve notice on persons. Thus for sixty years, before we had town planning, the Commissioners of Highways had this power and if the owners of such buildings infringed those regulations, there was a penalty attached which could be recovered before the Police Magistrate of Bridgetown.

You will find in Section 21 of that Act that, 'no house, storehouse, kitchen, stable, or building whatsoever shall be erected in the principal streets, alleys, and lanes within the limits of Speightstown, otherwise than with such materials and in such manner as hereinafter mentioned; and any person who shall presume to build contrary to the regulations contained in this section shall be warned by the sergeant of police on duty in the said Town, to remove or alter the same conformably with the said regulations; and on refusing so to do shall incur a fine of twenty pounds, and such building shall be deemed a common nuisance, and the builder or owner thereof shall, within such time as shall be appointed by order of the Police Magistrate, remove the same; and in default thereof such house or building shall be taken down by order of the said Police Magistrate, and the materials thereof sold by public auction by any police or parish constable and after payment of the expenses attending the taking down of such house or building, and the fines and fees of the complaint - in case such fine and fees shall remain unpaid - the balance shall be paid to the owner of such house or building. Provided always that nothing in this section contained shall extend to hinder the repairing of any house already constructed.

(2) The outside of all buildings to be erected in the principal streets, alleys and lanes of the Town shall be made of brick or stone, or bricks and stones together, or brick or stone nogged, except balconies and the frames of doors and windows; and any sergeant of police who shall connive at or suffer any house or building to be erected in the said Town, contrary to the preceding provisions, without giving information thereof to the Police Magistrate, shall forfeit the sum of twenty pounds for every building so erected."

The Police had power to stop people from putting up wooden buildings within the city area. The result, in Speightstown, has been that although it is an urban area without that geometric nicety which one finds in other cities of the Caribbean, yet there is a certain uniformity of style, architecture and spaciousness in the set-up of the buildings with one or two unfortunate exceptions. Of course, you had to allow people to do things; but by and large Speightstown is the one place which has not suffered from the evil effects of overcrowding which you will find in the metropolitan area controlled by the City Council of Bridgetown. I am not suggesting that the City Council has been responsible.

What I do say is that the Government is allocating money for housing development when it should have a programme of slum clearance operating at the same time. That is why the Government started out to devise a public housing scheme; Government started out on this scheme in order to clear away these overcrowded conditions.

Now, Sir, a member on this side of this House, as well as other people living in the northern parishes, are somewhat apprehensive that along with the resiting of the peas-

ants from Heywoods Plantation, at some time in the not too distant future the road at Speightstown is going to be diverted.
6.05 p.m.

I seem to remember that the Minister of Communications, Works and Housing mentioned something about an application having been made - or that they did not intend to entertain the application; however, he might be in a better position to enlighten us. Since the members of this House are apprehensive that this road may be diverted, it is time for the Government to make a categorical statement that at no time will they entertain any idea of diverting the road at Heywoods. They would go and divert these roads, and far from having an East Coast Road, we will not even have a West Coast Road. The thin end of the wedge would be at Sandy Lane; and the widening of the breach would be at Heywoods. All the Barbadians will thereby be driven to the centre of the island, and all the expatriates, and those who are disporting themselves, will be on the West Coast.

Mr. Speaker, this Resolution is not unconnected with the over-all policy which shows certain danger signs, which we are very anxious to avoid. If this is the only way in which we can build up our economy, then it is better for us to remain as we are, having a little beach to which to go. I understand that the Premier has given an undertaking that the people will still have an access to the beach at Heywoods; but with all the powers which the Executive Committee and the Cabinet now have vested in them, I have not seen them make any reservation of any land, or have a test case - just like what Mr. Bird did in Antigua - in order to ensure that the fishermen would have a place at which to wash their nets.

Mr. Issa has purchased three acres of land along a beach; but when the Government Officials were down there, the fishermen came down in a delegation to dry their nets, and the authorities had to leave out a road over about half a mile of land so that the fishermen could dry out their gear. We have not heard anything like that happening here. Far from that happening, we will not have anywhere to bathe except at the fish market at Browne's Beach. Eighty thousand people in Bridgetown only have Shot Hall or Browne's Beach at which to bathe, so that people will have to go to places like Heywoods in order to get a sea bath.

I did not hear the Hon. Premier when he was supposed to have made this statement; but I know that the agreement for the sale of Heywoods Plantation does not contain any reservation relating to a right of way for the public at all.

I promised the hon. member to produce something which he said was a categorical lie. The name of this company is the Commercial Land Developments Limited, 283 Danforth Road - Toronto 13 Telephone Oxford 9 - 7421. Let me give the House the statistics as to Heywoods Plantation:-

"(1) Average Production; per cane acre for the years 1957, 1958, 1959. For 1957: 32.40; 1958: 25.62; 1959: 27.99. Total, 86.01; average for three years, 28.67.

(2) Average number of employees in crop, 40; out of crop, 30;

(3) Average wage reaping; 1957, \$8,950.08; 1958, \$6,885.82; 1959, \$6,124.34. Total, \$21,960.24. Average for three years, \$7,320.08.

(4) Parochial taxes 1957, \$1,187.61; 1958, \$1,227.21; 1959, \$1,201.47. Total, \$3,616.29. Average taxes for three years, \$1,205.43."

Mr. Speaker, what I am reading from can become a document of the House. Now we come to the total direct income per annum to forty persons, \$19,764.48; Government \$1,205.43; (ASIDES) The total income to the people of St. Peter is \$20,969.91. Is that specific enough for the hon. member? This is what the Canadians propose to do with Heywoods;

"Proposed use for 'Heywoods' Plantation: two hundred houses at approximately three houses to one acre, 65 acres. Three hotels approximately 25 to 30 rooms each, 9 acres. One hotel approximately 60 to 70 rooms, 5 acres. Shopping Centre etc. 5 acres. Beach, gardens, lawns roads etc. 50 acres, making a total of 134 acres. The two hundred houses will cost approximately \$6 million. Three hotels, approximately \$360,000; one hotel, approximately \$180,000; Shopping Centre, roads etc. \$300,000, making a total of \$6,840,000. Labour during construction: Estimated cost of houses etc., basis of forty-five per cent labour, fifty-five per cent material, \$3,488,400."

6.15 p.m.

To continue, Mr. Speaker, "Estimated 2 employees to each house - 400 persons; estimated 150 employees to hotels - 100 persons; estimated 30 employees to shopping centre etc. - 30 persons" making a total of 530 persons.

I wonder if the Hon. Minister would like to hear the average wage the Canadians are going to pay? "Average wage of \$12 per week - \$6,360. per week." (VOICES: Shame!) (ASIDES)

Hon. M. E. COX: Clerks in Roebuck Street only get \$9 a week.

Mr. BARROW: Does the Minister feel that \$12 is a good wage? \$12 a week is less than the travelling allowance which a Minister gets. As a matter of fact, it is less than half of their travelling allowance; but he says that \$12 is a good wage.

