

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1961

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 7th March, 1961.

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 12 o'clock noon today.

PRESENT

His Honour Mr. K. N. R. HUSBANDS, (*Speaker*); Mr. J. E. T. BRANCKER, (*Leader of the Opposition*); 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*); Mr. T. O. BRYAN, (*Chairman of Committees*); Hon. F. E. MILLER, (*Minister of Social Services*); Mrs. E. E. BOURNE; Mr. J. C. TUDOR, M.A.; Mr. C.B. SEARLES and Mr. J. W. CORBIN.

Prayers were read.

Hon. L. St.A. THORNE entered the House and took his seat.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that the Minutes of the meeting held on the 28th February last have been printed and circulated amongst hon. members, and unless there be any objection, the Minutes of this Meeting will be now taken as read and confirmed.

There being no objection, the Minutes of this meeting are now taken as read and confirmed.

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

THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL TO THE HONOURABLE THE HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

The Legislative Council have the honour to return to the Honourable the House of Assembly the Act to amend the Holidays with Pay Act, 1951, which has been passed with amendments which are shown written in Clause 2 (a) (ii) and 2 (c) (ii) of the Bill.

Legislative Chamber,
28th February, 1961.

H. G. MASSIAH,
President.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the Barbados Statistical Service - Selected Monthly Indicators - December, 1960.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay on behalf of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries, the Animals (Importation) Control Regulations, 1961.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Bill to continue various expiring laws.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Bill to amend the Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic Act, 1937.

NOTICE OF REPLY TO QUESTION

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, if I may be permitted, I want to give notice of an Oral Reply to Question No. 21/1961 asked by the hon. senior member for St. Lucy, regarding Broadcasting Time on Rediffusion Ltd.

Mr. G. E. S. STRAUGHN entered the House and took his seat.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICES

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Resolution:-

"WHEREAS it is a fact that no Barbadian territory was involved in the 1941 lease W. I. Naval and Air Base Agreement between the United Kingdom and the U.S.A., in connection with the turning over of 50 over-age destroyers to Great Britain; but

WHEREAS Barbados has subsequently made its contribution to hemispheric defence by granting the U.S.A. an area in the parish of St. Lucy for the establishment of an Oceanographic Survey Base and other purposes; and

WHEREAS at the recent conferences in connection with the preparations of new Agreements covering U.S. defence areas in the West Indies, the U.S.A. Government expressed its desire -

To create and maintain throughout the West Indies, economic and social progress adequate to meet the legitimate aspirations of individual citizens for a better life and to provide them the fullest opportunity to improve their status; to assist in establishing the political and economic stability of the

West Indies; and made reference to its great expectations of the role which a politically stable and independent West Indies can play in world affairs; and

WHEREAS on the recent unconditional relinquishment of the major portions of the leased bases areas in Jamaica, Trinidad, Antigua and St. Lucia, the U.S.A. Government"-

(a) presented Jamaica with a gift of \$850,000 (W.L.) for the execution of a housing and slum clearance programme, extension of water supply system, and extension of technical, trade and University education, with promises of further assistance by way of loans,

(b) presented Trinidad with over \$1,800,000 (W.L.) for public works and other programmes,

(c) presented Antigua with over \$590,000 (W.L.) to finance studies in connection with a deep water harbour, to participate in extension of the runway at the airport and in the colony's corn meal industry, and promised future assistance in educational, electrification, communications and water supply programmes,

(d) gave St. Lucia \$500,000 (W.L.) for public works and other programmes, and

WHEREAS the Barbados Government was invited to participate in all phases of the recently concluded Bases talks thereby implying this colony's involvement in these issues,

BE IT RESOLVED that in view of all the foregoing, and the amicable and harmonious relationship existing between this colony and the U.S. Government, the U.S. Government be asked to render likewise financial assistance to Barbados for extension of our water supply system, for a large scale irrigation programme, for the provision of more secondary schools, and other purposes to be specified." 12.25 p.m.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to amend the Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic Act, 1937, be now read a first time.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: I beg to second that.

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

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to continue various Expiring Laws be now read a first time.

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

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE FOR MR. F. L. WALCOTT

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I am asking for three weeks' leave of absence on behalf of the hon. senior member for St. Peter as from today's date.

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

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of privilege arising out of a debate which took place in this Chamber on the 28th February, 1961. I see that the Hon. Minister of Trade is laughing, but he will be laughing on the other side of his face when I am finished. During the course of that debate, on the express invitation by members of the Government, I handed to Your Honour certain documents

which came into my possession in a perfectly legal and legitimate manner. I did that, and I still have authority to hand over to Your Honour or to any other competent person or to disclose documents in any way I desire. I made that point clear at the time. Your Honour will remember that several times during the course of my speech the Members of the Government on the other side, the Ministers particularly, or rather exclusively, challenged the authenticity of the statements which I was making from these documents and insisted that these documents be produced.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member's point of privilege will be gone through; I do not think that the hon. member can intervene. If it is the pattern to have constant interruption of order especially now that a matter of privilege is being stated, I do not think that the day's sitting will be a very quiet one. I would very much prefer to hear the hon. junior member for St. John through his point of privilege before any observations are made out of that point of privilege.

Hon. M. E. COX: I would like to draw Your Honour's attention to the fact that we did not question the authenticity of any statement. We said that we did not know anything about the matter; and that it did not concern us at all. We insisted that the documents be made the property of the House so that we and the public could have them to go into for future reference.

Mr. SPEAKER: Whether or not any member of the Government had asked that this correspondence be made documents of the House, I would not allow an hon. member to get up here and purport to read correspondence which is intended for the information of the House without such correspondence being made documents of the House. In any event, whether an hon. member of the Government had asked that they be made documents of the House or not I would have normally insisted that they may be so made. There is therefore no point in the hon. junior member for St. John saying that the members of the Government insisted on having that correspondence made documents of the House.

Mr. BARROW: Despite the numerous private lessons of the hon. senior member for St. Michael, I must say that he does not understand the procedure up to today.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member must be heard on a point of privilege.

Mr. BARROW: Your Honour will also recollect that I was never reluctant, or loth, to make these documents the property of the House or to give them into the custody of Your Honour. Since that date the Ministers have been apparently working overtime and sending out emissaries in different directions. That is a point which need not take up any time because it can be proved quite easily. Yesterday, I received a document a copy of which, I understand from the document itself, should have been sent to Your Honour for information. I do not know what the authors had expected you to do about it; I do not know if they had wanted to intimidate Your Honour; but they will not intimidate me. This document challenges the right of members of this House to divulge any information which concerns matters of vital public interest; and it also challenges the right of members of this House to speak without fear of being threatened or intimidated.

This document is dated 6th March, 1961, and it is a document which Your Honour already has. I am asking Your Honour to let it be produced on some other occasion when my legal advisers deem it expedient to do so. 12.35 p.m.

This letter is dated 6th March, 1961. It is addressed to E. W. Barrow, Esq., Chambers, Bridgetown, and was delivered to me yesterday afternoon at 2.45 p.m. in Court. (ASIDES). If the hon. members of the Government want the other documents produced they will have all of them. We shall see whether there is any conspiracy between the

Government and anybody else, and whether there should be any suppression of information which is of vital importance to the public. (Hon. M. E. COX: Read the letter.) You know the contents already.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I object to those nasty insinuations by him. What do I know about it?

Mr. SPEAKER: It is not a nasty insinuation.

Hon. M. E. COX: I know absolutely nothing about the letter he has in his hands.

Mr. SPEAKER: If one hon. member says to another hon. member that he knows the contents of something, that cannot be deemed by me to be a nasty insinuation.

Mr. BARROW: The letter reads as follows:-

Pinfold Street,
Bridgetown,
6th March, 1961.

E. W. Barrow, Esq.,
Barrister-at-Law,
Chambers,
Bridgetown.

Dear Sir,

We write on behalf of our client Commercial Land Developments Ltd. and on instructions of the President Mr. L. G. Hough, who is at present in Barbados.

It has come to our knowledge that you are in possession of certain correspondence between our client and a Mr. Clyde Corbin (now deceased) and of copies of letters written from our client to other persons in Barbados. It is also within our knowledge that on Tuesday the 28th ulto, you read in the House of Assembly of this Island extracts from and produced copies of certain letters forming a part of the said correspondence. As you know, our client has never given you permission to read any of the said letters all of which came into possession of the said Clyde Corbin in his capacity as agent for our client.

We wish to make it clear that in law, authority for any of the said correspondence to be read or published would have to be obtained from our client and this you do not have.

We understand that you have come into possession of this correspondence through Mrs. Corbin (the widow of the said Clyde Corbin). Mrs. Corbin is not the executrix or administratrix of the estate of her husband, nor could she in any way whatsoever give permission for the publication of the said letters. Further we have been reliably informed that Mrs. Corbin has never purported to give any such permission. Indeed there is no one in Barbados (apart from Mr. L. G. Hough) who legally could have given that permission.

We have been instructed to state that our client, Commercial Land Developments Ltd., acting through Mr. Hough its President, absolutely forbids you or anyone else from reading, publishing or in any manner making known the contents of any correspondence between our said client and the said Clyde Corbin or any letters written by our client to anyone at all.

Yours faithfully,
(sgd) BROWNE & CHAPMAN

RCC:jp

c.c. The Speaker,
House of Assembly."

That is the complete letter, Sir, a copy of which Your Honour has before you.

Now having read the contents of that letter which the Minister for Tourism was so anxious for me to read - I

do not know what he thought I arose for on this preliminary point of privilege - I would like to deal with the implications of the letter. You will notice that there are several inaccuracies contained therein.

Mr. SPEAKER: There are several of them that do not concern the House at all.

Mr. BARROW: If they think they have any legal rights against me, I am sure my colleagues at the Bar who will be assisting me, will be competent to deal with the matter even if I am incompetent myself. This is the first time I have had an expression of opinion from Solicitors. Normally an expression of opinion is given by a Lawyer to Solicitors. But the part of this letter which more intimately concerns the House on the question of privilege, is the attempt to prevent a member from expressing an opinion or disclosing any documents short of the Official Secrets Act, which are relevant to the subject matter of a debate and which have been produced in this House, and the implications of their sending a copy of this letter to Your Honour, by whose authority the documents quoted last Tuesday were printed and circulated amongst hon. members.

Now I think Your Honour can safely leave me to deal with the question of whether I have authority, or whether I am acting with propriety or not, in disclosing these documents. I want to make this clear: I have never at any time had the misfortune or good fortune to have Mr. Hough as my client; I have never at any time had the fortune to have Mr. Corbin as my personal client; and I repudiate the idea that anyone who is deceased can be the agent of a Corporation which has more or less perpetual existence.

If the Ministers want to find out who gave me authority, they can serve a Writ of Mandamus to find out who gave me authority to produce them. I assured Your Honour that I had had authority, and Your Honour considered and ruled that the correspondence was relevant to the debate; and because of the insistence and because of Your Honour's feelings on documents of this kind, Your Honour ordered them to be printed and circulated amongst members of the House so that every member here would be able to weigh and assess the value of these disclosures, and not merely hear something recited by a member of the House on the floor of the House.

Now I do not know what the law of Parliament or the common law of Canada is, but what I certainly resent is an infringement on the sacred rights of this Chamber; and that any individual, whether or not in collusion with the Ministers, should try to stifle a debate or intimidate even the Chair or a member of this House from discharging their public duty, by either issuing an injunction by letter or otherwise. I think you know me well enough, Sir, to say that I cannot be frightened by threats of this kind. The only way I will desist in any way from doing what I consider my public duty, no matter what heckling is going on by the Ministerial Benches right now.....

Mr. SPEAKER: It is not heckling. I believe hon. members will keep quiet in order that I may hear.

Mr. BARROW: I only want to say this, Sir, I can deal with them in the Law Courts if necessary; but what I definitely deprecate is the attempt to restrain the freedom of speech of a member of the House. We know that they can restrain employees from expressing their minds by dismissal; we know that they have gas chambers, concentration camps and things like that in other parts of the world; but we also know that in British Parliamentary democracy an injunction has even been issued by the Speaker of the House of Commons against the highest judicial officers in the land for interfering with members' rights of freedom of speech. This happened, as you know from Parliamentary history, in the Mother of Parliaments on more than one occasion; and therefore I regard this as a serious breach of privilege.

If these persons feel that they have been in any way injured, if they feel that their reputations have been damaged

by their own writings, if they think that any animosity has been created in the minds of the Ministers by statements made by them about the Ministers, their right of redress is not to threaten a member as a member and tell the member "I absolutely forbid you."
12.45 p.m.

I want to see the person in Barbados who can forbid me from doing what I consider to be my public duty. If I can take the abuse and slander which take place at election time by hon. members on the other side.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think the hon. member should trespass on that now.

Mr. BARROW: We cannot entertain any veiled far less any blatant attempt to fetter the sacred right of freedom of speech in this Hon. Chamber - provided that it does not go beyond the legitimate grounds of parliamentary debate, and that is a matter which is exclusively within Your Honour's province and not theirs. If any member transgresses the boundaries of legitimate debate and trespasses upon a member's personal life or anything irrelevant to the subject matter, as I understand it, it is the Speaker of the House and the Speaker alone who is the person to give specific guidance as to whether or not such is legitimate.

If any person outside of the House decides to challenge the supremacy of Parliament, or wants to suggest to us that he will use measures against a member of this House to suppress a debate in this Chamber because he feels he has such a right, then let him call a marshal or a bailiff and send him here and he will see how Your Honour will deal with him. Let them send here the highest of the execution warrants signed and delivered by the supreme judiciary authority in the island, and I am sure that the Marshal of this House will know how to deal with such persons. Let them attach to, or extract from a parliamentary debate of this Chamber - far less the writing of a nonsensical letter by any Minister, any firm of solicitors, any alien - and see if that is going to fetter my right to discuss matters of public importance on the floor of this House. I wanted to make that clear; and that is why I raised this question of privilege.

Sir, I need not give Your Honour the authorities for my stating what I have said, but I have here an abundance of authorities on the matter. It is my opinion that simply because Ministers and others in this twentieth century are prepared to make themselves into door-mats for persons of wealth from outside, and may consider that everybody in the island and every representative is built out of.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us get away from that.

Mr. BARROW: I was just only trying to make my position clear. I was saying that there are people in Barbados, and members of this House, who are not prepared to be door-mats for foreigners, for local Communists or for foreign people of wealth.

I intend to make a motion before I sit down, but there is a second point which I would like to raise arising out of this same debate. As a matter of fact, I intend to make two motions before I sit down. The second motion concerns an article in the Press. I do not know whether I should make a motion on this document first, and then deal with the second point of privilege.

Mr. SPEAKER: The one which you are going to make on this matter should be made now.

Mr. BARROW: Well Sir, my motion on this matter is as follows:-

"BE IT RESOLVED that this House take cognisance of a breach of privilege committed by a letter addressed to the honourable junior member for St. John in his capacity as a member of this Honourable House and against members of the House in general and the Officers of the said Honourable House by the terms of the said letter;

"AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the President of The Commercial Land Developments Limited, Mr. L. G.

Hough, be summoned to the Bar of this House to show cause why he should not be committed by Mr. Speaker."
12.55 p.m.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, the important point which arises from this communication which has been read and which has been addressed to all members of this Chamber, is that there is clearly a thinly-made attempt by the writer of this letter to influence, if not to intimidate, a member of Parliament. I would only need to remind Your Honour of how it is stated; and I quote from the 14th Edition of May's Treatise on the law of Privileges, Procedures and Usage of Parliament, Chapter VIII, page 122. Under the Heading "Breaches of Privileges and Contempts" and under the sub-caption "Acts tending indirectly to obstruct members in the discharge of their duty," it reads as follows:-

"Conduct not amounting to a direct attempt to influence a Member in the discharge of his duties, but having a tendency to impair his independence in the future performance of his duty, will also be treated as a breach of privilege."

And then Mr. Speaker, it goes on to deal with "Molestation of members on account of their conduct in Parliament." This is what it says:

"It is a breach of privilege to molest any Member of either House on account of his conduct in Parliament."

Instances of this type of contempt are stated. One of them is the sending of insulting letters to members in reference to their conduct in Parliament, or letters reflecting on their conduct as such members. The cases to which reference is made are the well known case of Woodcock's, 1831; the Reed's case, 1863 and Atkinson's case 1890-91. Unfortunately, none of these cases is, so far as I am aware, in the Library of this Chamber. However, May's Treatise goes on to deal with "Reflections upon Members" and states this further:-

"Analogous to molestations of Members on account of their behaviour in Parliament are speeches and writings reflecting upon their conduct as Members. On 26th February, 1701, the House of Commons resolved that to print or publish any libels reflecting upon any member of the House for or relating to his service therein was a high violation of the rights and privileges of the House. "Written imputations as affecting a member of Parliament may amount to a breach of privilege, without, perhaps, being libels at common law," but to constitute a breach of privilege, a libel upon a member must concern the character or conduct of the Member in that capacity and the conduct or language on which the libel is based must be actions performed or words uttered in the actual transaction of the business of the House.

For example, aspersions upon the conduct of members as Magistrates or officers in the Army or Navy, or as counsel or employers of labour or in private life, or otherwise than in relation to Parliament are not fit subjects for complaints to the House of Commons, even if the inference is to be drawn that they are unworthy to sit in Parliament."
1.05 p.m.

"Reflections on members even in their Parliamentary capacity have been ruled not to constitute a breach of privilege because *mala fides* was not imputed or because a charge was indefinite.

A libel on a Member's extra-parliamentary conduct may, however, constitute a breach of privilege if it is designed to influence the proceedings of the House; and to charge members with conduct which renders them unworthy to sit in Parliament, and to criticise the House for not expelling them would be a libel upon the House."

So, Mr. Speaker, it is in respect of the ultimate paragraph that I am supporting the motion. I am respectfully suggesting that here is an instance of an act tending directly to obstruct a member in the course of his duty, and which has a tendency to impair his independence in the future per-

formance of his duty. As such, it must be treated as a breach of privilege. If I may be permitted to refresh hon. members' minds, the relevant paragraph reads as follows:-

"We have been instructed to state that our client, Commercial Land Developments Ltd., acting through Mr. Hough its President, absolutely forbids you or anyone else from reading, publishing or in any manner making known the contents of any correspondence between our said client and the said Clyde Corbin or any letters written by our client to anyone at all."