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order. Did I understand the member to say that I said \$12 is a good wage?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member said that you said so.

Hon. M. E. COX: When did I say so?

Mr. SPEAKER: Does the hon. member deny having said so?

Hon. M. E. COX: Can't the hon. member tell the truth even by accident?

Mr. BARROW: Now the Premier said that land has been reserved. I have a copy of the agreement here, Sir, and I would lend it to them on that side to read. They can underline the part where the Government has made any reservations for access to a beach.

Hon. M. E. COX: I would like to see the agreement.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the hon. member for St. John said that he was making it a document of the House. The House can have it for all times.

Mr. BARROW: I can assure Your Honour that I have authority to produce it.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would like to remind the hon. member that he might require some of these documents subsequently.

Mr. BARROW: I am prepared to let everybody see these documents, to make them documents of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member reads rather quickly, and I think our Reporters might not get down all these figures as readily as they would like. I am sure the Reporters would want that document at least for a week to check and recheck it.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order. The hon. junior member for St. John referred to the fact that the Premier had stated that there was reservation of beach rights, in the agreement, but the hon. member categorically said there is none. That, to me, is an important thing in this House. I am asking the hon. member to clarify that. I personally believe there must be reservation of access to the

beach at Heywoods, but the hon. member categorically says there is no such thing in the agreement. I do not represent St. Peter, but as a member of this House, I represent the island of Barbados. I expect that when the Premier says something like that, he is absolutely certain of his facts. It is not usual for him to make statements he is not sure of. I want to know what is the position.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I did not say that it was in the agreement; I said that provision is being made for the beaching of the boats and the use of the beach.

Mr. BARROW: I would like to see how, if I bought a piece of land, you could tell me that you can put boats on it if you do not have it in the agreement. I was not here, but I understand that the Hon. Premier said that they had an agreement with the purchasers: that there should be reservations and the preserving of a general right of way to the beach. I would like to know if it is part of the subject matter of the same agreement.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member saying that it is not included in the agreement?

Mr. BARROW: This right to go on to the beach at the present moment must be an illusory right! The reason why I say that is because, at the time when Heywoods was purchased, they had no power to impose conditions under the Aliens Land Holding Act. It is only subsequent to the Heywoods agreement that they rushed through legislation to give them a toe-hold; they did not have any such right before.

Mr. Speaker, this is a copy of a letter written on November 20th, 1959;

"The Honourable Mr. M. E. Cox,
Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour,
Ministerial Offices,
Bay Street,
Bridgetown,
Barbados.

Dear Mr. Cox,

I would like to take this opportunity of again thanking you for your courtesy in seeing Mr. Corbin and myself *re* our projected development at Heywoods Plantation, while I was visiting in Barbados, some time past. It was also very kind of you to spare the time to have lunch with us to further discuss the matter on what must have been one of your busy days. We did appreciate this very much.

Further to our conversations *re* the housing and hotel development, I would like to advise that we have entered into negotiations with the New York owners of the property for its purchase, and while the deal has not yet been closed, we have every confidence that it will be closed by the end of the year, or shortly thereafter.

I expect to be writing to Mr. Mapp, the Minister of Communications, Works and Housing, *re* having the plantation released from agricultural use for a development project. I would greatly appreciate it if you could do anything to facilitate us receiving an early decision on this because the closing of our purchase of the plantation will be contingent on our being able to use it for development work. We shall, of course, keep you fully informed as to the plans and their progress *re* this project.

Again thanking you for your kind consideration in the past, and hoping that we may have the pleasure of returning this hospitality some time in the future, we remain,

Yours very truly,
L. G. Hough,
President, Commercial
Land Developments
Limited."

6.25 p.m.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, this letter is dated December 10th, 1959. It reads as follows:-

"The Honourable Mr. M. E. Cox,
Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour,
Ministerial Offices,
Bay Street,
Bridgetown,
Barbados,
West Indies.

Dear Mr. Cox:

Mr. Clyde Corbin has informed us that you are unable to locate the letter of November 20th, referred to in our letter to you of November 30th, 1959.

For your information, and in order to complete your files, I am enclosing herewith a copy of our letter of November 20th, 1959.

Yours very truly,
L. G. HOUGH,
President.

LGH/LW
C.C. - Mr. Clyde Corbin."

Sir, appended to that is a copy of the letter of the 20th November, 1959, addressed to the Hon. Minister of Trade. We do not have to repeat that again. Then, Sir, there is this letter of November 27th, 1959, addressed to:-

"Minister of Communications, Works and Housing,
Ministerial Offices,
Bay Street,
Bridgetown,
Barbados,
West Indies.

Dear Sir,

This letter is to inform you that we have been recently presented an Offer to Purchase to Wallace M. Bininger for the plantation lands known as Heywoods on the St. James' Coast. This Offer to Purchase is contingent upon our receiving permission from the proper Governmental authorities in Barbados to take these plantation lands out of agricultural production and to utilise them for the site of several tourist hotels of various sizes, and the balance of the land to be used for a housing project of some two hundred or more middle-class type houses, which would be sold to principally Canadian and American elder citizens and pensioners.

While we realise that there are some forty agricultural workers who work full or part time in this plantation at the present time, we believe that our project, once under way, would give employment to all of these people and many more, during the course of its construction. It would likely give steady employment in the future to many times this amount as hotel employees, maintenance and domestic servants, etc.

The active development of this property would likely not take place for a year, and the plantation would remain in agricultural production up to that point.

Our purchase of this property, is as I have mentioned, contingent upon our receiving permission from the Government to divert this land from agricultural use and we would require this permission before we close the transaction, which is scheduled for January 15th, 1960.

We respectfully ask that this matter be given the earliest consideration by your Department, and if there is any other information which you require regarding this, before making the necessary decision we would ask that you contact Mr. Clyde Corbin of "Cordoba" or Mr. R. C. Chapman of Browne and Chapman, Pinfold Street, our solicitor. Either of these gentlemen could possibly be of some assistance to you.

Thanking you kindly, and awaiting your reply, we remain,

Yours very truly,
L. G. HOUGH,
President.

LGH/LW".

I will now read a letter of December 15, 1959 from Mr. Hough to Mr. Clyde Corbin, "Cordoba" Maxwell A-21, Christ Church, Barbados, West Indies.

"Dear Clyde,

I received your last three letters for which I thank you, and will attempt to give you my views on these matters at this time.

Then he goes on to say.

Re your second letter dealing with your meetings with Mr. Mapp, it seems that it was very fortunate that you were "Johnny on the Spot" at this meeting with Mr. Mapp. Otherwise, the wrong impression must surely have been created by this petition of 38 tenants from Heywoods. I was quite surprised to see that they apparently resent not having been given the option to buy their property. If this is what they desired, why in heaven's name didn't they do it some time over the last twenty years, and I keep wondering what they would buy it with. However, judging by your letter, it seems that you had the situation well in hand and were able to dissipate any resentment the Minister might have had. Confidentially, one of the main reasons I wish to get a survey as quickly as possible is that I anticipated there might be a petition brought to the Government by these tenants, and if we had the survey so that I knew exactly what our boundaries were and the shape of the property and so on, we were anticipating up here that we might be able to do something to help these tenants to re-locate. But since we do not know the shape of this property or the boundaries, I hesitate to even suggest this in any shape or form since it might louse up an otherwise nice clean development. However, we are keeping this as an 'ace in the hole' and if the Government got tough, there is the possibility that when Cliff and I come down that we would take some very definite action ourselves on re-locating this people, but I would not want you to intimate this to any of the ministers or anyone whatsoever at this time. I prefer instead to see which way the wind is blowing first. Having had considerable to do with Public Relations in your career you will appreciate that if we decide to do something for these people, we will do it in a proper manner and do it in such a way that ministers or Party in Government aiding us will be able to take a few bows along with us for what is done and not have some opposition member who would be against us in any case taking the bows and kidding the people that it was his influence or pressure which made us do something for the tenants."

(Loud Asides).

Mr. Speaker, there is so much noise that I crave your indulgence to read that passage again. It is as follows:-

"Having had considerable to do with Public Relations in your career you will appreciate that if we decide to do something for these people we will do it in a proper manner and do it in such a way that ministers or Party in Government aiding us will be able to take a few bows along with us for what is done and not have some opposition member who would be against us in any case taking the bows and kidding the people that it was his influence or pressure which made us do something for the tenants."

6.35 p.m.

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order. May I ask the hon. member to whom that letter was addressed?

Mr. BARROW: I will tell the hon. member. The Premier can publish a denial in the Press tomorrow.

Hon. M. E. COX: To whom was the letter addressed?

Mr. BARROW: It was addressed to the agent in Barbados.

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order. I am going to insist that this document be made a document of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is insisting that that document be made a document of the House. It will remain a document of the House, in my custody.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: On a point of order. I would like to go further than the Hon. Leader has gone. Judging from the hon. member's charming smile which looks something like a Cheshire cat, it seems to me.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I would like the hon. member to get to his point of order.

Mr. BARROW: If he is making a point of order.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the hon. member take his seat while the Hon. Minister is making his point of order?

Hon. R. G. MAPP: We have asked a very simple thing; if everything is above-board we would like to see the document. Is it the intention for some hon. member to leave the House with that document?

Mr. MOTTLEY: It must be put in.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is going to be a document of the House.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: And will it be in Your Honour's possession as soon as the hon. member has finished reading it?

Mr. BARROW: I said that I would not read out letters without their being made documents of the House - provided that I will get them back when the matter goes to the Court. I will make photostatic copies for the Ministers! (Laughter). I would be the last person to suggest that an hon. member should read damning evidence against another hon. member and not have it made a document of the House. I will continue to read:-

"In the meantime, if the Government are willing to purchase land and re-locate these people elsewhere, I think it is the simplest solution to it all, and certainly the proper one. As you know from our letter of proposal to Binger, we have asked that \$5,000.00 of his money be held in escrow until the last tenant is gone....."

In other words, they have to bring in the Resolution today because Mr. Binger cannot get his \$5,000.00 until they get these people off the plantation. This letter was written.....

Hon. F. E. MILLER: On a point of order. The hon. member said that this was relevant to the debate, and for that reason some scope was given to him in the matter; but what relevance has this Resolution got to the debate about Heywood's Plantation? (ASIDES).

Mr. SPEAKER: Throughout the whole of this debate there was comparison made as to the suitability of Heywood's land as against Forde's pasture; that is why it is relevant.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: The hon. member said that we had to rush this Resolution in here; but this Resolution has nothing to do with Heywoods.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think that the Hon. Minister is serving himself well to make that objection. I have listened to what the hon. member has said, I do not know if he is right but he has said that one reason for the acquisition of Forde's pasture is the resettlement of people who have had notices to quit from Heywoods land. As soon as that has been mentioned, the Minister can correct or agree to it, therefore anything connected with Heywoods is certainly relevant to the Forde's matter *vis-a-vis* the resettlement of people of Heywoods on some other site at Forde's.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member...

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member will have an opportunity to reply. I take it that he is not now replying.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: I have to answer when statements like that are made. For the past two hours of this discussion all we have heard is lies. There is no truth in

that statement whatever. Land at Heywoods was made available at a pepper-corn rent, and some 30 odd families had been settled at Heywoods and not at Forde's.

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order. What the Minister is now saying does not coincide with the debate on the occasion when I made a motion relative to Forde's land. The Minister of Communications said that the same Heywoods land was not to be used other than for agricultural purposes; that is why Government could not agree with the acquisition of Heywoods.

Mr. BARROW: The Government did promise to resettle the people from Heywoods on Forde's Pasture. 6.45 p.m.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: On a point of order. Negotiations re the purchase of Heywoods for a hotel project was less than two years ago. For more than four years ago, as the hon. senior member for St. Peter knows, I have been negotiating with Mr. Percy Whitehead re the purchase of Forde's; so I cannot see how that could be associated with Heywoods in the first place.

Mr. BARROW: That is true. Negotiations were going on as long as four years ago; and you were one of the people present in "Laddie" Challenor's office. I am telling you that negotiations were going on before, and they culminated around January 15th, 1960.

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order. We are not in a position to say whether it was four or forty years ago. What we are in a position to say, as far as the Government is concerned is that it is not two years yet; for all we know, there could have been negotiations forty years ago; but we do not know about them. We can only deal with when the matter was brought to our attention. That was less than two years ago.

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order. In November, 1959, the Government made a pronouncement on Heywoods Land. At that time they did not say one word to this House that negotiations were going on to use Heywoods as a hotel project. They said they had a policy; and I knew that their policy was not to use agricultural land other than for agricultural purposes. That is what I remember the Government saying. I will bring the debate to prove that.

Mr. BARROW: Before the debate had even sort of echoed through this Chamber, on December, 1st, 1959, Mr. Hough, President of the Company wrote as follows:-

"The information contained in your letter re Forde's Pasture and Heywoods was quite interesting."

This was a letter written by the President of the Company in which it was disclosed that Mr. Corbin had been negotiating with the Minister about the resettlement of the tenants. This is not a copy, this is the original letter which was written by Mr. Hough saying that "the information contained in your letter re Forde's Pasture and Heywoods, was quite interesting, and I am pleased that it turned out the way it did."

It was just a week that the Minister of Social Services...

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the hon. member read that letter again?

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, this is a letter of November, 26th, 1959, written to the Solicitors re Heywoods Plantation:

"Enclosed with this letter is a copy of the letter to Mr. Bininger, wherein I have offered to purchase Heywoods under the terms and conditions as set forth in the letter. We are also enclosing a copy of Mr. Bininger's solicitor's letter of acceptance, which we received. We are also enclosing a copy of a letter to the Minister of Communications, Works and Housing, which I have sent requesting that we receive permission from the Government to take Heywoods Plantation out of agricultural production..."

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order.....

Mr. SPEAKER: While the hon. member is reading?