When the writer of this letter states that he absolutely forbids any hon. member of this House irrespective of Party, or when someone purports to write a letter and to send an ultimatum absolutely forbidding a member of Parliament or anyone else from reading or publishing or in any manner making known the contents of any correspondence between the two parties or any letters written by their client to anyone at all, he does not seem to realise what is Parliament; he seems to be unaware of the privileges of Parliament; he seems to be ignorant of the rights of Parliament.

Suppose the hon. and gallant member for St. John were not a gallant member but a timid soul; that letter might well prevent the hon. member from coming to this House and from doing his duty fearlessly as a member of this House in the interest of the community, and in the interest of the people he is here to represent without fear or favour. Theoretically or academically there are only two hon. members of the House who may be styled as hon. and gallant - the hon. junior member for St. John and the hon. senior member for St. George - but, Mr. Speaker, one must be regarded as fearless enough, after being elected to represent the people, to be willing to do one's duty without fear or favour; and one should not be liable to become the recipient of missives such as this from anyone regardless of who he is, however opulent his client may be, or however many Canadian dollars that client may fork out. A member of the House should be perfectly free to do his duty without bias and without fear; and no person, especially one though not learned in the law but has a legal training, should attempt to impair the conduct of affairs in Parliament of any member who has his duty to do according to his likes, and who cares to refer to documents not privileged and non-copyrighted which he has in his possession in order to fortify his point by what he can call chapter and verse.

It would be a sad day in the history of Parliamentary democracy in this island if a member of Parliament could be intimidated, threatened or scared, or attempted to be intimidated, threatened or scared by any individual however opulent may be the client for whom that individual is acting, by being written to and by being told - to quote the exact words of this letter - "I absolutely forbid you or anyone else from reading, publishing or in any manner making known the contents of any correspondence between" these two people. It is because of that, Mr. Speaker, that I support the motion which I formally second on the ground of principle.

You know, Sir, when we ask of the Governor, through Mr. Speaker, at the beginning of a Session of Parliament, for the various ancient privileges and the various rights formerly enjoyed by members, and these rights are granted by His Excellency, certainly one of them is to be able to speak your mind fairly, frankly, freely, and certainly without any fear of being the subject of a communication such as the learned and gallant member for St. John was the recipient of yesterday, 6th March 1961, addressed to him in his Chambers at Bridgetown and delivered to him in the performance of his duties as a member of this House.

It will be remembered that in the second paragraph of that letter it is stated that "it is also within our knowledge that on Tuesday, 28th ultimo, you read in the House of Assembly of this island extracts from and produced copies of certain letters forming a part of the said correspondence." My emphasis is on that part which says that on Tuesday 28th ultimo, the hon. member of this House read in the House of Assembly of this island; it is not for any person not a member of this Chamber to question what

takes place in this Chamber. Your Honour is the sole arbiter of whether what is taking place is right or wrong, whether it is appropriate or inappropriate, whether it may be done or may not be done. We appointed Your Honour as Speaker, so let the writer of this letter, his client and his colleagues as well as his friends understand that the debates and the proceedings of this Chamber are determined by Mr. Speaker and not by any letter-writer, be he a member of a firm of Solicitors, be he the representative of one of the most opulent Canadian firms, or be he anybody other than a Member of Parliament.
1.15 p.m.

If he feels that he has a grievance he may take what case he has to a Magistrate's Court of Justice; but let him not think that he has any redress on a Member of Parliament. I would take the same stand if a similar letter had been written to or produced in this Chamber by the humblest backbencher - if there are any humble ones. It is a question of preserving the rights of Members of Parliament; of ensuring that we are free to do our duties unfettered, untrampled, unintimidated and without fear and favour, according to our rights as we see them, and according to the rules and customs of Parliament - a Parliament sitting under the jurisdiction of a properly constituted and elected Speaker. That, Mr. Speaker, is the reason why I am supporting this Resolution which I have formally seconded.

Sir, the presence of this House is admitted because, in the bottom left hand corner of the letter addressed to the hon. junior member for St. John, there is a note that a copy has been, presumptuously, forwarded to Your Honour. One would not have thought that the writer of this letter would submit a copy of such document which, I submit, is a scurrilous document to Your Honour; but that has been done; and it does seem as if these Canadian dollars have gone to somebody's brain, and to none other than the writer of that letter.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I trust that members on both sides of this Hon. House will view this matter in a completely non-partisan manner. (Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: H-m-m-m.) The Hon. Premier says H-m-m-m! He is groaning as if in travail; I pity him and I hope he would be soon delivered!

I repeat, Mr. Speaker, that I sincerely hope hon. members will view this matter in a completely non-partisan manner bearing in mind that Parliament is supposed to be the highest tribunal in the country. The Hon. Premier has groaned audibly, but let us for a moment assume that there was a public matter involved in this Chamber in which the morality or otherwise of the Ministers was threatened; do they realise that the implication in this document complained of would mean that they themselves could not vote on any similar document, even in their self defence?

The hon. and learned junior member for St. John, who is on my right, has presented to the House a matter which in his considered opinion - and I am sure in the opinion of most of us - involves contempt of the House. The hon. and learned junior member for St. Lucy, who is on my left, has presented in no unmistakable terms the parliamentary implications of such an act. Now, I am not at all concerned at this stage with the specific matter with which this dispute refers; I am not at all concerned, in so far as privilege is concerned, with the purchase or the possession of Heywoods Plantation or the involvement or non-involvement of the Ministers. All that concerns me at this stage is that a member of this House should be threatened in the discharge of what he correctly interprets as his parliamentary duty. I go so far as to say that a letter of this sort would not have been received by a member of this House thirty or forty years ago.

There is no firm of solicitors in Bridgetown who would have dared to send a letter like that to a member of this House, or dared to append Your Honour's name as a footnote to it, thirty years ago. Can you imagine such a letter being sent to Sir Harold Austin, Mr. Douglas Pile, Mr. G. B. Evelyn from a firm of solicitors in Bridgetown? You could not perceive that.

What we have to make clear is that this House of Assembly as it is now constituted, is entitled to the same rights and privileges; and it has the same power and authority; and its dignity must be upheld in the same manner as it was thirty or forty years ago. That is what I want hon. members on the opposite side to realise.

In this particular instance members on the opposite side of the House have got to rise above the fact that their moral position might have been impugned in the matter under reference. What we have got to do today is to make it perfectly clear to solicitors, to millionaires, to bakers, to scavengers, and to all and sundry, that what Parliament does is supreme, and cannot be questioned by mere outsiders. In other words, if the solicitors complained of here had written a letter to the hon. and learned junior member for St. John in his private capacity as Mr. Barrow, or as a legal practitioner, or in a non-parliamentary capacity, complaining of certain illegal practices or an infringement of alleged copyrights, well that would have been a matter for him and them; but when they dared to actually submit to a member of this House in his parliamentary capacity a threatening letter saying what he can or cannot do on the floor of this House, then I submit that it is going too far.

I am not concerned as to whether or not at this stage the hon. member is legally entitled to quote from the documents in his possession. That does not concern me at all. (Hon. R. G. MAPP: That is the point. That is what concerns us.) Well, let us begin on that.
1.25 p.m.

I trust that hon. members opposite will endeavour to forget their involvement in this issue. I can well understand the trepidation of certain Ministers.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us continue with the motion which concerns the matter of privileges.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am only saying that it may be difficult for certain Ministers, because of further developments, to view this matter impartially.

Hon. M. E. COX: I object to that. There is nobody who is more willing to hear these letters read than we are. As soon as we hear them we will be in a position to put the facts to the country. (ASIDES).

Mr. SPEAKER: I cannot hear the hon. member who is on his feet.

Hon. M. E. COX: I said that we are ready and willing and only too glad to hear the disclosures made from time to time. We have made our position quite clear already. We would regret any muzzle being put on any of them. We have letters to read some too.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Does the hon. member mean the editorial "we" or the royal "we"?

Hon. M. E. COX: The Ministers of the Government will have the opportunity to read letters too.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I have two letters in front of me which I am sure that at least two of the Ministers would not want to be read in public.

Mr. SPEAKER: I cannot allow any departure from the substantive motion which is before us.

Mr. CRAWFORD: All I am saying is that it may be difficult for them to draw a line.....

Mr. SPEAKER: That is bound to provoke hon. members. The hon. member knows that as well as I do.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am suggesting that both sides of this House should view this matter in a non-partisan spirit. It may be difficult for one side of the House to approach the matter in this way, but even in spite of that, I am suggesting that they should regard their obligations as members of Parliament first.

The question of the legality of obligations on the floor of this House by a member of Parliament is a matter for him, and the people concerned. If an hon. member likes to commit himself to take a step in Parliament which outside of Parliament may be deemed to be unethical, the fact that it has come to Parliament puts a certain feature on it. We are not to concern ourselves with whether or not the hon. junior member for St. John was legally entitled to bring these documents to the House; I doubt whether any member of this House is either capable of stating or entitled to state dogmatically whether or not the hon. junior member for St. John had permission or was entitled legally to use the documents in the manner in which they were used. He must be compelled by his regard of what he interprets as his parliamentary duties to disclose this information on the floor of the House.

The hon. member was making certain allegations on the floor of the House; the allegations were challenged by the Government, and the hon. member was entitled to draw on whatever source of information he possessed in order to justify his remarks. As a matter of fact, what would have been the position of the hon. member if he had come in here at the time when this matter was being discussed, had made the allegations he made, and had made no attempt to substantiate them? He would have been called the most irresponsible person; in fact, I do not know what he would have been called.

Hon. members can clearly see the matter at issue before the House. It was a question of asking for authority to purchase Forde's pasture in St. Peter for the resettlement, among other things, of people who have been given notice to quit the plantation which was bought by the people involved in this issue. The hon. junior member for St. John thought it his parliamentary duty to make certain disclosures, and he quoted from this correspondence. If this House does not enjoy the privileges, immunities and rights which the House of Commons enjoys in certain matters of privilege, and if anybody outside feels that their rights have been infringed upon by any action taken on the floor of this House, then it is his duty to test the validity of it by whatever step he proposes to take in the Law Courts. If Messrs. Browne & Chapman feel that a member of this House has taken a step on the floor of this House outside the rights and privileges to which he is entitled, it is their duty to test the matter in the Law Courts. But it is completely beside the point to take it upon themselves to send a threatening letter to this House, or to tell the hon. member and Your Honour what they expect, and what they would like to be done. There is no parliamentary language in which to describe action of that sort. If they are solicitors they should take certain action against the hon. member for having acted without legal authority.
1.35 p.m.

I do not believe at all, Mr. Speaker, that the most eminent jurists in any part of the British Commonwealth would support an action of this sort. The hon. members on the opposite side of this Chamber would themselves be failing to support the dignity and the rights and privileges of this House, if they refused to condemn the action of these Solicitors.

Your Honour will recall that the Editor of the *Advocate* was once on their motion summoned to appear before the Bar of this House to show why he should not be charged for contempt. Whether or not he was brought is beside the point; that only exposed their folly at the time. (Hon. M. E. COX: And you are following it!) I am not committing such folly. The hon. junior member for St. John received this letter yesterday afternoon, and we as a Party have not had time to consider what action should be taken on it. As a matter of fact, the first time I saw the letter was when I came here this morning.

If a Committee of Privileges of the House had been in existence for this Session, my own suggestion would have been that the matter should be referred to them for action; and it is a reflection on the Government Party that, so far as this Session, no Committee of Privileges is in existence. (Hon. M. E. COX: What are we to do with it? On whose

motion is it appointed? You should know better than that.) Thus, in the absence, Mr. Speaker, of a Committee of Privileges, this matter of course may have to be referred to a Select Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER: Even if there existed a Committee of Privileges, it would again have to be referred to the House.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am saying that it might appropriately be referred to a Committee and then the Committee would investigate and recommend what action should be taken on it. I do not remember if the hon. junior member for St. John was a member of the House when the former Premier, the present Federal Prime Minister, mistakenly interpreted the legal authority of this House to include the right to summon members of the public before the Bar on contempt charges; it was proved then, when they made the motion for summoning in the Editor of the *Advocate*, that the House had no legal right so to do.

My motion, Mr. Speaker, will be that the matter be referred to a Select Committee, to be appointed presumably by Your Honour, for investigation of the matter, and of course, for recommending to the House what steps should be taken on it. I sincerely hope, Mr. Speaker, that one of the recommendations of this Committee would be to endeavour to accord to this House similar rights to the British House of Commons in similar circumstances. So far as I have gathered from the asides from the Ministerial Benches during this debate, their opposition to this motion springs from the legality of the hon. junior member for St. John to read those documents.

1.45 p.m.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the letter complained of says *inter alia*: "As you know, our client has never given you permission to read any of the said letters which came into the possession of the said Clyde Corbin in this capacity as agent for our client."

The writer of this document complained of, has questioned the right of the hon. junior member for St. John to read from those letters which he had in his possession. The hon. junior member for St. John said that he had permission and could prove that he had permission. I am not concerned with the legality of the matter, or with Messrs. Browne and Chapman or with Mr. Hough in any capacity, and least of all, would I want ever to say anything on the floor of the House which would tend to interfere with the development of this country economically in any form or the other. But the parties involved must realise that this debate has nothing whatever to do with our desire to assist retired Canadians who want to live here peaceably or what-not.

I regard it as my right and duty to preserve, to protect and to bequeath to the people who come after us in this Chamber, equal rights and privileges as enjoyed by our antecedents. If we are going to allow a firm of solicitors in Bridgetown, never mind how wealthy or influential they are, to threaten a Member of Parliament in the execution of his duties, where are we going? If we are going to allow that, well then, we should abolish Parliament entirely. If members of both sides of this House cannot see it in that way, well then, Mr. Speaker, goodbye to everything in Barbados. Sir, it would be left to be seen by the outcome of this debate, how hon. members opposite interpret their obligations and their rights as elected members of this ancient Chamber.

Mr. SPEAKER: Did the hon. member make a motion?

Mr. CRAWFORD: Yes, Sir, I made a motion for the matter to be referred to a Select Committee.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I am a bit worried about this matter because last Tuesday I heard extracts from letters being read by the hon. junior member for St. John, and since then I have been circularised with those letters. I suppose that it would come as a bolt out of the blue to some of us to come in here today and find that we are discussing a point of privilege arising out of those letters.

It is my belief that Your Honour must have given this letter a tremendous amount of thought. As I understand it,

you will have to give this letter a tremendous amount of thought.

Mr. SPEAKER: When you use the word "you", do you mean me personally?

Mr. MOTTLEY: Yes, Sir. I mean you.

Mr. SPEAKER: Oh no. I did not give it any serious thought.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am surprised to hear that. I thought Your Honour would have said that you had treated it with the contempt it deserved. I do not align myself alongside the legal luminaries who, of course, would decide whether this is an infringement or not. I listened to the hon. member who was speaking, and after I read this bit of correspondence which passed between the hon. junior member for St. John and Messrs. Browne and Chapman, Solicitors, over Commercial Land Developments Ltd., - and as I also understand it, a copy of such letter was also sent to Your Honour - I am wondering whether immediately as Your Honour was drawn into the matter it was not a matter outside the scope of the private or legal capacity of the hon. junior member for St. John and that it became a matter involving the hon. junior member for St. John as a member of this House. Because Your Honour was brought into it, I considered that Your Honour must have given some thought to the matter.

On the other hand, I may say that all things which are lawful are not expedient; and sometimes things which are expedient are not lawful. I do not know whether there is some legal right to prohibit the hon. junior member for St. John from reading in this Chamber the correspondence which has passed between Mr. Hough, the President of Commercial Land Developments Ltd., and the parties concerned, and which came into the hon. member's possession. I am wondering myself what would be my right in here, or what would be the right of a Member of the House of Commons, if a member got into his possession correspondence like that of Lord Kelsack's case. If it was a matter which would cast some suspicion on members of the Government, what would be the position of a member's right in reading such correspondence in the House of Commons?

1.55 p.m.

I am taking the last paragraph of this letter. I would say here and now, that, whether it is a privilege or not, if I were in the Government's position, I would be the first to say "Read all the letters you have; let us hear everything in these letters." The last paragraph of this letter says this:-

"We have been instructed to state that our client, Commercial Land Developments Ltd., acting through Mr. Hough its President, absolutely forbids you or anyone else from reading, publishing or in any manner making known the contents of any correspondence between our said client and the said Clyde Corbin or any letters written by our client to anyone at all."

I will come straight to the point. Last week in this House we were discussing a Resolution, the passing of which was moved by the Hon. Minister of Social Services, for the purpose of buying Forde's pasture in St. Peter, in order to develop a housing scheme and so on. I suppose that hon. members were shocked when the hon. junior member for St. John produced these letters showing that negotiations went on between the Government and this Company known as Commercial Land Development Limited for the purpose of allowing Heywoods to be sold for a hotel development scheme. We heard on one side that during that period, the Government had said that they would not use this land for any development scheme inasmuch as it could not have been taken out of agricultural production. On the other hand, the hon. junior member for St. John got hold of some correspondence in order to prove to this House that that was not true, since members of the Government were negotiating with this Company, and they had actually agreed that this plantation could be taken out of agricultural production and developed as a hotel. Some suspicion, I do not say that there is any proof, must remain in the minds of people if, out of the blue, these letters are read and then suddenly the solicitors are forbidding these letters from being read. What is wrong?

The Government has every right to say that "this land can now be taken out of agricultural production; this land can be developed as a hotel scheme." Up to last week I was looking at the matter in a way such that you have correspondence on something, and you begin to talk; but I am now beginning to become suspicious.

At this stage, it being 2 p.m. of the clock,

Mr. SPEAKER: It now being 2 p.m. of the clock, this sitting now stands suspended until 2.30 p.m. of the clock. This sitting now stands suspended.

On re-assembling,

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I should like to draw your attention to the fact that there is no quorum present and I ask that the bell be rung.

On the bell being rung, a quorum was obtained.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. senior member for the City continuing his speech on the point of privilege?