Hon. M. E. COX: I have already asked the hon. member when was the date of the first letter to the Government. I also notice that the member has not handed up the letter which he read a moment or two ago. The House wants all the letters. A lot of what he is reading I am hearing now for the first time.

Mr. SPEAKER: Now I appreciate the insistence of the hon. member who has just sat down, the Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour; but I do not appreciate the incessant interruptions during the reading of a letter. It is not the sort of thing to expect. It is all right to make an insistence, but that is not the way to do it.

Hon. M. E. COX: I just said that because I fear the letters may get misplaced.

Mr. BARROW: The hon. member seems to think that a letter is a hut! A letter cannot disappear from the House. I have given the House every assurance that, as soon as I am finished reading, I will pass the letters to Your Honour; but I got interrupted in the middle of one which I promised to pass to Your Honour. The hon. member talks about their insistence; there is nothing to insist on; he is pushing an open door!

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I am rising on a point of order. It has been drawn to my attention that the debate which is relevant to this matter under discussion is not yet printed. I gave notice of a Resolution on this matter on the 20th October and the debate started on 27th October, 1959; the Minister spoke and then other members spoke.

Mr. SPEAKER: In relation to what?

Mr. WALCOTT: The motion was to resume debate on the passing of the following Resolution:-

"Resolution relative to the acquisition of land in St. Peter."

I understand that these debates are not yet printed, but that there are in the form in which Your Honour would have to give permission for them to be used. Typewritten copies are here, but the only person who can give permission for them to be used is Your Honour. I only draw that to Your Honour's attention.

Mr. SPEAKER: Permission is granted if the hon. member wants to quote from them.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I will continue to read from the letter of December 1st, 1959, re Forde's Pasture and Heywoods.

"The information contained in your letter re Forde's Pasture and Heywoods, it was quite interesting, and I am pleased that it turned out the way it did."

The way it turned out was that they came with a Resolution to buy Forde's Pasture for the Heywoods people. You will remember that the Minister also said that the people had been resettled and so on, and this was four years ago and all that. Listen to this:-

"Incidentally, in regard to these notices which Challenor is sending out - could you get a copy of one of these notices and check to be sure that it is sent out under Bininger's name and not our name. I would appreciate receiving a copy here, if one was available. Keep your ears glued to the ground for any reaction to these notices. One thing that we do not want is any bad publicity or any bad reaction around Heywoods before we even get started. As much as possible see that our name is kept out of the deal entirely, until this matter of the notice has died down." 6.55 p.m.

The Canadians were also interested in buying Lascelles and Trents about the same time. Lascelles and Trents are part of the Panama Estates which the Sugar Industry Agricultural Bank tried to sell out for debt. The Sugar

Industry Agricultural Bank set up Lascelles Plantation for sale well knowing there was eight times as much money in the hands of the receiver to pay for the debt. That plantation group was owned by a group of poor Barbadian people living in Panama.

Mr. SEARLES: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. As I am one of the members of the Sugar Industry Agricultural Bank, I am in a position to say that Lascelles and Trents Plantations were highly indebted to the Bank for years; and the Bank could not get their accounts squared and because of that, they gave instructions to the Attorney to call upon these people to pay, if not, the Bank would have to foreclose. No foreclosure took place because the owners of Lascelles and Trents were the same owners as the owners of Four Hills; and they came together and took money from Four Hills and closed the debt. The Sugar Industry Agricultural Bank never at any time wanted to foreclose these estates purely for foreclosing's sake. The Bank was bound to take action inasmuch as the people would not pay anything.

Mr. BARROW: Is that a point of order?

Mr. SPEAKER: I am to judge what are points of order and no other hon. member must judge that.

Mr. BARROW: This Government binds itself, like the hon. junior member for St. James, to protect the interest of all people, particularly the people in the small brackets, against the unscrupulousness of money lenders and so on. The hon. junior member for St. James tells us that these people had money; why then were they in the hands of the receiver? They got an order from the Court to have this money paid to the Sugar Industry Agricultural Bank; however, this was only because these Canadian people were interested in buying Trents and Lascelles. It is remarkable that the Sugar Industry Agricultural Bank had put them up for sale at the same time.

Mr. SEARLES: Mr. Speaker, I am rising on a point of order. I am not the only member of the House who is a member of the Sugar Industry Agricultural Bank. The hon. junior member for St. Lucy, who is a member of that Party, is a member of this Board. The hon. junior member for St. Michael is also a member of that Board.

Mr. SPEAKER: It now being 7.00 p.m. o'clock....

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if with the permission of Your Honour, I can move the adjournment of the House. I had consulted the Hon. Leader of the Opposition earlier, and we had agreed not to order any dinner.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, it was understood, with the consent of the Leader of the Opposition, that we should adjourn at 7 o'clock, and we did not order any dinner. However, if hon. members still feel like going on, it will be all right with the Government.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, maybe, the Hon. Leader of the House may say that they have the right to decide this nonsense about eating and not eating.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Let me make it clear. The question of the adjournment of the House is not in my hands. It is in my hands at this time to suspend the sitting until 7.45 p.m.. Should I suspend the sitting now?

Mr. WALCOTT: I think that I can move the adjournment of the House. (ASIDES). As I understand the Rules of the House, any member can move the adjournment of the House. At any time, the House can be adjourned by any hon. member. (VOICES: Only a Minister can do that.)

Mr. SPEAKER: I will just read the Rule concerning that. Standing Order No. 15 reads as follows:-

"A Minister may move "That this House do now adjourn" at any time after the conclusion of questions at any sitting, but any other Member may only move such

a motion under the provisions of Standing Order No. 16 (Adjournment - Definite Matter of Urgent Public Importance)."

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Sir, if hon. members want to go on, we are quite willing to do so.

Mr. SPEAKER: They have not given the slightest intimation.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition said that he would adjourn at 7 o'clock. We are bound by that.

Mr. BARROW: Sir, may I say that I do not feel bound except for procedure. I would like to go on.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, members of the Government are just as anxious to go on; the debate is very interesting at this stage. We are prepared to answer every charge. For that reason, I have no intention to move the adjournment of the House at this stage.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I shall speak on a question of procedure. Now, the Hon. Minister has said that he is not going to move the adjournment. What type of Parliament have you now whereby Your Honour can sit there and the Minister can say that he is not going to move the adjournment? If he does not move it, must we sit down in here then like Mummies, just because, as the Rule which you have just pointed out says, a member of the Government must make the motion for the adjournment.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: If it is the feeling of the House, I am quite willing to move the adjournment.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. SPEAKER: It now being 7.05 p.m., the sitting of this House now stands suspended until 7.45 p.m. 7.05 p.m.

On re-assembling,

RESOLUTION re ACQUISITION OF FORDE'S PASTURE

Mr. SPEAKER: On the suspension of the sitting, the House was considering a Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of an area of land in Speightstown, St. Peter for the purpose of Housing Development and the use of a Community Playing Field. The hon. junior member for St. John was speaking.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I understand that the Hon. Premier now states that they did not have a specific agreement, inserted in the conveyance in respect of the land at Heywoods. With the exception of the Minister of Education, nearly every Minister was involved in this matter at one stage or other. The Premier said that he had some agreement from them. Why not state the fact that the agreement did not contain any such clause? He gave us the impression that it was an understanding which had been arrived at between himself and the purchasers and developers of this land.

I am very glad that the Premier has returned to his place; I want to put him on his guard right now. If what he says is true, then he has been led up the garden path. I am telling him categorically now that if they have ever made any such agreement with him as the Premier on behalf of Barbados, they are misleading him. I have correspondence which will satisfy Your Honour conclusively that what he is saying is not an accurate statement as to their moral or legal obligations to the people of this island.

In a letter dated 26th November, 1959, on page 4 the Director of this Company states this:-

"Incidentally, it is most important to us that there be no cloud or restrictions on the beach of this property..."

Here is a Canadian saying that there should be no restrictions on this property! But Your Honour will have to hear me. The letter goes on:

"and that it is a private beach, belonging to Heywoods Plantation..." The words "it is a private beach" are underlined. In other words, the Premier has been misled; these people well know that there is no right of way over the land at Heywoods. The President of the Company is in Barbados today; you can check with him whether that is his intention or not.

I invite the Premier to tell me that he maintains that he is right in his statement that Heywoods beach is other than a private beach. In the light of the statement: "It is most important to us that there be no cloud or restrictions on the beach of this property and that it is a private beach belonging to Heywoods Plantation", does that give the people of Barbados a general right to pass and repass throughout the length and breadth along any right of way leading to Heywoods Beach?

There was a gentleman called Mr. Shepherd from the Development Board. I understand that Government's real quarrel with Mr. Shepherd was over Heywoods. These Canadian people were not borrowing any money from the Development Board, at least not up to the time that Mr. Shepherd was dismissed; and Mr. Shepherd was like Mercury, making several trips up to Canada. The legal position of the Cabinet of Barbados in 1957-59 was that there was no law which said that the Government of Barbados or any Minister could prevent the transfer of any property from one person to another, whether he was a native of Barbados or otherwise.

As a result of that gap in our Laws, and the experience which grew out of Heywoods Plantation even within the past three or four months, legislation was enacted here so that everybody coming from outside would have to approach the Ministers legally; but any previous discussions which the Ministers were carrying on with these people before that Bill was passed were only to give the idea that Ministers were important people and you had to see Ministers first before anything could be done. I had, at a certain stage of the purchase of Heywoods, found out that no Minister had any legal right to transfer land. We agreed with the Aliens Land Holding Bill.....

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order. The hon. member is rambling as usual. The Government came in, because there is a law which gives certain powers to the Town and Country Planning Officer; that Bill was extended to that area before the land was purchased. (MEMBERS: When?) Before the land was purchased, it was only with the knowledge, or when they knew, that they could not develop that land without the permission of the Town and Country Planning Officer that they started to discuss the matter with the Government. They wanted to know what the position would have been after they had bought the land. (ASIDES).

The only reason why we came in was because of the Interim Control Order. They could not develop the land for the purpose for which they wanted unless and until they had permission from the Town and Country Planning Officer. They would never have paid so much money for a plantation to be used as a plantation if they could not get permission to develop it as they wanted to develop it. We were not selling any land to anybody. All these documents which the hon. member had read out do not concern us.
7.55 p.m.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order,.....

(A VOICE: You seem worried.)

Mr. MOTTLEY: Can the hon. member look at me and tell me I am worried? I do not recollect, Mr. Speaker, that at the time the Town and Country Planning Interim Order went so far. If the hon. member says a thing, I take it he is a responsible member; but when he says that the Interim Control Order was extended out to Heywoods, I would like to draw to his attention — I would not say it dogmatically — that it did not go out there then. As a matter of fact, I had something to do with this professionally. I know it did not go out there at the time.

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order. I repeat that before that land was purchased, the Interim Control Order was extended to that area.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order. I am only saying what he said "at the time" in answer to the member. I know when the land was purchased.

Mr. SPEAKER: This is just statement and denial. The hon. junior member for St. John will continue.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, the hon. senior member for St. Michael made a very interesting statement here to-night. He said that the Town and Country Planning Order was extended out there, but in the 1959 debate.....

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, one really has to restrain oneself. I said that before the land was purchased, the Interim Control Order was extended out there. I did not say anything about the 29th November. I do not know what he is reading there; I could not care less. I am merely saying that before the land was purchased, the Interim Control Order was made including that area.

Mr. BARROW: I was reading from a letter when the hon. member interrupted me. If I misunderstood him, I would like to make an apology; but he was right up to his ears in this thing long before the Town and Country Planning Order was extended to cover Heywoods. Was he not aware that.....

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order. "Yes". This matter had to do with tourism, and tourism is under my Ministry.

Mr. BARROW: I thought the hon. member said he did not know anything about these negotiations! He said in the course of the debate that I was a liar.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us get on with the debate.

Mr. BARROW: The hon. member said he knew nothing about it.

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order. I have never said anything of the sort. I asked him to quote the letters, and up to now he has not quoted them. He said that I wrote to somebody.

Mr. BARROW: I have not got through one-twentieth of the letters. Do you want me to read yours first? I said that I have over 300 pages of correspondence. What is remarkable is that not a single request or letter was ever received from the Town and Country Planning Officer throughout these negotiations. The Order was extended before the actual purchase, and not before the Agreement; and it was extended because the Ministers were told that they had no right interfering as the matter stood then. That is why they wanted to get into the "do" legally, and then they decided to extend the Order to St. Peter. If you look at the map in the Town and Country Planning Office, you will see that the boundary line stops at Heywoods. The boundary runs from Heywoods down the St. James coast, then to St. Michael, and includes part of Christ Church.

Now, he was negotiating in this matter when he had no legal right, except as Minister when he said "yes"; because of tourism, he had a right. Yet he said he knew nothing about it; he does not sell land. They were all up to their ears in this; all except the Minister of Education.

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order. If anybody comes to the island to discuss tourism or anything pertaining to tourism, the individual goes to see the Tourist Board and the Ministry concerned. (A S I D E S).

Mr. SPEAKER: If I am prevented from hearing the hon. member who is on his feet, I will deem that there is disorder in this House and adjourn it accordingly.

Mr. BARROW: I will go on to deal with the matter in hand. I am saying that throughout these negotiations certain people who had no right in them were up to their ears.

The Minister of Trade said he was in it because of tourism; but that does not tally with what they told the hon. senior member for St. Peter. They told the member for St. Peter and the rest of the House that it was not part of their policy to let agricultural land be turned over for any purpose other than agriculture, including tourism; so that is the position in 1959. But they were all up to their ears in it, inasmuch as there was a big financial transaction going on in which \$5 million were involved. Mr. Bininger had a escrow on his money at 6% bringing \$300,000 since 1959, and Mr. Bininger would have paid anything to see that the whole thing went through smoothly.