Mr. MOTTLEY: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I presume that since this matter has been allowed to take precedence over other business, it will not be long drawn out. When the sitting of the House was suspended, I was making the point that as far as the letter addressed to the hon. junior member for St. John is concerned, a copy of which has been sent to Your Honour, it is not for me to decide anything as I am not so versed in the procedure as Your Honour would be. It is a matter for Your Honour to say whether or not there has been a breach of privilege; that decision would be yours. I do not know if hon. members of this Government look at this matter lightly; I would like to suggest that this is a very serious matter. It is serious because a number of letters were read in here last week.

After those letters were read in here last week, and after reading the copies of those letters which Your Honour directed to be sent to hon. members, I had an open mind. There are certain members in the Government of Barbados - I am emphatic on this point - whom I would never associate with anything dishonourable; they may be foolish politically, or they may make mistakes or create suspicion, but I say that there are certain Government members whom I will not associate with anything dishonest. They are unlike certain other members of the Government who, as soon as one of their opponents does something which they feel they do not know anything about, the first thing they would say is that the member is corrupt and dishonest and is getting graft.

I will never forget that when Pan American Airways were about to land here, some hon. members said that I had been receiving money from Da Costa & Co. in order to get Pan American Airways to come here. As a member of this House, after the debate which went on in here last week in respect of buying Forde's and relative to the purchase of Heywoods, and also relative to the taking of Heywoods out of agricultural production and allowing it to be used for development purposes - according to the correspondence which the hon. junior member for St. John read out in here, which he said has passed between the accredited and authorised agent for this Company and which mentioned from the present Prime Minister of the West Indies back to other members of the Government - I still say I had an absolutely open mind then. I have been in the real estate business for a long time; I believe I am the oldest real estate broker in this island. On the face of it, I say that these are just letters; I believe that this is just another business deal.

2.35 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, one week after these letters were read and the hon. member said he has other letters to read, the gentleman who is the President of this Company has gone out of his way to bring pressure on a member of this House by saying that these letters should not be read. I am sure that the members of my Party had an open mind on this thing. Now, today we come to this House of Assembly and

the hon. member produces a letter, a copy of which was sent to you, in which high finance pressure is being brought upon an hon. member of this House; a threat possibly with an injunction.

Mr. Speaker, I have a high regard for Browne and Chapman as Solicitors but the letter said they absolutely forbid anyone from reading these letters. Are they going to take away his mentality, or take out his eyes? Listen to this: "We have been instructed to state that our client, Commercial Land Developments Limited, acting through Mr. Hough, its President, absolutely forbid you or anyone else from reading....." What do they mean by that? Do they mean that you cannot read it at all? Brown and Chapman wrote this letter forgetting that the hon. member can read. Mind you, this is a \$5 million scheme as we heard from the letters. They have written to a duly elected member of this House forbidding him not only from reading, but from publishing or in any manner making known the contents of any correspondence "between our said client and the said Clyde Corbin or any letters written by our client to any one at all."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that you are going to agree with me that this letter in itself would mean nothing; but when taken and read after the correspondence which was brought here by the hon. member for St. John, it shows a sign of fear by somebody. If you are buying land, you have to deal with Mr. Stevens and the Minister; you have to approach the Government if you want to take land out of agricultural production.

Mr. SPEAKER: We are not dealing with that now. Not the land but the privileges.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Any person applying for land which is under agriculture must apply to the Government, and Government must make a decision. There is nothing wrong in correspondence passing between the Government and a Development Company. If the Company is in Canada then correspondence should and must be passed; but there are certain suggestions made in the correspondence which Your Honour was kind enough to allow us to have.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is not a kindness.

Mr. MOTTLEY: It is a right. In this \$5 million scheme where there is all this high pressure salesmanship, there are certain suggestions; but what I am worried about is that one week after, a member of this Chamber acting in what he considers good faith - he is not a child and he would not be such a lunatic to have letters which he had as a Barrister any more than the Hon. Premier would come here and bring his clients' - rather, patients' - business and say what disease they were suffering from.....

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I am sorry I did not hear the first expression.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I said "clients" referring to your patients. I take it the hon. member for St. John knows what he is doing; he must be 40 years old. He cannot take professional correspondence that passed between himself and other people and bring it into this House, so that if the people were not his clients, and correspondence came into his possession which would tend to throw light upon something that went on with the Government which would be detrimental to the people of the colony, can anybody argue that he does not have the right to come and cast a searchlight upon it? I notice that none of these letters were published in the *Advocate*; the letters were only sent to members of the House, and therefore one begins to get a suspicion on what has happened.

Mr. SPEAKER: That has nothing to do with the breach of privilege.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I know it has not but it is a privilege.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is a different privilege.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I myself feel that I am going to vote and I am bound to vote for the motion which

resolves that this House take cognisance of a breach of privilege committed by a letter addressed to the hon. junior member for St. John. Hon. members on the other side may argue that it is addressed to the hon. member in his capacity as a Barrister. If it was brought home to me that the hon. member had either of these people or any of them as his clients, I would say it is a matter between himself and his clients, and they would have every right to do this. The hon. member solemnly told us in this House that he has never been Counsel for either of these people. To be honest, Mr. Speaker, when I read the correspondence, I was under the impression that the Government was anxious to get Forde's, because they felt it was best. If I were running a Government and my Party felt Forde's was best, I would buy it also. The hon. junior member for St. Peter felt that Heywoods should be taken out of agricultural production and reserved for bathing and development for the working class, but the Government said "no, this is for agricultural purposes and we are not taking it out." Then comes along a Company which says (a) you are hiring 40 people here now, but (b) you can hire 200 people if you take Heywoods out of agriculture. That was considered by the Government, and Government decided to take Heywoods out of agricultural production.

2.45 p.m.

We saw nothing more in it up to then, despite the fact that the name of the Prime Minister of the West Indies was mentioned as well as the names of the Minister of Communications, Works and Housing, the Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour, and despite the fact that it was said that somebody was around the bedside of Mr. Corbin. But today, now that we have come in the House and we see a letter restraining further information being given from those letters and wanting to restrain the hon. junior member for St. John from reading anymore, we see something more in it. In paragraph 2 of the letter sent to the hon. junior member for St. John, it is stated:

"It is also within our knowledge that on Tuesday the 18th ulto., you read in the House of Assembly of this Island extracts from and produced copies of certain letters forming a part of the said correspondence."

Mr. Speaker, they did not get that knowledge out of the *Advocate* or the *News*. They did not get it out of the *Truth*, neither did the *Beacon* publish it. You know that.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have not read the *Beacon*.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am surprised at that; and I compliment you for not reading it. However, I must say that I read every newspaper in the island. A good politician must read every newspaper in the island. Of course, the Hon. Minister of Communications has said that the *Truth* is not a newspaper.

Mr. Speaker, how would you feel, or how would any member of the Government feel, if he were in the position of the hon. junior member for St. John last week?

Mr. SPEAKER: I would not interpret it as a letter restraining him but purporting to and intending to restrain him.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I hope hon. members on the other side would agree with me that, Party issue or no Party issue, the integrity of this House must be upheld.

Hon. M. E. COX: Do not worry with that.

Mr. MOTTLEY: What does the Hon. Minister mean by saying "do not worry with that"? Let the hon. members over there sit and say that the hon. junior member for St. John should not read any more letters! (A VOICE: We want to hear all.) I have been hearing that for a long time.

Sir, to us, we feel that this attempt to restrain the hon. junior member for St. John is a breach of privilege. The fact that the solicitors have written stating that they absolutely forbid you or anyone else from reading, publishing or in any manner making known the contents of any corres-

pondence between their client and the said Clyde Corbin or any letters written by their client to anyone at all - and not only have they sent this letter to the hon. member but also to Your Honour - I think myself that this is something which should be the cause of such a Resolution as that which is before us. It is amounting to a breach of privilege.

Sir, I am sure that the strong feelings exhibited by some members of the Government against the same hon. junior member for St. John may make them decide against this matter; they do not seem to see anything which they can do to restrain him; but such a thing as this must have its repercussions. If he has letters purporting to cast a shadow of doubt on the activities of the Government's dealing with the sale of Heywoods, let him read them. One thing, thank God, I am not in Government. I can get up and say that, if I had anything to do with the sale of Heywoods, I would have drawn my commission for so doing; I am a real estate broker. But I counsel hon. members on the other side - not that my counsel may mean anything much to them - in the light of the strong feelings which exist between members of the Government and the hon. junior member for St. John, that they should not allow those feelings to prevent them from supporting this Resolution; or to say that what is done to the hon. junior member for St. John should be encouraged.

Now, Sir, this letter was addressed to you.

Mr. SPEAKER: Oh no. A copy of it was sent to me.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Sir, I have much pleasure in supporting the amendment to the Resolution. Like the hon. senior member for St. Philip, I feel that this matter should be sent to a Select Committee. The Select Committee would get all the evidence they want, and then make recommendations. I say that because should a similar thing happen to any hon. member on that side - where someone thought that because of their wealth, or even of their position, more especially if they were a tremendous big company like this Commercial Land Development Ltd., they can write a letter to a member of the Government because he was prepared to bring in correspondence to show what they were doing - we on this side would be bound to support hon. members of the Government in asking that a Committee be set up to go into the matter to decide whether what those persons had done was a breach of privilege. I counsel hon. members - even those who have strong feelings against the hon. junior member for St. John in that the hon. member brought it in letters to belittle them - to see that there is nothing wrong in what the hon. member has done.

I do not think that the President of that company is doing the Government a service when he suggests that no more of those letters should be read. Sir, I have been down here for a long time, and I have been interested in politics for a long time. Imagine, Sir, a big Canadian commercial company suggesting that to Mr. C. P. Clarke, Mr. Graham Yearwood, Sir Harold Austin or Sir Frederick Clarke when they were in your position! Imagine a company like that sending a letter like that written by any firm of solicitors to a member of the House during their time as Speaker telling the member: "I forbid you exposing any content of those letters!"

2.55 p.m.

This is not a thing which we can take lightly. In my opinion, we should not just sit by and take it lightly. It may be that the objection to the reading of these letters is not a good thing for the shareholders in Canada; it may be that the further reading of these letters will throw light upon something shady which went on; it may be that the President himself was not above board. If I were a shareholder in this Company in Canada and the correspondence between the accredited agency in Barbados was not exposed and read, I would come to the conclusion that Mr. President was doing something about which I did not know. Mr. Speaker, you would do the same thing too.

Throughout my political career I have suffered at the hands of that Government, but I am still prepared to say that there are members of the Government who, whenever

you cast a searchlight with the strongest beam upon the matter, there are those in respect of whom you will have to bring a lot to convince me that they are mixed up in any shady deal. For them to feel that because it is the hon. junior member for St. John, because of the feelings which exist, for them to sit by and do not allow this matter to go to a Select Committee and believe there will be an injunction in the Law Courts, I think they are counting on the wrong man. Nothing you do will prevent the hon. member from making an exposure in this matter.

In my considered opinion, every letter in his possession should be made known to the House; we have heard much, I can say things in my professional capacity, but I cannot say anything about Heywoods because I would not throw away my business so as to show my vanity. I am seconding the amendment made by the hon. member. I hope that members of the Government will not prevent this matter from going to a Select Committee, lest it should appear that there is so much to hide that nobody wants it to be brought out.

Hon. M. E. COX and Mr. CORBIN rose to speak.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister caught my eye first — unless he wants to give way to the hon. junior member for St. Andrew.

Hon. M. E. COX: I thank you, Sir. Our position is this: as far as these letters are concerned, we want to see and read them so as to be able to assimilate all of them. There could be no question of stifling, or of any attempt to stifle anything, or prevent or assist anybody in preventing a member of this House from airing his views whether they be false or otherwise. When I got this letter, I must say quite frankly that I concluded that it was a matter entirely for the hon. junior member for St. John and the solicitors; but since I have been told that Your Honour was addressed with a copy of this letter, I considered that it has become a matter for the House. *(Hear! Hear!)* One of the more important reasons why we would like to support very strongly the amendment which was made to the Resolution is because the last paragraph of the letter reads as follows:—

"We have been instructed to state that our client, Commercial Land Developments Ltd., acting through Mr. Hough its President, absolutely forbids you or anyone else from reading, publishing or in any manner making known the contents of any correspondence between our said client and the said Clyde Corbin or any letters written by our client to anyone at all."

We could not agree with this. We would have to defend this. When the hon. member was ranting and giving his undertones and overtones, we appealed to him to say from whom these letters had come and to whom they had been addressed. We insisted that these letters be made the property of this House. When one says anything which is good, one deserves to be thanked; and when one says something bad, one deserves to be plastered. As to the hon. member who has just sat down, I would like to thank him for some of what he has said about the Government.
3.05 p.m.

His speech was like the parson's prayer — good in parts. He knows some of the members of the Government, and, as he said, he knows that he cannot associate them with anything shady. *(A VOICE: Some!)* The hon. junior member for St. Andrew said "some". *(Mr. CORBIN: Who?)* I am sorry; it is the hon. senior member for St. Lucy; you can always rely on his mischievousness at times.

Mr. TUDOR: The hon. member is too offensive at times. I take serious objection to his saying you can rely on my mischievousness. I ask him to withdraw that.

Hon. M. E. COX: If he feels so, it is all right.

Mr. SPEAKER: Does the hon. member withdraw?

Hon. M. E. COX: Yes, Sir, I strongly take exception to the insinuation, when the hon. junior member for St. John was on his feet, that we knew something about the letter

written by Browne and Chapman. I would like to tell him that any of us running this Government can stand up to the most severe searchlight of scrutiny at any time. We have absolutely nothing to be ashamed of in our administration.

I go further and say that in this case, or in all cases, when we minute on our files, we are not minuting with the understanding that we will be there forever. There is the likelihood in many years to come — I see the hon. member for St. George is about to clap — that when he is dead and gone, some other form of Government might be instituted, or rather some other people with different political philosophy or ideology may come into this House, and what we do now will be there so that those who come after can see. As a matter of fact, as soon as I heard about this debate and what the hon. member disclosed the other night, I went and got my letters which are kept by the Ministry. I am ready to tell this House, as soon as the debate continues, about the correspondence between my Ministry and the gentleman. We have absolutely nothing to hide. We acted in the interest of the community, when it was decided that this land should be used for development purposes.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the hon. member is now replying to something else.

Hon. M. E. COX: I merely mentioned that because every member who spoke, the hon. junior member for St. John, the hon. senior member for St. Philip and the hon. senior member for the City referred to it.....

Mr. SPEAKER: And I repeatedly cautioned them.

Hon. M. E. COX: I was merely saying that we were acting in the best interest of the people of Barbados. We do not know whether or not there is a breach of privilege; but before I sit down, I would like to say this:.....

Mr. SPEAKER: It will be sent to a Select Committee. That is all.

Hon. M. E. COX: We are not satisfied that there is a breach of privilege.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is for the Committee to find out.

Hon. M. E. COX: On the face of what arguments have been adduced?

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order. That is not fair. If the hon. member supports sending the matter to Select Committee, and, as Leader of the House gets up and makes a statement that they are not satisfied that it is a breach of privilege, he is prejudicing the findings of the Committee. When he says that he is supporting the motion for a Select Committee, that is all eye-wash. When he says that they are not satisfied that there is any breach of privilege, he commits the whole of his Party. That is not fair.

Hon. M. E. COX: All it means is that I am not yet satisfied. When it gets to Committee,.....

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order. Surely the hon. member must not twist his words and play with them. He said he is not satisfied.

Mr. SPEAKER: May I intervene at this moment and say that if the motion passes for this thing to engage the attention of the Committee, no one knows what the Report will be? The Select Committee is not already committed to report and say that a breach of privilege has been enacted.

Hon. M. E. COX: All I am trying to say before I sit down is that this Resolution which was moved about bringing Mr. Hough and these other persons before the Bar of the House is nonsense. About three years ago there was a report in the *Advocate* Newspaper which members referred to as a breach of privilege. It was discussed and I think the hon. senior member for the City.....

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The hon. member is out of order, but I am going to leave it to you.

Hon. M. E. COX: I am dealing with the Resolution before us which asks us to have Mr. Hough summoned before the Bar of this House. I was saying that on a previous occasion when it was suggested that.....

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

Hon. M. E. COX: I am making the point that the situation which exists today with this Resolution, is similar to that which was decided on by this House a few years ago. Am I not in order to say that? Mr. Speaker, I would appeal to you to give us at least as much latitude as you gave the other side. (VOICES: Shame!)

Mr. SPEAKER: What is the hon. member now trying to insinuate?

Hon. M. E. COX: Nothing.

Mr. SPEAKER: I know that an attempt to insinuate something is nothing at all.

Hon. M. E. COX: I am trying to show the farcicalness of the suggestion contained in the Resolution to bring the gentleman before the Bar of the House. We have been told that we have no power to do that. You know, Sir, that you have already suggested some years ago to us that we should do what obtains in Australia. I think it was as far back as 1949 when the rights and privileges of this House were challenged, and we were told, and a ruling was given, that we did not have the same rights conferred upon us as are conferred upon members of the British House of Commons.

Mr. SPEAKER: I made that ruling.

Hon. M. E. COX: We were told that by a higher authority too, Sir, from outside.
3.15 p.m.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. When you said that you made that ruling, the Hon. Minister said that he was told it by a higher authority than you. There can be no higher authority in this House than you.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think he means a higher authority in this House; he means a higher authority outside.

Hon. M. E. COX: I mean a higher constitutional authority than Your Honour.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not know about that.

Hon. M. E. COX: I mean such authorities as Jennings, Bryce and soon. We had a ruling from outside on this question, and as a result of that, Your Honour suggested years ago.....

Mr. SPEAKER: This House does not receive rulings. What is the hon. member saying at all?

Hon. M. E. COX: However, Sir, we had advice on our privileges. As a result of that advice, Your Honour suggested that we should pass a law, just as was done in Australia - and I think India did a similar thing - conferring on the House of Assembly those rights which are conferred upon members of the House of Commons; but nothing more was done since that suggestion was made.

As Your Honour knows, quite recently I gave the Clerk of this House some of the Ordinances in existence in some of the other territories including Ghana. We have no authority to summon anybody to come here; it is farcical to suggest that you can send for somebody to come to the Bar of this House.