Mr. Hough, the President of the Company said that he would have to make sure that when they were talking about Forde's Plantation and the resettling of the peasants that they must get the Ministers in the "do" with them and take a bow to the public, so as not to let any member of the Opposition get the credit. The hon. senior member for St. Michael is always saying that we are with the capitalists, and here you get the biggest capitalist who came to Barbados saying that the members of the Opposition are not with him and not to let them get any credit. You have that letter in your possession, Sir, for safe keeping.
8.05 p.m.

Why should we not take in the circumstances that they have alienated the land from people of Barbados? As Mr. Hough says, these people were beginning to harbour resentment over the fact that they were not offered the chance to purchase Heywoods Plantation. That is the very thing which the hon. senior member for St. Peter was asking for years. Here is Mr. Hough surprised to the effect to see that they apparently resented not having been given the option to buy some of Heywoods. I do not think anybody wants to expropriate anybody's property, except the members of the Government. I am not trying to expose them, but if I have to explain facts which may show them up in the eyes of the people of the island, well, I will have to do so.

Not one of them had any right in this thing at all. As the hon. senior member for the City said, all that they had to do was to extend the Town and Country Planning Regulations to include Heywoods Plantation. What did they do? They came in with an Alien Land Holding Bill. Then they tried to hold up the sale. I do not know what their motive was; why they seemed then not to be in agreement with the sale of that plantation; I think it was because a certain Minister was giving trouble. (A VOICE: Who was the Minister?) The Minister of Communications, Works and Housing. As you know, according to a letter, it was said of him that he was giving trouble.

Now, Sir, you will find at this time in 1959 when they had no legal right to interfere, that they were all getting into it; and even Mr. Shepherd of the Development Board was in it too. He made three trips to Canada. These people did not go to the Development Board for one cent; yet Mr. Shepherd took three trips to Canada under all sorts of guises; and every time he went up there, he had a good time with Mr. Hough.

Getting back to the licensing arrangement with the Government, that was just a big bluff; the Government did not have any Aliens Land Holding Act. You have Mr. Hough saying that, however, since the time he had a talk with Mr. Shepherd and other people, the legal position was that a licence was necessary then. Here it is you get Mr. Shepherd telling these people that he had to work this thing in order to try and get it for them, and that it was difficult and all that sort of thing.

Let me read a next letter for you. It would need 18 Parliamentary Secretaries to assist me in sorting out this correspondence; so, Mr. Speaker, you must bear with me at times if I get a bit confused. In a letter dated November 13th, 1959, Mr. Hough writes to Mr. Wallace M. Bininger of Foxboro Point, Essex, Connecticut, U.S.A., and says this: I will read from Paragraph Two:-

"Perhaps you are not aware that there is some new Government regulation which prohibits taking plantation

land out of production and using it for other uses, such as building, without the consent of the Government. However, I have talked to the Honourable Mr. Cox, the Deputy Prime Minister, and the Government Planning Chief, a Mr. Stephenson," (he has that name wrong; it is Stevens.) "and other interested parties, and they have told me that in their opinion, since Heywoods Plantation has never been considered a very profitable plantation, and does not have a very good earning record agriculturally, that they would look very favourably on having it taken out of the plantation use and put to other uses. In order to accomplish this, I would need to petition the Minister of Agriculture, and I have been assured that by doing this and giving an outline of the proposals I have for this property, that I would be able to get a letter from the Minister which would give me the assurances I need as to the future zoning of this land, before closing.

"Upon inspecting Heywoods Plantation, I find that contrary to your belief and the information you passed on to me - that there were no tenancies on this land - that there are some forty tenants clustered at each end of the property on the main road. These tenants pay some \$14.00 B.W.I. collectively per week, I understand. I have been assured by Mr. Wilkie, the Overseer, and Mr. Packer, that these tenants could be removed from the property in about six months. But Mr. Challenor and a Solicitor to whom I spoke, have both told me that it is imperative that notices to vacate be given the tenants before the 30th November, 1959, in order that those tenants who have crops in have a proper legal notice to vacate.

"We were a little unhappy to find that these tenancies did exist on the property, but we do not regard the situation as serious, provided that your agents were to have them removed from the property within one year. There is the possibility that we might decide to prepay the mortgage at the end of the first year and start development, and if this was the case, we would want these tenancies off the property by then. However, this would be giving an additional six months notice to the tenants, and this extension of time would assure that the tenants would not suffer any hardship in vacating."
8.15 p.m.

The rest of the letter goes on to recite the proposed terms of the agreement. You will be surprised to know, Sir, that the circle is widening! We are now with the Minister of Trade, the Minister of Communications and the Minister of Agriculture; we have to go now to Trinidad to get in the Federal Prime Minister! (Mr. MOTTLEY: Keep him out of this!) On page four of the letter dated May 14, 1959, this is what is stated:-

"I was pleased to learn that you had a talk with Sir Grantley Adams, since I notice that he still packs a tremendous amount of influence in Barbados, and I believe that if we had him on our side we could possibly get the concessions from the Government and the Development Board, which I think are essential to putting over the type of an operation that I have in mind...."

I am reading documentary evidence of originals and they can question the gentleman on that. The letter goes on:

"I certainly think that it would be well worth your time to continue your talks with him when he arrives back in the Barbados.

"Regarding the "Lascelles" and "Trents" Plantations.... These two properties together, being alongside Sandy Lane appeal to me very much...."

These are the plantations which those poor Barbadians in Panama bought, it was the first cooperative effort, either inside or outside of Barbados, to try and get a toe-hold in the agricultural development of this country. Are you selling out these people for tourism? That is the question I would like answered. Mr. Speaker, I am continuing to quote:

"I think that you should follow up and get all the financial information possible from the banks or institutions who

may be handling it, because these two show the highest potential for our pet project..."

After talking about Chancery Lane they go on to say this:

"However, so far "Trents" and "Lascelles" appeal to me most of anything that I have seen from an all-round standpoint..."

In a letter dated 15th June, 1959, again this is what we get:

"However; I am still very much interested in the two plantations next to Sandy Lane that we have discussed, and since there is no particular urgency to sell these, and since it might take a long time to get a clear title if one were to make an offer..."

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order. We do not read from the bottom or the middle of a letter; we want to be able to grasp the contents of the letter. Let the hon. member read it from the beginning, and let us understand it; this is the first time we are hearing anything about this. For the benefit of the members on this side of the House, let the hon. member read from the start, not from the middle.

Mr. BARROW: If the hon. member knows nothing about this, how does he know that I am either reading or taking this out of its context?

Mr. SPEAKER: It is not for me to dictate to the hon. member how he should read, or from where he should read; that could never be any interest of mine. All of these letters are documents of the House. The relative parts which are necessary, plus the letters themselves will be produced in the debate. Also copies of these letters will be available to hon. members.

Mr. BARROW: I repeat, how could the hon. member accuse me of taking something out of its context when he says that he knows nothing about it? I think that he had better investigate the Civil Service because they have been stopping his mail. Mr. Speaker, I quote:

"I am still interested...." (*ASIDES*).