The House will have to appoint a Committee to go into this matter. We on this side would like to put forward an amendment to the motion; this is how the amendment should read. I would like to say before I read what I have here, that up to now no Resolution has been read out in the House; neither the Resolution nor the amendment which

was made. I would like to know if I am in order to read this; this is our proposal:-

"BE IT RESOLVED that this House take cognisance of a letter addressed to the hon. junior member for St. John, a copy of which is submitted to His Honour the Speaker, in his capacity as a member of this House;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the letter be referred to a Select Committee of the House for consideration."

As I said, I do not know what was the amendment by the hon. senior member for St. Philip.

Mr. SPEAKER: The amendment by the hon. senior member for St. Philip deals with reference to a Select Committee; he did not change the substantive Resolution. I do not think that he wanted anybody to be summoned to the Bar of the House.

Hon. M. E. COX: It is nonsense to do that. That Resolution would have to be re-worded.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. So far as I remember, in the Resolution of the hon. senior member for St. Philip, he merely said that a Select Committee should be appointed by Your Honour to investigate something or the other. I believe that you will find that his version and that of the Hon. Leader of the House can be dovetailed.

Hon. M. E. COX: Sir, we cannot regard a letter sent to the hon. junior member for St. John, in his private capacity, as something against this House. As far as I understand it, the hon. member was sent a letter in his private capacity. (A VOICE: Oh, no.) What I am drawing attention to is the fact that the hon. junior member for St. John was acting in a legal capacity on behalf of the widow of the deceased; and this letter was directed to him in his legal capacity.

Mr. TUDOR: Sir, I rise on a point of order. I must correct the hon. member there. The hon. junior member for St. John has emphatically stated that he is not employed as Counsel for the people involved.

Hon. M. E. COX: Suppose he kisses the Good Book, I will still have my doubts. That hon. member is acting in his legal capacity for the lady in question; therefore, I take it, as I have said, that this letter is addressed to him in his legal capacity.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I must interrupt the hon. member. Nothing has been said in this debate, or during the debate last week, by the hon. junior member for St. John which would lead the Hon. Minister or any other hon. member to believe that the facts are contrary to what was stated by the hon. junior member for St. John. The hon. junior member for St. John has said more than four times that he is not in any way acting as Counsel for any of the parties involved.

Hon. M. E. COX: We have letters which we may have to submit to the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: All that may be referred to the Select Committee, I do not think we need bother about that.

Hon. M. E. COX: Sir, if they are saying that the hon. member is not acting in his legal capacity, I am saying that he is. Why are those letters given to him and not to the hon. junior member for St. Lucy?

Mr. SPEAKER: Nothing is just proven by his statement.

Hon. M. E. COX: I know that he was acting on behalf of this lady. I am definitely sure about that; and that is why he has all those documents in his possession. The lady feels that a wrong was done to her husband by not giving him the full commission on the sale of this place; that is why those documents are blown about now.

Mr. SPEAKER: More of that later.
3.25 p.m.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order. That is so refreshing and revealing. The Hon. Minister said that the lady did not get the full commission; I would like to know who has got the full benefit of the commission.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is no business of ours.

Mr. MOTTLEY: But the hon. member mentioned it in the House. Let us accept what the hon. member said about Counsel. The Resolution says that the House should take cognizance of a breach of privilege committed by a letter addressed to the hon. junior member for St. John; whatever he might have been while acting for this lady, he is still the hon. junior member for St. John. The Hon. Minister says that the hon. junior member for St. John was acting as legal adviser for this lady but that does not prevent us from having this.....

Hon. M. E. COX: I am not disputing that.

Mr. SPEAKER: Two halves make a whole!

Hon. M. E. COX: It is a pity that people cannot understand. The lady is not a party in any dispute. The hon. member was her legal representative and acted on her behalf, when he hoped that she could have wrung a little more out of these people. I will deal with that later.

What I am trying to establish is that it is not fair to bring members of the House in this matter. This Resolution says: "BE IT RESOLVED that this House take cognizance of a breach of privilege committed by a letter addressed to the hon. junior member for St. John in his capacity as a member of this Honourable House and against members of the House in general.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of explanation. The hon. member referred to the last paragraph of the letter which says: "We have been instructed to state that our client, Commercial Land Developments Limited acting through Mr. Hough its President, absolutely forbids you or anyone else from reading, publishing or in any manner making known the contents of any correspondence between our said client and the said Clyde Corbin or any letters written by our client to anyone at all." Whatever else the hon. junior member for St. John is outside, this must apply to him and to members of this House.

Hon. M. E. COX: The hon. member is not any other person. However, Sir, I will concede that point so as to get along with the business of the House. The Resolution read as follows:

BE IT RESOLVED that this House take cognizance of a breach of privilege committed by a letter addressed to the hon. junior member for St. John in his capacity as a member of this Honourable House and against members of the House in general....."

The Resolution goes on to state "and the Officers of the said Honourable House....."

The Officers of the House do not come in; you cannot refer to the Speaker in this capacity as an officer of the House.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order. As soon as you regard him as a member of the House the matter should be sent to a Committee of the House. If this is not a breach of privilege, then it should be thrown through the window.

Hon. M. E. COX: We cannot put in the Officers of the House; we cannot sit down here and consent to a nonsensical thing. Our amendment is "That the House take cognizance of a letter addressed to the hon. junior member for St. John in his capacity as a member of this Honourable House, a copy of which was forwarded to His Honour the Speaker of this House, and be it further resolved that the letter be

referred to a Select Committee of this House for consideration."

Mr. STRAUGHN: Mr. Speaker, the House will realise that I must be very concerned about this matter of privilege; I have an item on the Order Paper in that connection. We hope that this matter gets settled during this Session. There were certain points which I noted as to why I thought that this matter should go to Select Committee; and it is pleasurable to know that it will get the support of being sent to a Select Committee. The Resolution says:-

"BE IT RESOLVED that this House take cognizance of a breach of privilege committed by a letter addressed to the hon. junior member for St. John in his capacity as a member of this House....."

The very fact that these things are questioned means that there should be further clarification of the matter which we could better consider in Select Committee. The letter was addressed to E. W. Barrow, Barrister-at-Law, and we would consider whether it has been addressed to him as a member of this House.

The second point is one which would be unanimously dispensed with altogether; and that is the question of summoning Mr. Hough to the Bar of the House. That point has been settled, has been taken as not to be part of the privileges of this House. The third point which made me feel that we would be acting wisely if we sent this matter to a Select Committee, was what was stated in paragraph three of the letter from Messrs. Browne & Chapman which says: "We wish to make it clear that in law, authority for any of the said correspondence to be read or published would have to be obtained from our client and this you do not have." 3.35 p.m.

Your Honour has on more than one occasion, certainly on one occasion that I can remember exactly, cautioned the members of this Chamber that we are a law making body but not necessarily a law interpreting body. If somebody is going to tell us about the interpretation of the law, I think it would be much better if we would go to a Select Committee and get that part also clarified. The letter also stated in paragraph 2 that "the said Clyde Corbin accepted as the agent for our client," but Mr. Speaker, the document which you caused to be circulated, Document No. 7, tells us that the same President of this Company has been writing to Mr. Corbin in such a way as to tell him that he was not the official agent of his Company. I am wondering whether we should not get that examined in the Select Committee; indeed it might be a question in which we will have a certain document of the House which will be something that has taken place in the House, and in which Browne and Chapman would be imputing what actually took place in the House.

These are things we would want guidance on in Select Committee. Mr. Speaker, this is where the hon. junior member for St. John needs to be corrected; he certainly reiterated it quite a number of times last Tuesday, and again today, when he talked about the Aliens Land Holding Bill being introduced to take care of this business. As far as we know, there is no Aliens Land Holding Act on our Statute Book; but he says that there is an Act which governs these things. That Bill as far as I know never became law and does not apply, but he has been making this statement a number of times. A question that still bothers the minds of some of us, is whether the idea of forwarding a copy of this letter to Your Honour was a matter of courtesy, or one which might be interpreted as a matter of presumptuousness. It is a matter on which members have varying views; and it is not for Your Honour necessarily to give us what your interpretation of it is, but certainly it is a question that could be further investigated in Select Committee.

I am happy to see that it will be a unanimous decision to send this matter to Select Committee; and it is clear that whether it is a question of legal interpretation or a question of whether it is genuinely a breach of privilege

of this House, you need more detailed investigation on the matter. A Select Committee is the best place where that can be done.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, in order that the Select Committee when appointed should have clear guidance on what is before it, and since neither of the two members who have motions standing in their names before us is present, I thought it best to bring together their respective views in a manner which I believe will meet with the approval of the other side, and which does not alter the size of the Resolution. I am therefore suggesting that the second paragraph of the Resolution should read as follows:-

"AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this letter be forwarded to a Select Committee of the House in order to consider whether a breach of privilege has been committed by Mr. L. G. Hough, President of the said Company."

I have recast it in that way inasmuch as he is mentioned in the letter from Browne and Chapman as having instructed them.

Mr. SPEAKER: We do not know that is true. The only person who comes before us is the person who signed the letter.

Mr. TUDOR: We have a Resolution before us moved by the hon. junior member for St. John in which Mr. Hough is mentioned.

Mr. SPEAKER: His name is just mentioned. Certainly, the House cannot say that Mr. Hough committed any breach of privilege. Who is Mr. Hough other than a name? We know that Browne and Chapman are people in Bridgetown who have sent a copy of a letter to me.

Mr. TUDOR: But, Mr. Speaker, they have been instructed by him.

Mr. SPEAKER: His instructions to them mean nothing.

Mr. TUDOR: My argument is based on the material paragraph which has been quoted by all the members who have spoken, and by the hon. senior member for St. Michael. Paragraph 5 of the letter reads as follows:- "We have been instructed to state that our client, Commercial Land Developments Ltd., acting through Mr. Hough its President, absolutely forbids....."

It is the agent of the Company itself absolutely forbidding hon. members from exercising their authority and obligation.

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order. Who signed the letter? Suppose Mr. Hough came and said he knew nothing about it? You have to deal with the individual whose signature is attached to the document.

Mr. TUDOR: Sir, as an alternative to that, may I suggest that in the first paragraph after the word "letter" we insert the following? "dated 6th March, 1961 from Messrs. Brown and Chapman." If that suggestion is accepted by the hon. member on that side, the Resolution would read as follows:- "BE IT RESOLVED that this House take cognisance of a breach of privilege committed by a letter dated 6th March, 1961, from Messrs. Browne and Chapman addressed to the hon. junior member for St. John in his capacity as a member of this Honourable House, a copy of which was forwarded to Mr. Speaker;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this letter be forwarded to a Select Committee of the House in order to consider whether or not a breach of privilege has been disclosed by the contents of the said letter."

I would like to know if the amendment is accepted.

Hon. M. E. COX: Yes.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is accepted.

Mr. CORBIN: Now, Mr. Speaker, I am rising first of all to say that I congratulate you for your patience. I believe that if members had worked in accordance with rulings, this debate would already have been finished. 3.45 p.m.

When I first read this letter which we have received here, I saw at once that it was against every member of this Assembly. It seems to me that another power has risen up against the present power which we of this House have today; that is to say, they want us to speak, to act, and to do things which they would have us to do.

Mr. Speaker, when we reached here today and read a copy of this letter, I thought from the beginning that every one would unanimously agree to this matter being sent to Select Committee; but, instead of that, we have heard all this argument on it. If hon. members of this Assembly would act in accordance with the dictates of Your Honour, the behaviour of members of Parliament, especially of those hon. members on the other side, would be a lot better and we would get along a bit further with our work.

Sir, when we heard the asides of hon. members on the opposite side, we thought that they were against this Resolution; we look at a man according to his ways and actions. In other words, a man sins by thought, word and deed; and their minds showed us that they were against this Resolution. When I hear hon. members bellowing at one another, it shocks my modesty. To me, their behaviour is ridiculous.

In the letter, there is this paragraph:- "We have been instructed to state that our client, Commercial Land Developments Ltd., acting through Mr. Hough its President, absolutely forbids you or anyone else from reading, publishing or in any manner making known the contents of any correspondence between our said client and the said Clyde Corbin or any letters written by our client to anyone at all."

If this letter had been sent to a member in Parliament of a Republic country, the person who had written this paragraph of this letter would have been taken from where he was, dragged into the street and beaten severely. It is an insult to every member of this House; it is absolutely trying to bias us from our responsibility. When we reach this House, we should reach here with our hearts free from bias. I do not see why this House does not have a law to prosecute anyone who is caught writing letters of this nature. As I have said, it is an insult to us.

I am going to ask the Government to keep a keen eye on the people who are coming to this country; if they do not, these foreign people would soon have us under their feet; they are trying to tell us what to do; they should not tell us what to do; we are in a position to tell them what to do. Later on, they would tell us that we must go in the sea and live.

I am asking that Government take a strict hand and keep themselves in high regard. This is the beginning of trouble and confusion which you will be having in this island. There are certain parts of this island at present where I am certain that Barbadians cannot trespass, and it is because you have given these foreign people all kinds of privilege. Sir, I agree with the Resolution that this be sent to a Select Committee.

The question that the Resolution as amended by the hon. senior member for St. Michael do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, before you proceed with the business of the day.....

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Is Your Honour going to appoint the Select Committee now?

Mr. SPEAKER: I shall do so later. The hon. senior member for St. Michael may proceed with the Order Paper.

ORDER No. 2 EXEMPTED FROM STANDING ORDER.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I would like to move that Order No. 2 be exempted from the provisions of Standing Order No. 5.

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

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

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

RESOLUTION re SINGLE MEMBER CONSTITUENCIES

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 1 of Private Members' Business is to resume debate on the following Resolution:—Resolution re Single Member Constituencies and the appointment of a Commission with respect thereto. On the last occasion, the hon. senior member for St. Michael was addressing the Chair.

Hon. M. E. COX: On the last occasion, I was about to reply to the remarks made by the hon. senior member for St. Peter. Just before that, I was replying to the points raised by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition and the hon. senior member for St. Lucy relative to the question of a nominated Speaker, and about the policy of increasing the membership of this House.

3.55 p.m.

I had interrupted the hon. member to say that, as far as this Government was concerned, such was news to us; we had not heard of that before. Speaking for myself, I would like to say, and I believe it is the view of the Government, that in so far as a nominated Speaker is concerned, I would be opposed most strongly to it if that was suggested by anybody. We have never entertained that view; we have never thought of it. As a matter of fact, in my humble opinion, it would be a retrograde step ever to suggest anything along the lines of a nominated Speaker.

I have great sympathy for those people who are nominated Speakers in Trinidad and in British Guiana; no doubt, a nominated Speaker cannot feel the same sense of security, or sense of authority etc., as a member who is elected by the people of this island. I have always felt that these Speakers may be at a disadvantage in that, while they are trying to discipline members, it can be easily said by any member "I was elected but you were appointed." Just as the relationship is between this House and the Other Place, which is a nominated Body, a nominated Speaker would be on the same footing.

The hon. senior member for St. Lucy also spoke about not contesting the Speaker's seat; that is one of the things, too, with which I do not agree. I feel that every seat in this House should be open to contest; and if it were agreed not to contest the Speaker's seat, that is also tantamount to having a nominated Speaker or almost so. I do not feel that that situation should exist; I maintain that the Speaker's seat should be contested.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is speaking for himself, I take it; or is he speaking for a collection of persons?

Hon. M. E. COX: I am expressing a point of view with which I hope there will be agreement; I do not think there should be any agreement not to contest the Speaker's seat. The Speaker is Speaker when the House is elected; the members of the House elect the Speaker. That is my view which need not be supported by other hon. members.

We questioned the extension of, or the increase in, the membership in these areas; and, like the nominated Speakership, that is an item which, in my opinion, was hatched in the fertile brain of the hon. member. None of these suggestions have really been considered by us or put to us; and they have never been initiated by us.

I regret that the hon. senior member for St. Peter is not now in his seat; but in order to get the records straight,

it is important and incumbent upon me to reply to some of the points which he made. During the course of his speech, he referred to a Manifesto which the Party published in 1944. He said that seventeen years ago the Party laid it down in its Manifesto that it was in favour of single member constituencies. My rebuttal to that is that it is true that the Progressive League, as it was then called, in 1944 in its first Manifesto to the people of Barbados said this:—

"The League is still in favour of Adult Suffrage and the abolition of all property qualifications."

And it goes on a little further:—

"Mr. Adams also introduced a Parliament Bill which passed this House but was abandoned in the Council. A Bill to amend the Executive Committee Act providing for the appointment of executive members by the House instead of by the Governor passed its second reading by one vote but was disembowelled in Committee by one vote — the Speaker's vote."

The Bill was introduced to provide for the appointment of the members of the Executive Committee by the House instead of by the Governor. Have we pursued that course? That was dropped like the matter of single member constituencies. Rather than that, as you know, it was in the 1946 Convention that Sir Grattan Bushe, a former Governor, said that he would send for the person who was most likely to command a majority in the House of Assembly. In other words, instead of placing the power in the hands of the House of Assembly to appoint the members of the Executive Committee, that power remains in the hands of the Governor who will call upon the individual whom he considers fit and best to command a majority in the House.

4.05 p.m.

There is something right under "adult suffrage" which the hon. member did not care to read because it did not suit him to refer to it. This is what the policy also states on page 3:

"The League believes that the wealth produced in this island will not be equitably distributed until the resources of the wealthy are under and controlled by the Government on behalf of the community. Sugar Factories for example must be owned by the State and/or so controlled that their profits bear a just relation to the returns received by the growers of sugar canes and labourers employed. The League believes that a single Government purchasing agency should be established as the sole exporter of sugar so that unnecessary middle men's profits may be eliminated."

That is what we said in 1944. Have we since pursued that course? Have we put it in our Manifesto from 1944 until the last Manifesto in 1956? I am saying "no". We dropped the question of Single Member Constituencies from the time we put it in our Manifesto in 1944; we also dropped the question of the House of Assembly appointing members to the Executive Committee instead of the Governor; and thirdly we dropped the question of nationalising the sugar industry. The fourth thing we dropped was cutting the middle man's profits which we mentioned in this Manifesto. Surely if the hon. member wanted to do justice to his speech or to the community, he should also have referred to that. He could also have referred to taxation; we said then that we believed that a surtax should be placed on large incomes. Have we ever done that? We have never pursued those things since.

I have quoted those items to show, Mr. Speaker, that as time goes on, there are occasions when you revise and modify your plans. We need not put things that we achieve in our Manifesto for the coming election or elections. We also drop things that we feel might not be in the interest of the community. I know that members, including the hon. junior member for Christ Church, would make a noise if we instituted a surtax.

The hon. member wants to know how we could publish this seventeen years ago and can change our minds now;

the answer is simple. The answer is that with greater experience and with more knowledge of the intricacies of the situation as it stands, it is absolutely essential and necessary to revise our various plans. Since 1944 we have had four more elections; we had elections in 1946, 1948, 1951 and 1956; and in neither of our Manifestos for these elections have we again mentioned the question of single member constituencies. Surely, anybody in his right senses must conclude that we were no longer prepared to institute single member constituencies. So the question of putting this in our Manifesto 17 years ago and deciding not to have single member constituencies now, is the height of nonsense.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. senior member for St. Peter has himself been a member of this Party; he was a member up to 1954. Up to January 1954 the member used to attend meetings of the Barbados Labour Party; but in February 1954 the member broke away and attacked the Government and the Prime Minister from then until today. The member arrogates to himself the right to change his tune in less than a month; but as far as the Government is concerned, and as far as the Party is concerned, it is wrong and unpardonable that the Government or the Party should change its policy after seventeen years!

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

I was saying, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the hon. member said that it is something wrong and bad for us to change our policy in so far as single member constituencies are concerned, but, mark you, he has not said anything about the sugar industry or any of the other items which we have dropped since 1944.

I am going to repeat on the floor of this House what I have said publicly, and what I have caused to be written in the *Advocate* Newspaper in a letter from me some time ago. The sole and only reason why the member has left this Party, why he has become one of its strongest critics, why he is opposed to us and will continue to be opposed to us is because the Prime Minister of the West Indies had to call him to a meeting on a Sunday night in January, 1954, which lasted from 8 o'clock in the night until after 1 o'clock in the morning, at which the Prime Minister, the hon. senior member for St. Peter, the Hon. Premier and myself were present. The Prime Minister of the West Indies appealed to him to stay with the Union at least for one year so as to train somebody...
4.15 p.m.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I would not like it to go on the records of the debates of this House, that the hon. member has made a statement like that which he knows has been refuted by the hon. senior member for St. Peter on several occasions unless it is also recorded in the records that at this moment the hon. senior member for St. Peter is in Geneva and not in the House.

The hon. senior member for St. Peter is competent to deal with the hon. senior member for St. Michael on this matter; I do not want to enter into it; but I just wish to say that I have heard that same statement refuted by the hon. senior member for St. Peter in and out of this Chamber. The hon. senior member for St. Michael is only pushing out his chest like a mouse when the elephant is not around; he is only saying that because the hon. senior member for St. Peter is not around and not in his place.

Hon. M. E. COX: I will say this: I was away in England when the hon. senior member for St. Peter said something about me which, if I were here, I would have refuted. If the hon. junior member for St. John regards himself as a mouse, perhaps he is even smaller than a mouse; he is a molecule. The hon. senior member for St. Peter took the opportunity when I was in England to be slanderous against me.

Mr. BARROW: The Hon. Minister cannot reflect on me in that manner.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: When the Minister was referring to the hon. member, which member did he mean?

Mr. BARROW: I object to his saying that I was slanderous. I do not know, Mr. Deputy Speaker, what he was referring to. If he wants to repeat the slander on himself, it is all right with me. I said that it is unfair for the hon. member to make a statement like that when he knows that the hon. senior member for St. Peter has on divers occasions directly refuted that statement. I do not know what to accept at this stage; therefore, I want it to go down in the records of this House that the hon. senior member for St. Peter is not in his place.

Hon. M. E. COX: Sir, I can read debates which took place in 1951, 1952, 1953, where the hon. member has plastered you and said all sorts of things about you.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Will the hon. member get on with the matter before us. Leave out that.

Hon. M. E. COX: I cannot wait until the hon. senior member for St. Peter returns from wherever he has gone. What must I do? Because he is out of the island should I not say what I know? There are people who can bear me out. The Prime Minister of the West Indies had him until the early hours of the morning in the early part of January, 1954, at the Headquarters of the Workers' Union appealing to him to stay with the Union at least for one year, and then he, the Prime Minister, would reshuffle the Cabinet. The hon. member knows that that is true. The hon. senior member for St. Peter has not said up to now what has caused him to be attacking us and abusing us from then until today. I am saying what I know is a fact. I do not have to tell any lies.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the hon. senior member for St. Peter said during the course of his remarks that the people of Barbados could have had adult suffrage long before, but because the Prime Minister of the West Indies was afraid of the Congress Party getting the majority in the House, that prevented him from bringing in any measure for adult suffrage. Sir, nothing could be further from the truth than that statement. The man to whom the hon. member is referring is a man whom everybody knows. The same hon. member used to get up on platforms and refer to him as the Moses of the Barbados Labour Party, as the Lion of Judah, as the Giant and everything like that.

Anybody who knows the Prime Minister of the West Indies would know that he is not a man to be turned back by fear, or even by the wealthy people of this island. In this House, I heard the former junior member for St. James, Mr. Keith Walcott, refer to him as the big bad wolf. Why was that? It was because the Prime Minister was bringing members to the House like the hon. senior member for St. Peter and myself to push out people like Mr. Keith Walcott, people who were exploiting the people of Barbados. He was a man who had one of the stoutest hearts which a human being could ever have; and to say that he was afraid of bringing in Adult Suffrage because he feared the Congress Party would get a majority, is just misleading and cheap.

Apparently, the hon. senior member for St. Peter does not know quite well what is the meaning of Crown Colony; He thinks Antigua, St. Vincent and such places are Crown Colonies; therefore, he refers to the Crown Colonies having Adult Suffrage before Barbados, and how the Prime Minister hindered it for selfish reasons. Barbados while being a Crown Colony, had representative government.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I would just like to correct the hon. member. The fact that a colony has representative institutions makes it not a Crown Colony.

Hon. M. E. COX: I rather side with the authorities who know. I have an authority on the subject here with me. I can pass it on to the hon. member at any time.

The position is, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that Barbados is a Crown Colony, Trinidad is a Crown Colony as well as Jamaica, Antigua and all of the others. They are not responsible for themselves; and in some of them, their re-

presentation differs. The only difference between Barbados and Jamaica and Trinidad is that the Queen can legislate in Council for them. In other words, when the constitution was suspended in British Guiana, the Secretary of State for the colonies went to the Queen and the Queen sat in Council and said there that the constitution was suspended. 4.25 p.m.

In Barbados, Bermuda and the Bahamas, if there were questions of suspending the Constitution, such would have to be done by an Act of Parliament. A Bill would have to be introduced in the House of Commons, and it would have to be debated and passed by the House of Commons, the House of Lords, and then submitted to the Queen for her signature. But we are all Crown Colonies. If that is all that the hon. member has been teaching - I understand that he lectures in political science - if that is what he conveys to the children, I am sure he is wrong; and the sooner he takes lectures from authorities on this question and then pass the information on to the children the better it will be for him.

Mr. TUDOR: On a point of order. I can well ignore the personal slander coming from the Hon. Minister; he is quite capable of doing that. It is interesting to hear from him something which is opposite to what Sir Grantley Adams has been saying.

Hon. M. E. COX: I appreciate how he puts it. What has been laid down? The hon. member is not saying.....

Mr. TUDOR: On a point of order. Sir Grantley Adams, whom the hon. member was lauding a few minutes ago, said on about twenty occasions both inside and outside of the House, that Barbados is not a Crown Colony; that it has the most advanced constitution in the world; and that it was different in every single respect from any other colony. We are now hearing from the constitutional expert on that side that the expert is wrong!

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

At this stage, it now being 4.30 p.m. of the clock,

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is now 4.30 p.m. of the clock and this House will revert to the consideration of Government Business.

RESOLUTION POSTPONED

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day under Government Business is to move the House into Committee of Supply to consider the grant of sums of money for the service of the island.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am asking leave to postpone Order No. 1 and to take Order No. 2 as the first Order of the Day under Government Business.

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

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day therefore is to resume debate on a Resolution to approve the Compulsory Acquisition of an area of land in Speights-town, St. Peter, for the purpose of Housing Development and use as a Community Playing Field. On the last occasion when this Resolution was being debated, the hon. junior member for St. John was speaking.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, at the moment of interruption on the last occasion when the House was in session, I was on my feet. Perhaps, Mr. Deputy Speaker, this may be the appropriate stage for me to consider a question of privilege arising out of this same debate last Tuesday. During the course of that debate, I pointed out that the Premier must have been misled when he made the statement, that as long as this Government remains in power, there will be no beach rights granted to anybody in Barbados.

I want to draw something to Your Honour's attention because I consider it very relevant to the subject matter

of the debate. The Premier said, and it was repeated while I was in the House, that he had an agreement with the purchasers of this property.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: On a point of order. I said I never used the word "agreement."

Mr. BARROW: It was accepted by them when they said to the Premier that the contract did not contain any clause reserving a right of way for fishermen or anybody else. The Premier has said that he did not say he had a written agreement or a clause or reservation in the contract.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: On a point of order. I have never used the word "written"; I did not use the word "agreement".

Mr. BARROW: That is exactly what I am saying. I am saying that the Premier said that he did not have any written agreement; what is he saying now? If he has not got any written agreement, what is meant by these headlines in the *News* of the 5th March, and the *Advocate* of March 2? The only reference to this debate since last Tuesday has been found on page five of the *Barbados Advocate* of Thursday, 2nd March, 1961, which I intend to make a document of this House. The headline to this article says: "Nobody in Barbados will get beach rights."

The Premier says that the fishermen will continue to beach their boats at Heywoods. Is the Premier saying that the fishermen are going to beach their boats at Heywoods in defiance of the proprietary rights of the owners of the plantation or not? However, that is not what I am specifically referring to here now. If what I read here is correct, then the Hon. Premier has a case as well, because the *Advocate*, has misrepresented the whole course of the debate of last Tuesday; but it has specifically misrepresented him. I would like to quote this article. 4.35 p.m.

"An assurance was given in the House of Assembly on Tuesday by Premier Dr. H. G. H. Cummins, that 'as long as this Government remains in power, there will be no beach rights granted to anybody in Barbados.'

The House was debating a Government-sponsored Resolution for the compulsory acquisition of Forde's Pasture, St. Peter for housing development and for a community playing field.

In the debate, Opposition members suggested the acquisition of Heywoods instead of Forde's Pasture. And one member, Mr. Edwy Talma (DLP, Christ Church) urged that an adequate parcel of beach land should have been included in the resolution 'to maintain and retain free and easy access to the sea.'

But Dr. Cummins, who said that he did not want to enter the debate, replied to Mr. Talma.

He (meaning Mr. Talma) is trying to give the impression that people living along that coast who might be removed from Heywoods would no longer have access to the sea. That is absolutely incorrect."

This is now in heavy type.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: With what are you dealing now? You said that you were rising on a point of privilege and now you are reading from a Newspaper. Is that to support your point of privilege?

Mr. BARROW: Both, Sir.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: If you are talking other than on that you are breaking the Rules of the House.

Mr. BARROW: I am not. The Rules of the House demand that you must - and I am sure the Leader of the Opposition does book work; I do not have the brain for that, and will cite authority to show that a member rising on a point of privilege must - read the whole article complained of and make it a document of this House. You can only make

it a document of the House by reading it; so how can I be breaking the Rules of the House when I am trying to follow them?

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Did the hon. member say he is speaking on a point of privilege, or on the Resolution?

Mr. BARROW: Why can't I quote from the newspaper? I said that I wanted to speak on a point of privilege before I continued the debate. Have you never heard the word "privilege" mentioned today?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: When I asked the hon. member he said that he was not speaking on a point of privilege.

Mr. BARROW: When was that? I thought I had made it clear three times; and I was pointing out that in doing so, I had to quote from the newspaper and make it a document of the House.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: You said you were speaking on a point of privilege, but when I asked you again you said you were not.

Mr. BARROW: A point of privilege takes precedence over any other motion. If you asked me if I am speaking on a point of privilege or something else and I said "no" you must have misunderstood me.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I asked if you were speaking on a point of privilege, and then I told you that you could not quote from the newspaper; so if you misunderstood me, you may say so. I will ask again on what you are speaking.

Mr. BARROW: I am speaking on a point of privilege. Do you really think it matters to me to try and mislead the Chair? What have I got to gain? A point of privilege takes precedence. I was interrupted - and that is what got the whole debate confused - by no less a person than the Hon. Premier when there is nothing on the hook as yet. I was quoting then from the same newspaper; and I am glad for the interruption because it shows that my point of privilege is justified. (ASIDES). The hon. junior member for St. Joseph seems to think, Sir, that this is the Northern District Council!

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will read paragraph 1 of Standing Order No. 26 - "Time and Manner of Speaking and Contents of Speakers." It reads as follows: "A member shall not read his speech, but he may read extracts from books or papers other than newspapers in support of his argument, and may refresh his memory by reference to notes."

Mr. BARROW: That does not arise, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: A point of privilege did not arise out of your remarks.

Mr. BARROW: I would like to bring you up-to-date. I got up at the beginning of today's Session at the appropriate time and informed His Honour the Speaker that I had two points of privilege to raise. In the course of my remarks, the Speaker agreed that as they involved two separate Resolutions, it would be more appropriate that they should be dealt with separately. I accepted His Honour's ruling and said to His Honour at that time that I was reserving my right to raise the second point of privilege at a later stage of today's debate.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: We are not dealing with Order No. 2 now; we are dealing with a point of privilege.

Mr. BARROW: The Government has asked for leave to postpone Order No. 1 and proceed with Order No. 2; and I got up and said that I had been speaking at the Moment of Interruption on Tuesday, 28th February, 1961, but as a point of privilege had arisen out of the debate, I wanted to proceed with the point of privilege. Since I have spoken, apart from the inane asides of your colleagues which I

suppose you yourself cannot help overhearing, the Hon. Premier interrupted to say what he had said during that debate; and from that stage on the whole issue has become a bit muddled. I must confess that it is not my fault or yours.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: If the hon. member is speaking on a point of privilege now, he may proceed.

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order, May I ask what is the position then with Order No. 2 which is before the House? When Your Honour said that Private Members' Business had terminated and you called Order No. 1, I got up and asked leave to postpone Order No. 1 and to take Order No. 2 as the first Order of the Day. Your Honour called Order No. 2 and said that when we adjourned on the last occasion, the hon. junior member for St. John was speaking and he proceeded to speak on the Order. I am therefore asking for a ruling now, Sir.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: When the hon. member got up to speak, he said he was going to speak on a point of privilege arising from this same debate.

Hon. M. E. COX: The hon. member started where he left off last time; so much so that the Premier got up and interrupted as the hon. member started off saying something about the fishermen beaching their boats at Heywoods. He went on to say that the Premier said that he would do this and that; and the Premier got up and made his position clear on both occasions. I am submitting that the question under discussion now is Order No. 2 and not a point of privilege.
4.45 p.m.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member, when he began to speak, said that he was going to speak on a point of privilege. He raised a question about an article in the *Barbados Advocate*. He then turned and said that he was going to speak on a point of privilege. I took it that it was an argument which arose out of the same subject.

Hon. M. E. COX: A point of privilege, as I know it, precedes any other motion. The hon. member was in his seat when Your Honour called for Government Business. If the hon. member wanted to speak on a point of privilege, he had a right to get up, declare his intention and raise his point of privilege.

The hon. member, being the member who was speaking on the motion last Tuesday when Government Business was interrupted, got up and continued his speech. It was right, since he was speaking when the House was interrupted. He has no right to be speaking on any point of privilege now. As he did this morning, he could have risen and said that he was speaking on a point of privilege.

Mr. BARROW: Sir, I rise on a point of order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member must take his seat. An hon. member is already speaking on a point of order. You cannot rise on a point of order at the same time.

Mr. BARROW: Which rule is that?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. junior member for St. John must take his seat and allow the hon. senior member for St. Michael to finish his point of order.

Hon. M. E. COX: I have made the point; it is as clear as a pikestaff. The hon. member has lost the opportunity to raise his point of privilege. He has sat in his seat and heard you call the first Order and never said anything. I then got up and asked that that Order be deferred, and asked that Order No. 2 be taken as the First Order of the Day. The hon. member, up to that time, never rose on a point of privilege. Because of that, I humbly submit that Order No. 2 is under discussion, and that the hon. member has no right to speak on a point of privilege.

Mr. BARROW: Ask him which rule is that.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am speaking to the hon. junior member for St. John. Please take your seat and allow the Chair to speak. I am speaking to the hon. senior member for St. Michael now. When the hon. junior member for St. John got up to speak, he began immediately to refer to the remarks of the Hon. Premier, and said that he would be raising a point of privilege on that same question relative to beach rights at Heywoods. As soon as the hon. member said that, the Hon. Premier got up and said that he did not use the word "agreement". The hon. junior member for St. John went on to read from the newspaper and the Hon. Premier got up and said that he did not say "written agreement".

Then I interrupted the hon. junior member for St. John and asked him if he was quoting from the newspaper on a point of privilege or speaking on the Resolution. It appears as if he misunderstood me and he said "no". I believe he misunderstood me. I believe it was his intention to speak on a point of privilege because he had started to speak on the beach rights, what the Premier had said, and what was stated in the newspaper article.

Hon. M. E. COX: With great respect to Your Honour, all that is a continuation from the last occasion; and not for introducing a motion of privilege.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I do not want him to dictate to the Chair all the time.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member is not dictating to me.

Hon. M. E. COX: The motion before the House is to continue the debate on the Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of an area of land in Speights-town, St. Peter, for the purpose of housing development and the use as a community playing field. How can a debate arise now on a point of privilege?

If you have a debate on a point of privilege, you must pass a resolution. But a motion is already before the House. How are you going to get the motion which is before the House taken away for the hon. member to make a motion? It just cannot work.

Mr. BARROW: I take my rulings from the Chair.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will read Standing Order No. 68:-

"A motion directly concerning the privileges of the House shall take precedence of all other public business."

"If during the sitting of the House a matter suddenly arises which appears to involve the privileges of the House and which calls for immediate intervention of the House, the proceedings may be interrupted, save during the progress of a division, by a motion based on such matter."

If the hon. member wants to raise a point of privilege, he will have to make a motion to that effect. 4.55 p.m.