If we allow this Government to go along as they are going on, these people will drive all of us in St. Thomas. On the 21st January, 1960, on page one of this letter which I will pass on, it says this:
8.25 p.m.

This is now down in 1960 when he had shaken the dust of Spooners Hill off his feet. The letter goes on as follows:-

"In regard to your letters, if we understand them correctly, the whole situation hinges on the Premier of Barbados and his Cabinet making up their minds as to whether they want tourist business or whether they wish to get additional votes. I trust that when Sir Grantley Adams returns he can do something to speed up the situation. Unfortunately, we feel that he is a very busy man, taken up with many of the problems that are now besetting the Federation. On top of that, he is in ill health, and all we can do at this stage is to hope that someone will get moving and take a firm stand one way or the other.

Quite frankly, if the Government is not prepared to take a firm stand on this point, we may be forced to withdraw entirely from the deal."

What is the firm stand?

"I can see nothing but complications arising on every hand in the development of the property if the Government support is not 100% behind tourism development. We have enough problems at home without going 3,000 miles to run into larger headaches."

That is when the Minister was giving trouble.

"As you well know, there are other places in the sun that are taking a more realistic view on outside capital for development purposes."

I want these to be enscrolled on the records of this House. Let me sum up the situation now, Sir, because if I go on, we would not be able to get the Estimates done until 1963; but I am continuing next week. Here endeth the first lesson.

In 1959, the Minister of Social Services and the other members of the Government made their famous pronouncement that they did not intend to take land out of agricultural production. Around the same year, Sandy Lane - 380 acres - went out, and negotiations were going on with the same Ministers, at the time they were making the statement, to take Heywoods out of production. Part and parcel of these negotiations were that those tenants around Heywoods should be resettled somewhere, preferably at the expense of the taxpayers, but the 'ace in the hole' was that if it could not be done that way, it would be done by the purchasers.

MOMENT OF INTERRUPTION

Mr. SPEAKER: It is now the moment of Interruption. I must enquire if this matter is controversial.

Mr. BARROW: It is very controversial.

Mr. SPEAKER: Then that is the end of Government Business.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House would like to facilitate and accommodate the member or members especially on this question; and although I have not discussed it with the Leader of the Opposition, I hope he will agree to let us come back tomorrow afternoon. (OPPOSITION MEMBERS: No.) (Hon. R. G. MAPP: Do you only want to hear one side?) (Mr. WALCOTT: Do you mean that you can only hear the other side tomorrow? That is another example of dishonesty.)

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. senior member for St. Peter is making loud asides.

Mr. MOTTLEY: We will talk this out and let the House adjourn automatically.

Mr. SPEAKER: Do I have to rise again?

Mr. MOTTLEY: Call it disorder or whatever you like, we are talking until 9 o'clock.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, we regard this matter as a very serious one, (Mr. MOTTLEY: Oh yes, we agree with you.) not so much from what the hon. member was saying - because nobody in this world would accuse us of being dishonest or shady by what was read out - but the overtone all along when he was reading these letters and placing a different interpretation, construction....

Mr. BARROW: On a point of order. Let the hon. member get this straight. As Your Honour has heard, this debate is not concluded. If he wants to adjourn the House, let him do that. Have you heard me make any comment except to read the letters and pass them on to you?

Hon. M. E. COX: Oh yes. There was all that cheap talk in which you indulged.

Mr. BARROW: I object to the hon. member getting up and saying that. I have another 250 pages of letters to read, but if they adjourn until tomorrow, it may take another three meetings. I am not going to get to the end of this before the Estimates. The hon. member is not before a jury, so why is he rattled and disturbed? He said he never knew anything about the project, and yet letters were written to him.

Mr. SPEAKER: That debate is over.

Hon. M. E. COX: I heard him say he is sorry he did not get any of the change.

Mr. BARROW: When did I say anything about a piece of change?

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until 3 p.m. on Wednesday, 1st March, 1961.

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

Mr. WALCOTT, Mr. BRANCKER and Mr. MOTTLEY rose.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. senior member for St. Peter caught my eye first.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, we spent a long time in making the Rules of this House, and what surprises me tonight is to see the Premier, who said in Trinidad that Barbados is still run by Barbadians, sit there like an innocent dupe and allow the Deputy Premier to make a motion that he himself could not be in agreement with on the basis of principle. Why do you want to adjourn the House until tomorrow?
8.35 p.m.

We cannot allow the Hon. Leader of the House, whose mentality has not yet developed to the position which he is holding, to believe that Parliament is some little debating club under the sun or some little parish pump toy.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Can the hon. member really get up and cast aspersions at another hon. member?

Mr. SPEAKER: I was thinking of it myself. When the hon. member used the remarks about "mentality has not yet developed", that is a sort of personal reflection. I would like the hon. senior member for St. Peter to get on with what he has to say without making personal references.

Mr. WALCOTT: Sir, the Hon. Leader of this House has the idea that when we come in here we are as small boys. As I have told him, on many occasions, he has been elected to this House and I have been elected too. He thinks that they have the right and we have no right in here. That is his attitude, and that is why I talked of mental development. If a man is mentally developed, and is a parliamentarian, he will know that we have a right to be here.

He said today that we do not understand Parliamentary Procedure. He further said "I have made an agreement with the Hon. Leader of the Opposition to finish by dinner." He gets up now that you have this debate, and says that you boys will come back here tomorrow!

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I never said that they must come back here tomorrow; they need not come. I am within my right to make the motion that the House adjourn until tomorrow or until Sunday, or Saturday, or until any time; but I cannot compel them to come to the House. All they need to do is to vote against the motion.

Mr. WALCOTT: The hon. member is fond of using a phrase about abuse. What is the meaning of abuse? I do not believe there can be any academic degrees for abuse; but when it comes to abuse, the hon. member has all the degrees. If there were a University for abuse, the hon. member would get first class honours.

For what purpose has the adjournment been moved? It has not been moved for the purpose that, in the normal circumstances, you come back on Tuesday. I believe the Ministers have the intention of starting the Estimates next Tuesday; and then we will be told - as we are often told - by the Hon. Leader of this House, that we will meet from day to day until we get through the Estimates.

Today, the 28th February, they have now decided in Parliament to meet tomorrow, the 1st March. That is why I say they need mental development to understand and to run Parliament; if they had it, you would not get them coming in the very day that parliament is meeting and telling members that you must come the next day, particularly in view

of the fact that the question of urgency does not arise. They know that they could not get Your Honour to call a special meeting to carry on today's debate on this matter. Look at the Order Paper and you will see how many items are on it. There are six items on it, and one of them should have been withdrawn. The Hon. Minister has the effrontery to tell us that we are little boys. If you put the motion to the vote, their backbenchers have the sort of idea that the motion for an adjournment is a Party matter, therefore, they must vote with the Party.

The Hon. Ministers think that they can be so clever as to hold us up to ransom whenever it suits them; but as long as I have breath in my body, and I happen to be a member of this House, I will not allow that to take place. We have agreed that we will have a time table for the meeting of this House; and we have made Standing Orders to that effect.