Mr. BARROW: I am not going to tolerate anybody like the hon. member interrupting me when I am speaking to the Chair, or anybody giving rulings from over there. Your Honour will find abundant authority in May's Parliamentary Practice to the effect that a point of privilege takes precedence over any other motion. An hon. member need not make a motion arising out of a question of privilege at all. I am not disclosing, until I have heard the feelings of this House on this matter, whether I will make a motion or not. I gave notice at the beginning of today's business that I intended to make a motion.

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

Mr. BARROW: I do not know that you could interrupt an hon. member in the middle of a sentence.

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order. Any amount of nonsense does not worry me at all; it all shows that they

are ill-bred. The Rules say that if during the sitting of the House a matter suddenly arises.....

Mr. CRAWFORD: That is not a point of order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member is now out of order. The Chair will have to hear the point of order first; I cannot say that it is not a point of order until I hear how far the hon. member is going.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The hon. member is not correcting anything which the hon. junior member for St. John has said.

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order. I am reading Standing Order 68 paragraph 2.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have just read that.

Hon. M. E. COX: It says: "If during the sitting of the House a matter suddenly arises....." I am submitting, with great respect, that nothing has suddenly arisen.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The House will have to deal with this matter. If the hon. junior member for St. John wants to carry on, he will have to make a motion.

Hon. M. E. COX: The hon. member is not making a motion.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: If the hon. member is not making a motion then he cannot carry on. Has the hon. member finished?

Mr. BARROW: Your Honour knows that I have not finished; I was interrupted on three occasions. The hon. senior member for St. Michael is an authority on constitutional law, and now he is an authority on the Rules of this House. According to May's Parliamentary Procedure, a question of Privilege takes precedence over any other business; an hon. member can make a motion at any time except during the taking of a division.

The Fourth Clerk of the House of Commons, Mr. Lidderdale, made these Rules out of May's Parliamentary Practice and therefore, for guidance, we still have to look at May's. I have a judgment before me now in the Privy Council on the 26th July, 1960, reported in the 1960 All England Reports on that very same point. Because the Rule says that a member may make a motion if a matter suddenly arises, it does not mean that he cannot speak on a question of privilege or if the matter does not suddenly arise. A question of privilege takes precedence over any other question.

It has been said that lawyers should never argue law with laymen, I will take my ruling from you, Sir, because it is felt that you have a special knowledge of the Rules.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is my ruling that if the hon. member wants to continue on the question of privilege, he will have to make a motion.

Mr. BARROW: I will make a motion at the end of my speech as I did this morning. It will apply to somebody else, namely, the Editor of this newspaper. I will make a motion, if you want me to do so, and I will continue to speak; but I am speaking on a point of privilege.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Well, the hon. member will have to make a motion.

Mr. BARROW: I will make the motion, but I will make it at the end of my speech as I did this morning. We have a precedent for that, in other words. 5.05 p.m.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member may continue.

Mr. BARROW: The same reference, same paper, same column, same speaker. The member who said that he did

not want to enter the debate replied to Mr. Talma. This is the quotation:-

"He is trying to give the impression that people living along that coast who might be removed from Heywoods would no longer have access to the sea. That is absolutely incorrect."

This is not in bold type:-

"He said: 'With regard to this particular spot (Heywoods), the promoters have already been told and they have agreed that the beach rights will remain.'

"Fishermen would also continue to beach their boats at Heywoods, Dr. Cummins said.

Chief speakers on the Resolution, which was introduced by Mr. Freddie Miller, Minister of Social Services, were Mr. Frank Walcott (Ind., St. Peter) and Mr. Errol Barrow (DLP, St. John)."

Now in bold type, it is said that the promoters have already been told and they have agreed.

The Premier says that he never made use of the term "agreement" at all. I was pointing out that what he objected to on the last occasion was a written agreement; but here he is reported as having said that the people had agreed. You cannot make a unilateral agreement; that has not been heard of since the time of Hitler! An agreement has to be at least between two parties; and it must be taken that the Premier when he speaks authoritatively, means that the agreement was made between the owners of Heywoods and the Cabinet; it could not be made between anybody else.

What I object to on a point of privilege, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is that certain inaccurate statements have been made in this Report. I will continue to quote and tell you when I get to the inaccurate part. The Report goes on:

"Mr. Walcott said that he did not agree with the idea that Heywoods was agricultural land because negotiations were made with Canadians to build hotels and cabanas there."

I do not think that is correct either, but I am not concerned about that. I will continue to read:

"Those people who lived at the front of Heywoods, said Mr. Walcott, had been given notice to leave and go to Forde's. He suggested that Heywoods be acquired for development, instead of Forde's.

"During the debate, Mr. Barrow read letters which, he said, had been sent to various Government Ministers by a Canadian firm which wanted to set up a hotel project at Heywoods. Some of those letters were produced by Mr. Barrow and made the property of the House.

"He had been speaking for over two hours when debate on the Resolution ended at 8.30 p.m. — the Resolution being considered controversial."

That is the complete article, and I make this paper a document of the House. Now, Sir, what I want to draw to your attention is that newspapers are supposed to publish not one side of a debate, but they must publish a full and fair report; not full in that they must necessarily put down every word that is said. For instance, no one would expect that the effusions of some of the members on the other side when they interrupt on points which are not points of order, should necessarily take up the newsprint of any daily or weekly newspaper; but they owe a duty to the public, to the House, and to themselves, to publish a fair report of the proceedings in this Chamber.

They made a headline statement that the Premier said that beach rights will be preserved, but did not insert the statement I made on the other side in the course of the debate stating from Document No. 5, which has been circulated to hon. members, that the new owners of the plantation

regarded the beach as a private beach, and that that must be clearly understood. The *Advocate* said absolutely nothing about other statements relative to the question of beach rights and the removal of these tenants from Heywoods; and I am submitting that that is a breach of privilege of this House.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I hope I have made my position clear. This headline that was printed by the *Advocate* was designed to lull the good people of St. Peter into a sense of false security; to give the impression that the Government had some kind of agreement or understanding or whatever term one may choose to describe it by, that there would be no question of anybody coming in here and taking away beach rights from Barbados.

The hon. senior member for St. Peter dealt with it; and I dealt with it and went further. I produced authority not in handwriting, but typed and signed by the President of the Company who owns Heywoods, to show that this was not so. I intend to read the passage again despite the threats made to me and other members of the House to prevent me from disclosing matters which are of vital public importance. This was Document No. 5 and the back ground to it I need not give.

"As it now stands we are making reservations and plans to come to Barbados for this closing on January 11th. If you run into anything which calls for at least one of us getting down there ahead of time, do not hesitate to let us know since we would like this thing to go off without a hitch if possible. I understand that in searching one of these old plantation files one can run into quite a bit of time and work."

Now this is the passage:-

"Incidentally, it is most important to us that there be no cloud of restrictions on the beach of this property, and that it is a private beach, belonging to Heywoods Plantation."

I read that three times in the debate last time; but the *Barbados Advocate* dismissed all the warnings and remarks made by the hon. senior member for St. Peter and myself in about two short paragraphs saying that we quoted letters and spoke. They only headlined what I consider a grossly misleading statement made by the Premier that everything would be all right down there and that the people there had agreed. I am only asking you whether or not you consider it is a breach of privilege.

What is more remarkable is that on the 2nd March, the same day on which that newspaper article appears, I wrote a letter to the Editor of the *Barbados Advocate* which was delivered and which reads as follows:-

2nd March, 1961.

The Editor,
Barbados Advocate.
Sir,

In today's issue of your paper there are two errors which I would like to bring to your notice.

"On page 5 column 4 'Mr. Barrow read letters which, he said, had been sent to various Government Ministers' etc.

"I read during the course of the debate several letters, originals which were not sent to Government Ministers but which passed between private individuals and which I have been given authority to disclose. So far only one letter read by me is addressed to a Government Minister (Trade and Tourism) and that is a personal file copy and not the original which the Ministry ought to have. The Ministry should have a fair copy which was sent to the Minister of Trade and Tourism when no reply was received to the first letter.

"I also notice on the same page under the heading 'DLP surveying Barbados' economy' in column 4 'The

preparatory work of these committees have now been completed," said Mr. E. W. Barrow.

"Mr. Editor I do not use singular subjects with plural verbs.

"Under normal circumstances I would ignore such an error as a lapse on the part of your proof reader, but this usage appears with such regularity in your editorial columns that I consider it high time that you tighten up on your reporters and leader-writers.

Errol Barrow."

5.15 p.m.

Now Sir, I have written that to the Editor of the *Barbados Advocate*. Let us leave out the second part and its diggings at their inaccuracies; they merely had me as using a singular subject with a plural verb.

I took the opportunity to point out in the first part of this letter that there were several inaccuracies. The article may have given the impression that I have letters from Ministers which were the property of the Ministers, but there is no such thing. That was six days ago, and the Editor of the *Barbados Advocate* has not thought fit to publish that letter which was sent to him to correct a mistake. Not only are they not correcting the mistake, but they are contumacious and recalcitrant; because, even when an error is pointed out to them, so vicious are these people, they will not publish one thing which will present the debates of this Chamber in a normal favourable light to all. They like to distort the reports of this Chamber in such a way as to cast a most unfavourable light on members of the Opposition. When the mistake was drawn to their attention, they failed to publish the correction, and that is adding insult to injury.

I know that certain members of this Chamber finds May's Parliamentary Practice repugnant, but I would like to quote something from it. I am going to read from page 56 of the Fourteenth Edition of May's which is the standard work used in this House. It says here:-

"The judgment in *Wason v. Walter* in 1868 was made on the principle that the publication of the proceedings both of courts of justice and of Parliament are protected by privilege on the same ground - "that the occasional inconvenience to individuals arising from it must yield to the general good." A fair and faithful report of the whole debate would therefore not be actionable."

"The judgment further indicated why the publication of a single speech from a debate would not be privileged - "It is to be observed that the analogy between the case of reports of proceedings of courts of justice and those of proceedings in Parliament being complete, all the limitations placed on the one to prevent injustice to individuals will necessarily attach on the other; a garbled or partial report, or of detached parts of proceedings, published with intent to injure individuals, will equally be disentitled to protection."

Then, if you turn to page 125, you will find this on "Misrepresenting Members' Proceedings."

"Wilful misrepresentation of the proceedings of Members is an offence of the same character as a libel."

You will find, without my trying to be tedious, that all through May's Parliamentary Practice it is not competent for a newspaper to publish a partial or a garbled account on a debate. If they give a certain amount of weight to one side of the question, they should in the normal course give an equal amount to the other side. If a Minister makes a statement which can mislead not only members of this House but all the inhabitants of Speightstown, Heywoods, Rose Hill, Forde's Pasture and all the surrounding districts, and that statement is filled with inaccuracies and untruthfulness and an authority is produced to show that it may be even of the nature that it would create an estoppel in a Court of Law, misrepresentation on the part of the writer is conclusive.

In the course of last Tuesday's proceedings, the *Advocate* had three Reporters in here; and I find it difficult to understand how, two days later, instead of giving the public first hand information, they gave stale news. When a week later, however, they have not corrected their sins of commission which has been drawn to them in a letter, and they have created other sins which mean that they are wilfully refusing to publish the corrections one way or the other, it shows that these people are intent on doing one thing and one thing only; that is, wilfully distorting the proceedings of this Chamber.

I am asking Your Honour to deal with them. I do not want to spend any more time on this aspect of the matter. I think I have ample time to deal with the banner line of Thursday issue of the *Advocate* when I am dealing with the debate on the Resolution. But I do feel myself constrained at this point to move this motion:-

"BE IT RESOLVED that this House take cognisance of a report appearing in the *Barbados Advocate* Newspaper of Thursday, 2nd March, 1961, on page 5, purporting to be an account of proceedings of this House of Tuesday, 28th February, 1961;"

"AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the matter be referred to a Select Committee of the House in order to consider whether the said article constitutes a breach of privilege of this House and to make recommendations thereon."

5.25 p.m.

We have spent a lot of time today considering questions of privilege, but in no other community of which I know, do we find such flagrant and regular disregard for the dignity and authority of the House. In no other territory of the Caribbean of which I know, is there such abuse of the powers of the organs of public information. So much so, that on two previous occasions, His Honour the Speaker has himself drawn to the attention of the House, matters which His Honour construed to constitute breaches of privilege; and the same newspapers have adopted a most arrogant and insulting attitude towards His Honour the Speaker and members of this House.

Since the people in Barbados are not in a position to get information from any source other than the Daily Press and the Radio, which has a monopoly in this island, one has to be very careful where matters of public information are concerned, such as the beach rights at Heywoods, that the public be not misled and the debates of this Chamber be not misrepresented.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to second that motion. I do not think it is necessary to add very much to what has been said earlier today on this subject; what applies to the matter which we discussed earlier today has equal application to the motion which is now before the House. It must be realised and appreciated that newspaper reports must be either full, or if they are abbreviated, they must be fair and accurate.

Certainly any report which only shows one slant in respect of a debate in which there was more than one aspect, cannot be regarded as being fair or accurate. I think that we did wisely today when we referred to a Committee of this House the matter which we first discussed; and I do not think that we should do otherwise with the present matter under discussion. Hence I formally second the motion for referring this matter also to a Committee of this House.

It must be remembered that the publisher of a report of a Parliamentary debate is protected, if the whole debate is published; but there is a distinction between the absolute privilege of members speaking in the House, or in any Committee of the House, and the qualified privilege of a publisher reporting words spoken. I quote from page 56 of the 14th Edition of May's Treatise on the Law, Privileges, Proceedings and Usage of Parliament. It says this:-

"In the latter case publication of parliamentary proceedings is protected, not specially by privilege of Parlia-

ment, but on the analogy of the publication of proceedings in courts of justice.

The judgment in *Wason v Walter* in 1868 to which the hon. and gallant member referred, was made on the principle that the publication of the proceedings both of courts of justice and of parliament are protected by privileges on the same ground - "that the occasional inconvenience to individuals arising from it must yield to the general good." A fair and faithful report of the whole debate would therefore not be actionable.

The judgment further indicated why the publication of a single speech from a debate would not be privileged: "It is to be observed that the analogy between the case of reports of proceedings of courts of justice and those of proceedings in Parliament being complete, all the limitations placed on the one to prevent injustice to individuals will necessarily attach on the other, a garbled or partial report, or of detached parts of proceedings, published with intent to injure individuals, will equally be disentitled to protection."

That is Chief Justice Cockburn in that same case. In England the Newspaper Libel and Registration Act, 1881, provides that: "a fair and accurate newspaper report of the proceedings of public meetings, published without malice and for the public benefit, is privileged."

I do not think it is necessary to add anything more than what I have said earlier today and what I have cited from "May's". I have already formally seconded the motion for referring this matter also to a Committee of this House. The Committee will go into the matter and arrive at certain conclusions and will make recommendations on the conclusions which have been arrived at. If the Committee compare the newspaper report with what appears in Hansard and find that it is unfair, they will make recommendations which will affect the particular case, or the recommendations will be of value in the future with a view to preventing a recurrence of unfair or unfaithful reports, and assure that in the future the publisher of these reports will be subject to punitive action and consequential action on the part of Parliament to ensure that publishers cannot get away with unfair or unfaithful reports published in this country. 5.35 p.m.

The question that the Resolution do now pass was put and resolved in the negative, the House dividing as follows:

AYES: Mr. TUDOR; Mr. TALMA; Mr. BARROW; Mr. CRAWFORD and Mr. BRANCKER - 5.

NOES: Mr. BRYAN; Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS; Hon. M. E. COX; Hon. R. G. MAPP; Hon. L. St. A. THORNE; Mrs. BOURNE; Mr. SEARLES and Mr. STRAUGHN - 8

RESOLUTION re COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF FORDE'S PASTURE

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order No. 2 stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Social Services: to resume debate on the 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.

On the last occasion the hon. junior member for St. John was speaking.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Government Party now wants to purchase 13 acres, 3 roods, 3 perches of land adjoining Heywoods Plantation, the property of Mr. Percy Whitehead, for the purpose of using it as a Community Playing Field for the parish. What the hon. senior member for St. Peter and I were pointing out, was that they have said in the Resolution - nothing to do with the Addendum, and the Resolution is what we are concerned with - is that they want this 13 acres for a Community Playing Field. In the Addendum to the Resolution, however, they stated that

a Community Centre and Playing Field for St. Peter should be established on about five acres of this land and that the remainder should be used by the Housing Authority for Housing development.

I have cited other documents to show that at one stage it was contemplated rehousing and resettling the 38 tenants who will be evicted from Heywoods Plantation. Now the position, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is that since the purchase of that estate of Heywoods, the Government according to what they are claiming, have got a lease of about four acres at the corner of Heywoods plantation to rehouse the 38 people, not on an agricultural development scheme. You can very well see that with about four acres and thirty-eight people, it is roughly nine persons to the acre; so that with 43,000 square feet odd to the acre, the average person would be living on less than five thousand square feet.

Government has now made some kind of deal with the owners of Heywoods Plantation not to use Forde's Pasture as originally to rehouse the dispossessed Barbadians who have been displaced by these two hundred Canadian families with their exclusive beach rights - not people coming here for tourism, but people coming to live in Barbados. So we will have one way emigration. We cannot emigrate to Canada, but Canadians can emigrate here; and you dispossess people whose fathers and grandfathers have tilled the soil and have handed down the land from one generation to another to give spacious and luxurious *liebestraum*, if I may use that term, to 200 Canadian families. You enter into an agreement to push these 38 Barbadian workers who have been tenants on that land on one corner - and that is the concession which is being made by the Government. We are not using Forde's Pasture for these people at all. That is the true position with regard to Heywoods; and they are in a position to review it if they want.

The only person down there who has got any right of way to the beach is a member of the Barbados Government Party's National Committee, and a political aspirant for several parishes, we do not know which; they have him running from Your Honour's constituency to St. Peter, back up to St. Lucy, and over to St. Thomas; so the only person who has a fourteen foot right of way is Mr. Hutson Williams, an ex-member of the Conservative Party. He has been negotiating a fourteen foot right of way for his personal property with those people who have the corner of Heywoods Plantation where these tenants are supposed to be the recipients of this pepper-corn rent land, which the Minister of Trade was talking about.

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

Mr. BARROW: I am sorry, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I meant the Minister of Communications. This particular corner of Heywoods Plantation up to now has not got any right of way to it. Let us get that straight. 5.45 p.m.

The result was that the Housing Authority went down there to build a road; and the Authority put in a request for \$60,000 to rehouse these people. I understand that the reason why they did it that way, was because they thought the Canadian Corporation was going to pay the bill. Out of that estimate for \$60,000, a certain amount was for roads.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I rise on a point of order. Let me get the hon. member clearly. What did he say that \$60,000 was for?

Mr. BARROW: That \$60,000 is to resettle these people on the four acres of land. Included in that estimate would be the construction of roads, which would not come to more than \$24,000.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I rise on a point of order. I think the hon. member said that the Housing Authority has submitted a bill. To whom did they submit the bill?

Mr. BARROW: I said that they submitted an estimate. If the Government knows to whom they can tell me. It seems

as if everything is a mystery to members of the Government. Let the Hon. Minister of Communications get up and tell you to whom the Housing Authority submitted the estimate. I said that they had expected the owners of Heywoods would have paid the bill. The position is that not one of these houses has been moved on to the four-acre site, or to Forde's Pasture. They have not come for any money for that, so they may have to move these people to Forde's pasture.

Let us say that it would take \$24,000 for the building of roads. That would leave \$36,000, which would mean roughly speaking, \$1,000 a house just to move these house 100 yards or so from where they are. That would mean that just moving a house would cost more than the house costs. The average person moving a house pays \$20 for the hire of a lorry, and before you wake up the next morning, you find the house moved.

The whole situation is so confused that nobody knows where they stand; even the Hon. Premier thought he had beach rights. The Government cannot talk of giving beach rights to anybody, because in Barbados the Government does not have any beach law. The Common Law is that the sea water to high water - a neap tide - is vested in the Crown, but the Government has no rights; the only right which the Government has is if anybody wants to erect a jetty, they must normally bring a petition to the House for authority to do so. It was granted to the Caribee Hotels Limited, last year; and you can look through the laws of this island and you will see various Acts which give effect to that.

Why should the Hon. Premier push out his chest and say that they are not giving any beach rights? They cannot do it because they do not have any beach rights. If the Government owns Shot Hall, well, the Government has a right to the beach at Shot Hall. The Hon. Premier may mean that he is not giving away any beach rights at Gravesend. Of course, they have given away beach rights up there to B.U.O.C., the Barbados Light and Power Company, and the Molasses Terminals.

What is it therefore, that we in Barbados would like to see? What we want is a right of access to the beaches. From time immemorial you will find, as at Rockley, we have bits of land which are vested in the people of the district. The hon. senior member for Christ Church can speak with authority on that.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member is going up to Christ Church now. Let us get back to the Resolution.

Mr. BARROW: I am not straying from the Resolution. Just let us be sensible and rational. You cannot discuss a Resolution without analogy, illustration, or without reference to procedure. I mentioned Gravesend and Your Honour did not consider that as going too far. Just let me trespass a little away from the Public Buildings and go to Rockley. You will see that even there the Government had to buy the beach, but that beach was vested in the inhabitants of the district because from time immemorial the inhabitants were using that beach.

The Government should make sure that the common and ancient rights of the people of Barbados who have been enjoying rights-of-way over beaches should be preserved. They cannot sit back, like the Hon. Premier, and say that Government is not giving away beach rights; the Hon. Premier should say that Government is going to acquire beach rights for the inhabitants of the country.

The situation is that the people of Barbados - the common people who ride in buses - are being driven steadily into the centre of the island; they are being hounded off land from near the sea-shore so that this land may be taken up by multi-millionaires and people from overseas who regard it as their exclusive right to enjoy the bounties of nature in this island. Let me give you an example. For a number of years members of this House including the Hon. Premier - and I would say that he more than anyone else -

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

I was saying, Sir, that the Hon. Premier, like other members for a number of years - I would say the Hon. Premier more than anyone else; and I like to give Jack his jacket, and every dog his due - was one of the loudest in his criticisms of the Paradise Beach Club, but somewhere along the line he gave up the struggle. He was insistent in his struggle that there should be a public highway along that area, inasmuch as the owners of that property who were Barbadians at the time, did not like the idea of certain types of people bathing on that beach; they wanted it reserved for their guests. The hon. junior member for St. Thomas was very adamant in his attitude that it was the public's right to pass along there, and that the Government of the day should take active steps to restore the road. 5.55 p.m.

I do not know what reason he had for giving up the struggle, but he did make a struggle. Today I never thought that the Government would allow the owners of Fresh Water not only to stop the road which used to exist there, but to allow them to go out into the ocean and erect barriers. When the Premier said, in the matter of Heywoods, that he would preserve the beach rights, we have seen alterations made before the words had actually died from his lips.

My main purpose in quoting from this correspondence is to warn the Premier that they are young in this business of Government, and they must not go on making concessions time after time to capitalists in the interest of tourism; because, all the time these people are telling them one thing but doing another thing behind their back. I think it is known that a person who pretended to be friendly with the Premier had called him names behind his back; that person was Mr. Whyatt.

Here was the hon. member like a knight in shining armour, complaining about Paradise Beach Club nearly 25 to 30 years ago; he is now Premier, and you have Barbadians being placed in this position. Do not let the hon. member come in here and make statements about which he is not prepared to satisfy us, and statements which cannot be substantiated by facts. If a fisherman reads this statement in the newspaper of the 2nd March (*Asides*) The hon. senior member for St. Thomas can make any asides he likes; we have a reference which is relevant to this debate. On page 4 of document No. 9 this is what people think of the hon. member: This is what is stated:

"I am going to write to Shepherd this afternoon and lead him along on our thinking regarding industry in the Barbados and it may be that he becomes a little more enthused after that. I agree with your thinking entirely regarding the Honourable Mr. Mapp - a difficult man is often much easier along without witnesses and I have the utmost confidence in your ability in this regard so carry on..."

In so many words, Mr. Mapp is a very difficult man, therefore get him in a corner without witnesses. Why on earth would any one want to get him in a corner without witnesses, I do not know. After that, he becomes co-operative; therefore the hon. member can make all the asides he wants to make.

The first point is that until the Government gets some compulsory acquisition or an agreement in writing, I would advise any fisherman or anybody from that district that the public has no right as such over lands at Heywoods to and from the sea. That is the sole purpose of my making these disclosures. It is for the purpose of making the records straight. The hon. member has said that he has made no agreement with these people but the newspaper says that they do not intend to give any.

In the surrounding French Islands - the islands are now British but they were under French control - in St. Lucia there is something called the Law of the Fifty Paces; and in the Napoleonic Code, it means that all the land fifty or eighty feet of high water mark is vested in the Crown.

Therefore, when Dr. La Corbiniere said that they do not intend to give up any rights, they have a legitimate ground for saying so. Before you can build a hotel within fifty feet of high water mark, you have to approach the Government because the property is vested in the Government. That is the Napoleonic Code.

At present, the Premier has told us nothing to satisfy us that the Government has reserved any right of way for the fishermen. Another point is, the willingness of the Ministers to take land out of agricultural production. Mr. Cadbury came down here and we have not seen his Report, but they can take shelter behind that. The Report which this expert makes included such a vital point as taking land out of agricultural production.

Your Honour will see in one of the documents which I have produced that the gentleman concerned is himself a non-Barbadian. The President of the Commercial Land Development Ltd. challenged Mr. Cadbury as to if it is possible to say whether land should be taken out of agricultural production or not. In one of the documents which I have here...

Hon. M. E. COX: It is document No. 3.

Mr. BARROW: The hon. senior member for St. Michael has studied this matter well and therefore he can say that the document is No. 3.
6.05 p.m.

I am saying that the same President of the Commercial Land Developments Limited challenged that, but we in the House did not even have an opportunity to challenge it because they never came to the House and got the House's advice about taking land in St. Peter which was agricultural land out of agriculture; they did everything in a conspiratorial atmosphere; and it was not in the interest of the people in St. Peter, the tenants of Heywoods Plantation or the fishermen who were using Heywoods Beach to haul up boats and have an easy entry and egress from the beach. This matter should not have been done in a conspiratorial manner at all.

I doubt the representatives of the parish were given an opportunity to express their opinions as to whether this would be deleterious to the best interest of the people of that parish or not; but here was a non-resident alien stating that he did not see how Mr. Cadbury could pontificate on a matter like that; and with that sentiment I entirely agree. So that was the second point taken on agricultural land; the first being the question of beach rights. The third point was that the President of the Corporation adverted to the fact that there was some talk of peasants sending a petition to the Minister.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, not only did they petition, but some of them appeared to have expressed the desire to acquire certain portions or parcels of Heywoods Plantation so that they could work it, and instead of being tenants, they could now become owners in their own right, even if it was of a few thousand square feet. The 38 of them are going to be shepherded, like Mr. Shepherd who has gone, or railroaded on to four narrow acres of land which do not have any right of way out into Church Street or Queen Street. They are still on Heywoods land; and the time within which they were to quit expired since 31st May last year; and up to now the Government does not know whether they will eventually end up at Heywoods or Forde's; but they are still illegally in possession according to the law of the parcel of land which they held from generation to generation. What is rather tragic is that the poet said -

Ill fares the land
To human ills a prey,
Where wealth accumulate and men decay.

It is a pity that in the burly-burly of modern day politics and business existence, members do not take time off to read a little poetry sometimes, because they would not make these tragic errors. Now you have these 30 families who are going to be shunted not on to Forde's but on to Heywoods

because there are four acres at the corner. If we were elevating the people of Barbados, what we would say is this: satisfy us and show that Heywoods Plantation is non-productive.

I would like to take them up to places like Goodland in Christ Church, Chancery Lane and real dry areas, where the tonnage produced is not half that produced at Heywoods Plantation. I have the figures here for Heywoods. In 1957, they were getting 32.40 tons per acre, and this is an absentee proprietorship. You can imagine that if a real good Barbadian planter were working Heywoods Plantation for his own interest, and not for an absentee proprietor, what kind of yield you would get from Heywoods Plantation.

Now the average production per cane acre was 32.40 which dropped to 27.99 in a year when, notoriously, we did not have a good crop; and we have got people in this island working land which is almost bare rock and getting fifteen to twenty tons. That might be marginal, but is still considered productive. So you see at no stage was the House consulted, at no stage were the representatives for St. Peter consulted, and I am saying almost without fear of contradiction that at no stage were the people directly affected by this dislocation of their daily existence given an opportunity to purchase.

Suppose you gave two acres to each of them; that would only be 75 to 80 acres. All may not have had the money, but the gentleman was very caustic about them anyhow. How does he know they did not want to buy? How does he know how many have moved out in despair of being able to own land which is at present owned by an absentee proprietor? It is just like trying to get part of Balls Plantation which belongs to the Lascelles group. Absentee proprietorship is not something that is good for the country. Almost all the Barbadian planters make good use of the land and try to get the best out of it, and if Heywoods is comparatively low, it is only because of absentee proprietorship. What interest would there be in a person producing more when he is going to get the same salary? So the fourth point is the lack of opportunity of people there to acquire at least part of this place.

Why should 200 Canadian families dispossess 38 peasants? Why should Government at this stage be hustling and turning, trying to get these people from this Company to put aside \$5,000 for the purpose, when they have put in an estimate for \$60,000 for the same purpose? Something is wrong.

I would like to know if there are no people in Barbados who do not consider that this strikes at the whole root of Government, and also at the very ideology which it has set forth before the people. What we want to know is whether Barbadians come first, or people from outside. We must be careful that in our quest for industrialisation and tourism we do not create a nation of domestic servants and lackeys and nothing more. We must be creating a higher standard of living for our people, and not inviting people to come to Barbados, and keep us in a state of perpetual servitude without even the right to have a sea-bath.
6.15 p.m.

I saw this coming 15 years ago, not 15 months. If this kind of thing continues, the next on the list is Trents and Lascelles. Sir, I ask you which plantation from here to the North Point in St. Lucy has not been taken over by foreigners? They have got Maycocks, and the estate adjoining River Bay and all of those along that coast line. Which estate have they not taken over and which we have not surrendered everything to them? We have as much right down there as we have in the Belgian Congo. We have as much right down there to trespass as we have to go in Stanleyville and challenge Colonel Mobutu. Somewhere has Sir Winston Churchill said that "we will fight on the beaches." Well, we have to start and draw a line somewhere; therefore, I suggest to hon. members on the other side that the beach may be the appropriate place to set a bridgehead and start resisting. It is all that we have left. We have the oxygen, nitrogen and other gases which make up the atmosphere, and that is the only thing which

people of Barbados do not have to pay taxes for and which they are not prohibited the use of; but we have no helicopters to use them when we are driving up in the air.

Hon. members on the other side seem to think that I have quoted from these documents to show what other people think of them. I quoted from them to warn them of the people with whom they have to deal. Do not mind the cocktail parties, do not mind the times they took you out for lunch; it is because they want to wrest a concession from the people of Barbados, and not from you, that they have done that. You may personally gain in prestige, but what about the people in Barbados? You had a startling illustration this week of this kind of thing at the Fresh Water Beach. The Hon. Premier still thinks he has beach rights. A man cannot give away what he does not have.

Of course, it is true to say that I can give away Brooklyn Bridge, Seawall Airport and Bulkeley Factory, but they do not belong to me. There is no law to prevent me from putting in my last will and testament that I bequeath, devise and give to such a body Bulkeley Plantation and Seawall Airport. Similarly, there is no law against the Hon. Premier saying that he has no right to give away beach rights; he only has them at Shot Hall beach and where land is owned by the Executive Committee. Do not mislead the public. Do not let us give away our birthright.

Sir, if this debate has served no other purpose than to give to the members of the public the kind of machinations which can take place perhaps with all sincerity but through pathetic ignorance on the part of the Ministers, it will serve some good. The Ministers may - and the "may" is highly problematic - have wanted this gentleman and 200 Canadian families to come and settle in Barbados so as to make them believe that the people of Barbados are not Communists since they allow 200 people to come and settle here; and that we are prepared to lean over backwards to accommodate them.

What have we done? Using its own yardstick all that the Government may have done is to create jobs for domestics and to give Mr. Hutson Williams a fourteen feet right-of-way; but then it has taken away the right-of-way of our fishermen to the beaches. Let them get up and say what they like; I have put the whole lot of facts before Your Honour, hon. members and members of the public. Maybe, twenty years from now - I am not put here forever; I may have gone to my Valhalla or to my Father - somebody may take up records of this House and see that the same thing which I have said has happened. And it may happen in less than a year. As a matter of fact, it happened last week on a matter so closely related to this debate which has been going on during the course of the last seven days. It was the very thing which I have been warning about.

Do not let the Hon. Premier make statements which cannot be substantiated. If he is tired and does not know what the answer is, let him go and get somebody in the Civil Service to acquaint him of the facts; but do not come in here and mislead the people of Speightstown. They do not have any beach rights. I have the conveyance for Heywoods, and I have cited a letter which shows that they do not have any such rights.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, I must admit that I am a bit disappointed. When this debate adjourned on the previous occasion, we had heard that a mass of letters would be produced today - over 200 of them - and that they would be read, and that it would take another all night session to discuss the matter.

Mr. BARROW: Sir, I rise on a point of order. Does the Hon. Minister want me to throw them in his face? The letters are here. Look at them.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: The hon. member is only confirming what I said. Do not let him get anxious. I will implore him to keep quiet and save his vigour. As I was saying, we had expected to hear more; we wanted him to read more; we challenge him to read more. He has changed his mind, and I

do not know why; maybe it was because of the fix he was in this morning, and the frantic way he went about his business of privilege. So far as we are concerned, we have no fear, and, therefore, that is why we invited him to read more. However, we feel very glad that he has read those letters, has produced them, and has made them documents of this House. I will quote what he quoted, and I will also quote more; what he did not quote.

This Resolution concerns a matter which first reached this House four years ago, not two years ago. The Government has been considering this matter of Forde's Pasture since four years ago; and we started examining the possibilities of it during that time. For the life of me, I cannot comprehend how it is possible for the hon. member to connect this with Heywoods; but I will come to that later to show that it was all a fabrication. I cannot for the life of me see how this Resolution can in any way be mixed up with what the hon. member said.
6.25 p.m.

Mr. BARROW: On a point of order. Is the hon. member suggesting that these letters were fabricated by me or somebody else for the purpose of embarrassing him? Is he suggesting that this is a fabrication? Because if he is doing that, I would like him to make that clear.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: When I have finished reading the documents in my possession, and what I have written, he will see what are fabrications and what are not.

Mr. BARROW: On a point of order. I still want him to make it clear if the documents which were circulated are fabrications. That is a direct challenge which is being made to my integrity.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: The hon. member has not risen on a point of order. He is continually interrupting me.

Mr. BARROW: I would like the hon. member to make his position clear because he may have to withdraw what he said. I notice that the hon. member is still standing while I am speaking on a point of order.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I was wondering if he was on a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member said that he was speaking on a point of order.

Mr. BARROW: I want to get the position absolutely clear, because the hon. member says that he is going to clear up what are fabrications and what are not. When I read from the documents just now the words, "I agree with your thinking entirely regarding the Honourable Mr. Mapp -- a difficult man is handled much easier along without witnesses and I have the utmost confidence in your ability in this regard so carry on," I regard that as an expression of opinion. Does the hon. member regard that as a fabrication?

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister says that when he is finished the hon. member will know whether it is a fabrication or not.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: When this matter of Forde's was started, except for the fact that Heywoods was in existence - I am speaking for the island as a whole - the matter of Heywoods changing hands did not arise. Until 1959 this matter of Heywoods being sold out to a Canadian investor was never mooted at all, or even thought of. From the letters which we have, I do not think it was thought of.

What is the position as regards Forde's? I am speaking strictly on the Resolution which is before us. Forde's was contemplated for community purposes chiefly as a community centre and a playing field; it was close to Speightstown, and the matter of housing came into the picture because the area was too big an area for a playing field; and part of the area is suitable for housing. The hon. junior member for St. John termed the area to be a swamp; I do not know if the hon. member knows what he is talking about at all, in so far as that area is concerned.