Mr. MOTTLEY moved from his seat to another.

The hon. senior member for the City is a very nervous man.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I am sure that you will agree with me that that is a most offensive remark. (Laughter). If my wife comes across this remark made of me in the House, that is sufficient to entitle her to get a divorce from me!

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think that that is enough!

Mr. MOTTLEY: It is professionally slanderous to make such remarks; that "I am a nervous man." No hon. member should use such expressions in this Chamber.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member may not do that. You must not break the Rules of this House.

Mr. WALCOTT: Sir, I must apologise for breaking the Rules of the House.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am telling the hon. member not to suggest in any remarks that I am a nervous man. I came over to speak with the hon. senior member for Christ Church. I see absolutely no reason why the hon. member should have made such remarks. If the hon. member feels tired, I can take over the debate for the next fifteen minutes.

Mr. WALCOTT: Sir, I am serious; I do not want to be offensive. Any time a member cannot keep quiet, well then, he is nervous; he should read a book. I have been in company with nervous people and I have found out that when they are not doing anything, they sit down and read a book.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The hon. member means active people, he does not mean nervous people. I should not like to meet the hon. member in a duel. Your Honour understands what I mean by duel! I do not mean fisticuffs.

Mr. WALCOTT: Sir, this House has Rules, and we all know these Rules. I see here in these Rules which I have that this House does not, like the Other Place, adjourn *sine die*. After the first meeting, unless the House otherwise decides, the House shall meet on every Tuesday at 12 o'clock noon.

As in cricket, you have an umpire, and you do not wait until you get on the field to look for an umpire. This is like cricket; you do not wait until you get here to say that you must come next Tuesday. What are the reasons adduced for us meeting tomorrow? The reasons adduced are, because in a debate something arises which the Government did not expect, this Government says "we shall meet tomorrow" although they did not propose to meet later than dinner time.
8.45 p.m.

The Minister will say that we can do our business how we like, but no private member has asked for any concession to do any other business. As I said before, constitutional propriety does not mean anything to the Hon. Minister. From the way in which he reacts to things, it is as if

this were a Parliament in which he could say: "I can close it down"; and he would close it down and come back tomorrow. (ASIDES). You should be where Lumumba is now. (Laughter).

Mr. SPEAKER: "He", not "you".

Mr. WALCOTT: This is a sample to show what independence means. Without parliamentary procedure, you will see what power means to some people. They become so intoxicated with power that you have this indication. Do you see the indication, Sir? You debate something today and you come back with it tomorrow. If a debate takes place on an issue, you have the right to reply to the points raised; but the guise under which you are adjourning the House until tomorrow so as to carry on the debate is moonshine. It is not as though we had reached the end of the Session; as if you did not debate this matter on Wednesday there would be no other opportunity for you to debate it. It does not mean that the Government is going to abandon this Resolution. This Resolution has been moved by the Government, and is there any suggestion that Government should withdraw the Resolution? It would be the only thing to do in the circumstances anyhow.

We could debate this Resolution until December, 1961, so that we will have the whole year in front of us. I do not see why the Hon. Minister should not treat this House with common courtesy; he has adopted this vexatious attitude without saying anything to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition. Today that common courtesy has not been extended to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition; and it is moonshine to say that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition is different from other hon. members. He is different when he is differing from other hon. members. Has the Hon. Leader of the Opposition changed tonight? I am saying that this Jekyll and Hyde attitude will not do. One day you say that an hon. member is a gentleman; this is no reflection on other hon. members, but that it is only singling out an hon. member for more than the Hon. Leader would give to other hon. members. Now the hon. member is the same as any other hon. member!

The Hon. Leader of the House says that we can vote against this Resolution. I want to say that unless we are adjourning in the normal way... If the Hon. Leader of the House does not know constitutional propriety and decency, let me tell him that.....

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order. I would like to know what the hon. member means by constitutional decency; does he accuse me of not having constitutional decency could by moving the adjournment of the House?

Mr. WALCOTT: I will make some analogies. You cannot appear at a person's house for dinner unless you are asked; and if you are invited you cannot be called upon to pay the price. In the normal way you move the adjournment until Tuesday so that you do not tell anybody anything; but if you are not adjourning until such day, then decency demands that you discuss the matter with somebody else. Not having constitutional decency, in ordinary Barbadian language, means that you do not have any manners.

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order. Is the hon. member saying that I have not got any manners?

Mr. WALCOTT: The hon. member thinks that having manners is having physical stiffness, and wearing clothing not suited to the climate in which we live.

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order. I notice that the hon. member is mimicking me! I want to know if the hon. member is referring to me as being unmannerly.

Mr. WALCOTT: I do not have any stiffness which I cannot limber up when the occasion requires. There is a difference between having stiffness and being comfortable. If the hon. member is saying that he is watching me so closely as to see that I am taking a leaf out of his book, I would prefer to die.

I repeat that constitutional decency means that at any time the Leader of the House wishes to change from the normal procedure, he should acquaint certain persons in Parliament. The House of Commons sits from Monday until Friday; the House of Commons can also decide to meet on Saturday; but the Leader of the House of Commons will never as a result of a debate move that the House meet on Saturday, and without knowing if the Speaker has made any arrangements privately or otherwise that would embarrass him in coming to Parliament on that day. I have seen where Your Honour, owing to the Rules of this Chamber, has found it very inconvenient to leave that Chair because His Honour the Deputy Speaker has been away; and Your Honour would not like to call on the Chairman of Committees to deputise for you. I am making a substantive motion, that is, that this House do now adjourn until this day week at 12 o'clock noon.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure in seconding that motion.
8.55 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, I was myself surprised that the Leader of the House should have attempted to move the Adjournment until tomorrow. As a matter of fact, not only do I regard this as being discourteous to the Chair, but I regard it as not in keeping with the spirit of Parliamentary decency or decorum in not acquainting the Opposition. To my way of thinking and to put it mildly, it is the sort of vindictiveness.....

Hon. M. E. COX: I object to that. What vindictiveness could there be? I am on my feet, Sir.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Stand on them.

Hon. M. E. COX: I said on a point of order.

Mr. MOTTLEY: You have now said it.

Hon. M. E. COX: What vindictiveness could there be in asking that the House be adjourned until tomorrow? The vindictiveness could only be from the person who thinks it is vindictive.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I can only say it is not vindictiveness, it is maliciousness, because the hon. member knew well enough that when he came here he had no intention of adjourning this House until tomorrow; if he says now that it was his intention, I say it is more discourteous to you that he did not say it. Dinner was not even ordered because there was no intention of going on after 7 o'clock. I do not want to appear unparliamentary by saying it is bad manners but if people argue, Mr. Speaker, in a Chamber, whatever their personal feelings may be,.....

Mr. SPEAKER: It now being 9 p.m., o'clock, this House now stands adjourned until Tuesday, 7th March, 1961, at 12 noon.
9.00 p.m.