Those of us who have lived in that area and who know the upper part of Forde's, know that this area is quite suitable for housing. It is true that we may have to drain certain parts of it. (*Laughter*) The fact that hon. members opposite laugh shows their ignorance. The fact that you have to drain an area does not mean that there is a swamp. Even for the purpose of sewerage you have to provide drainage; so that when those hon. members laugh, their ignorance is more pronounced. In order to make an area suitable for proper housing, you have to provide drainage. That is the only particular difficulty which we have had as regards Forde's; the part which is close to the sea is quite suitable for a playing field, but the other part is reserved for housing and that is a dry area.

This matter of Heywoods changing hands came into the picture, so far as I am concerned and from what appears in my file, in November, 1959; that is some two years after the matter of Forde's had been before the mind of the Government. I do not say that the matter of Heywoods did not arise before 1959, but as far as we are concerned, it did not arise with us because it was a purely private transaction.

The hon. junior member for St. John, as usual, rushed in here in such a way that at times I wondered if he was a lawyer or a child. Without examining the facts properly, he discovers that we were trying to put a stop to this business; and half way through reading his letters it struck him that it must have been the Aliens Land Holding Bill...

Mr. BARROW: On a point of order. The hon. member is talking unadulterated nonsense. I would never have to deal with this if it were not for the representation of the people. He said that I discovered something half way through; I have had these things in my possession for twelve months, and he has heard me read things out at Diamond Corner. At the time when they were negotiating without legal authority, and when the people were ignoring them, when they were extending the regulations, it was quite recently, last year, I presume, to preclude any further recurrence as to their being slighted in the way in which they were slighted, that they came in with the Aliens Land Holding Bill.
6.35 p.m.

Now he tells me that I discovered that half-way through reading. You will find in the debates over six months' ago in this House that I said the same thing; but he says I discovered it last Tuesday. When we were discussing the same land restrictions Bill, I made reference to Heywoods plantation. I said that that was the reason why we were getting the Bill; but every other island in the West Indies had it several years ago. He is really pathetic.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: If the hon. member wants to make a new speech and now say what he should have said, it is a matter for him; but on the last occasion he said that the Government discovered they could not do anything about the sale of this land, and rushed in here with the Aliens Land Holding Bill. He never mentioned anything about the Town and Country Planning Act.

Mr. BARROW: On a point of order, I think Your Honour was in the Chair. Do I have to say any more?

Mr. SPEAKER: No!

Hon. R. G. MAPP: He said - it is there in the debates which will be published - that we rushed in here with an Aliens Bill in order to try and stop this; but that we were too late. We over here laughed to see his profound ignorance, because the Aliens Land Holding Bill has not become law. The hon. junior member for St. Joseph during his speech today, on the motion of privilege, referred to what the hon. member for St. John had said about the Aliens Bill; and said that the hon. member for St. John must have meant the Town and Country Planning Act. The Leader of the House had to remind the House.....

Mr. BARROW: I hope this is the last time I will have to get up on a point of order. When I said they rushed in

here with a Bill, they literally did rush in here with a Bill; I did not say the Bill was passed; they have not even pressed it since then.

Mr. Speaker, that is not the point however. They rushed in here with a Resolution to extend the Town and Country Planning Order to the North beyond Heywoods, and they also rushed in here with the Aliens Bill. If he wants to quote me, for the sake of all that is good and gracious, as the hon. junior member for St. George would say, let him take up the report and quote what I said; but do not build up a false premise and destroy it. He rushed in here with a Bill and it was not passed; everybody knows that.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: The hon. member is confusing himself. We made an Order and extended it to St. Lucy specifically - we make no bones about it - to include an area such as Heywoods; and that is what the Leader of the House had to remind the hon. member opposite about. What was the point of our shutting our eyes to what was going on?

It was alleged that we told the House when we were debating Forde's, that we were keeping Heywoods for agricultural purposes. We do not hesitate to say that up to a certain time in 1959, we were opposed to Heywoods being used for other than agricultural purposes. In November, 1959, an application was received from this Company so far as that property is concerned; it was the normal kind of application to the Government through the Minister of Communications and Works; and it was one of the letters which the hon. member read. The letter reads as follows:-

"Dear Sir,

This letter is to inform you that we have 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."

This is now November 27th, 1959.

Mr. SPEAKER: Did the hon. member read "Heywoods on the St. James' Coast?"

Hon. R. G. MAPP: That is the phrase they used. The letter goes on as follows:-

"We respectfully ask that this matter be given the earliest possible 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

As I said, this is a project which is of considerable size and of some importance, and instead of being dealt with by the Town and Country Planning Officer, it obviously required a political decision; so he directed that the application should be sent directly to the Minister, that is, to the Government. In accordance with Government policy which is usual in applications of this sort, the letter was forwarded to me on 29th November. We took the usual course adopted in such matters. We discussed it with the Town and Country Planning Officer, with the other members of the Government at that time, and we felt that this land should not be diverted from agricultural use to any other use.

The first time I met Mr. Corbin was when he came to see me soon after that. He came along with Mr. Lashley from the Housing Authority and introduced himself and talked about this matter. One of the points I raised with Mr. Corbin was the matter of the tenants on the land. That was made quite clear from the letter by Mr. Hough which talked about the Minister being difficult and putting him (Mr. Corbin) in a difficult position.
6.45 p.m.

One of the things which Mr. Corbin told me at the time, was that they were willing to offer these people some cash payment; and he had even consulted some plantation owner in St. Peter, I think it was a gentleman who probably looked after the estate; I do not know whether he was the agent or what, but I think it was the Attorney. Mr. Corbin said that he had thought that they would have given the people \$200 or \$300; but he said that the Agent only wanted to give them \$50 each, and he certainly could not entertain that. In fact, Mr. Corbin did ask me at the time not to mention it as it would only arouse ill-will. I held political meetings down there since then, and I did not even say anything about it. I told Mr. Corbin that I knew nothing about any transactions or any negotiations going on between him and the owners of that estate, but until proper provision was made for resiting these tenants, so far as we were concerned, we were not going to agree to the purchase.

Discussions between Mr. Corbin and these people on this matter went on; but that is the only time I saw Mr. Corbin. I checked up on that since this debate started. The hon. junior member for St. John said that there were four Ministers around Mr. Corbin's bedside. On the last occasion, he said five, therefore, he has reduced the number by one. Only recently, I went and checked on the facts, and I found that the Hon. Minister of Trade and myself were in Trinidad at the time of the death of Mr. Corbin. We have noticed that the hon. member has reduced the number to three today - but that is the manner in which the hon. member comes in here and does his business.

Mr. BARROW: Sir, I rise on a point of order. I was in Trinidad in February too. The Hon. Minister knows that, I would like the hon. member to know that Mr. Corbin did not die in February at all.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Sir, since this debate, I have made a check and have found out when Mr. Corbin died; and even when Mr. Corbin was buried. As I have said before, that meeting was the first and only time I have met that gentleman. I have seen Mr. Hough twice. I have never taken lunch with Mr. Hough nor with Mr. Corbin.

Mr. BARROW: Sir, I rise on a point of order. Why is the hon. member getting so excited? I did not say that he had lunch with anybody. I said that there was an expense account for wining and dining Ministers; and also that the Minister for Tourism had personally entertained the gentleman to lunch. Either the Minister entertained the gen-

tleman to lunch or the gentleman entertained him to lunch. That can be seen from a letter.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is referring to a letter. Why not read it?

Mr. BARROW: Why don't they read it? The hon. member is getting on as if I said that he had lunch with somebody. It is the document which refers to lunch and to expense and to wining and dining.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: The hon. member need not get on with his legal tricks. Let him save that for the Courts.

Mr. BARROW: Sir, I rise on a point of order. I object to the hon. member talking of legal tricks by me. I was merely asking the hon. member to be accurate.

Sir, you will see from a reference in Document No. 9, a sentence which says:

"Incidentally, we do not expect that you should pay incidental expenses on our account or pick up a cheque for wining and dining the ministers or people whom you have to see on our account."

Then, in another letter, reference was made to a lunch - who paid for it, I do not know - between somebody and the Minister for Trade. The hon. member must eat lunch every day, and at whose expense it does not matter to me. In Document No. 4, which is a letter dated November 20th, 1959, and written to the Hon. Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour, it is stated:-

"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."

You have further this statement:-

"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."

That is at the very end of the letter, so it appears that the hon. member, or the public of Barbados, paid for the lunch.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Sir, I was referring, when I was interrupted, to the fact, as I have said, that we impressed upon both Mr. Corbin and later on Mr. Hough, that we would never agree to this transaction and to the diversion of this land from its former use until we had settled the matter of the siting of the tenants. When it comes to these small points and the allegations by hon. members - as if it were something against the character of the Ministers - I think the simplest child would dismiss all of that as only a waste of time. It can only emanate from a member who has his mind in a sewer.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The hon. member cannot reflect on another member in those terms. Of course, it does not matter to me.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. senior member for St. Thomas said that it can only emanate from an hon. member who has his mind in a sewer. I will ask the hon. member to withdraw those words.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Those words are withdrawn, Mr. Speaker,
6.55 p.m.

It takes a strange quirk of mental thinking on the part of anybody to try to use the fact that somebody writes in a letter that you wined and dined with somebody else, and

therefore the person must have, of necessity, done something wrong or crooked. What yardstick are you applying to that person? Are you applying your own yardstick? To whom can that attitude apply unless it is somebody who is morally deficient?

All over the world, in all States, in all Governments, that sort of thing happens. Would you say that because the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom had lunched with some person interested in a particular project the Prime Minister was bought out? When the Secretary of State for the Colonies went to Africa and wined and dined with Sir Roy Welensky, would you say that he was bought out? On the contrary, he so came down on the side of the Africans that he caused Sir Roy to say that his predecessor, Mr. Lennox-Boyd was a good man who had stuck by them, but here comes this man who had taken sides with the Africans.

I did not think, Mr. Speaker, that the day would come when I would sit here in this House, which I entered in 1946, and hear a member descend to the level to which I heard the hon. member descend.

At this stage, it now being 7 p.m. of the clock,

Mr. SPEAKER: It now being 7 p.m. of the clock, this sitting now stands suspended until 7.45 p.m. of the clock, 7.00 p.m.

On re-assembling,

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, there is no quorum present, and I ask that the Bell be rung.

On the Bell being rung, a quorum was obtained.

Mr. SPEAKER: On the suspension of the sitting the Hon. Minister of Communications, Works and Housing was addressing the House in connection with a Resolution to approve the Compulsory acquisition of an area of land in Speightstown St. Peter, for the purpose of Housing Development and use as a Community Playing Field.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, I was developing the sequence of events which took place in considering this matter of the application of the Government to this project at Heywoods. I had reached the point where I referred to the Government's discussions on this matter, and that we had given the matter considerable thought. We have a total arable acreage of 106,238 acres in this island; and we obviously had to plan as against the depletion of our total acreage, the promotion of tourism and the benefits which would accrue therefrom. I do not think that you could expect otherwise.

There were heated arguments in favour of and against even with respect to the area of which we were thinking. I addressed meetings in the area on this matter; and Your Honour is aware that we discussed the matter with the people in the Northern area who would be concerned with it. At that time we certainly did feel that this particular area of land should be kept for agricultural purposes. 7.50 p.m.

There are some 120 acres involved; and there was the fact that, only recently, we had allowed 400 acres, not only at Sandy Lane but along the whole St. James Coast, to go out of production during the course of the last five or six years. We could not prevent it because we did not have the Town and Country Planning Act in operation. We went into this matter very seriously, took the advice of our agricultural experts, and balanced one opinion against the other. We had our own firm opinion on the matter from a political and public point of view, and we discussed it with the people. I remember that at one meeting we held in Speights-town there was this fear that tourism might entice people here with peculiar racial attitudes and soon, and upset the equilibrium of the society.

At that time too, Sir, - that was in December but I do not see the exact date of the letter I am going to refer to, because it went to the Ministry of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries, and I only have a copy without the date - you sent a letter enclosing a petition from the residents of the area in which you said:-

"Dear Sir,

I have the honour to forward to you a copy of a notice to quit and deliver up possession of house spots, agricultural holdings and a house served on thirty-eight families who have for several years been resident on lands of Heywood Plantation in the parish of St. Peter.

"I have yesterday, Wednesday, 2nd December, visited every one of these holdings and have spoken to the occupiers of these lots of land. They have regretted that no opportunity has been given to them by their landlord of purchasing these holdings on which they have lived in many cases for more than twenty years."

This letter was therefore written on the 3rd December.

"I have also spoken to the Manager of Heywoods Plantation who has assured me confidentially that there is a three acre parcel of land of Heywoods Plantation adjoining Forde's Plantation which in his opinion would make an excellent land settlement area to accommodate these tenants who now find themselves served with notice to quit.

"I sincerely and anxiously hope that your Government find it possible to give this matter your earnest and speedy attention.

"I further understand that Heywoods is about to be sold by the present owner to a business concern who intends to develop the marginal lands now facing Highway No.1 and presently occupied by these tenants into a sort of township to provide accommodation to persons of foreign origin.

"Again I hope your Government give this matter your urgent attention.

I have the honour to be,
Yours sincerely,
(Sgd.) K. N. R. Husbands,
Member of the General Assembly
for St. Peter."

And Your Honour also enclosed in that letter copies of the notices sent to these 38 people who were affected, 33 of whom occupied house spots, two of whom occupied agricultural holdings, and the other three occupying small house spots plus small agricultural holdings.

As I said already, faced with these conditions, we gave this matter very long attention, and there were divers of views. I would just like to quote from one of the letters at this point to show that the last letter read by the hon. junior member for St. John showed that these Canadian people were almost despairing. After the hon. member read all the letters and imputed immoral transactions, and that somebody was saying how to get out of this difficulty and get around this difficult Minister, this letter shows that obviously the time of the option was drawing to a close; and members will see that the Company was almost despairing of getting anything out of the Government. This is the letter of January, 21st, 1960:-

"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."

This is written long after the other letters into which the hon. member read something gullible and corrupt on the part of the Government. Is this consistent with a Government that wants to sell the very life of the people or the country for a mess of pottage? That is what the letter stated, and after mentioning about Sir Grantley Adams, it goes on as follows:-

"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."

When you read through the letters, you will see that this is a Canadian writing with a Canadian slant. He uses

the word "deal" in hundreds of paragraphs. For instance, he wrote "I think that it might be possible to arrange some very good deals there on a low down payment, much, much lower than can be accomplished here in Canada." He used another expression about "getting all the bugs straightened out." But the hon. member of course took out the word "deal" and used it however it suited his purpose. In Document No. 2 he also wrote: "If you will recall, I informed you that Nick Parravicino asked some \$3,000.00 per acre, and that I would be writing him to tell him that this was much too dear and that the "deal" was off."

However, to get back to the letter of January 21, 1960, this is what was written:

"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. I can see nothing but complications arising on every hand in the development of the property if Government support is not 100% behind tourism development. We have enough problems at home without going 3,000 miles to run into larger headaches. As you well know, there are other places in the sun that are taking a more realistic view on outside capital for development purposes."

That is the letter that the hon. member quoted, but he took out the parts that suited him; he did not read that last sentence. I am very sorry he is not here, but I have some very strong things to say; and I am going to say them whether or not he is here, so that they will go down in the records. I have quoted that last letter to show that it is consistent with everything I am saying; and inconsistent with all the imputations, accusations, inferences and inadvertent suggestions thrown against members of this Government. At one time we even considered that we could restrict the development to hotels only, and refuse the use of the land for housing.

8.00 p.m.

Before coming to a decision on that, I received instructions that the Hon. Premier had decided that, as Mr. Cadbury was coming here, he would put the matter to Mr. Cadbury. That was natural. Here is a project that is mooted as one to bring economic progress within the area; and as you know, by our having a Deep Water Harbour in the near future, there would be less employment that way. We also considered the fact that agriculture as a whole was employing less people than in the past. We could not prevent Sandy Lane from shutting down; therefore, we had to take all these things into consideration. What better decision could we have arrived at than to call in our Economic Adviser to see what effect this deal would have on the economy of the island? We had to plan things and see whether it would be in the interest of the people of this island to allow the project to go forward.

Well, the matter was referred to Mr. George Cadbury late in January, 1960, and in early February this is what he wrote to us about it:-

"Since this is a matter of urgency and a reply in principle should be given to Mr. Hough of Toronto before the end of February, I should, I think, give you an interim opinion of the use of this estate other than for agricultural purposes even before completing a thorough analysis of the situation."

"It is now quite clear that the proposed use of 136 acres of this estate which includes the present roadway and allowance is likely to produce income for Barbados considerably in excess of the present income produced by cultivation. I think therefore that permission should be given sufficient to enable Mr. Hough to complete the purchase of the property. A detailed study of the probable income from his proposal is in the course of preparation and will be circulated later."

I have no hesitation at this point in saying that we placed great faith in a man of Mr. Cadbury's reputation. He is an economist of proven ability - not a pooh-pooh economist like some people we know - and one who has identified

himself with Colonial people; a man whose reputation was acclaimed in Jamaica and other parts of the world, and is beyond any doubt whatsoever. We brought him to Barbados for this purpose, therefore, we have placed great faith in what he has recommended.

I may say that every Jamaican knows what this man is capable of; and it is chiefly through the advice and assistance given by Mr. Cadbury that we arrived at this decision. He went into the matter thoroughly and he reported as follows on it:-

"Heywoods project consists of 134 acres of which about 100 are estimated to be in production of sugar cane. Yields are low and the gross revenue ex-farm is only \$37,000 per annum and employment is provided for 40 persons in crop and 30 out of crop. The export value of the sugar so produced is estimated at something less than \$80,000 and total employment created in field and factory is about 50."

"The proposed use of the Estate is for 4 hotels and 200 houses for persons who in the main will have foreign incomes. This use would involve a minimum net transfer of foreign funds to Barbados of about \$200,000 per annum and the direct employment of an approximate average of 580 persons per annum."

"A comparison of these two sets of figures of net foreign transfer indicates a sugar cane yield of about \$600 per acre compared with a yield estimated at \$3,500 per acre for the hotels and the houses. It is of course conceivable that there may be an alternative agricultural or horticultural use for the acres but the maximum yield yet estimated from this type of use does not exceed \$1,000 per acre."

"Another rough comparison is of the contribution to the economy of the two uses.

	<u>Sugar Cane</u>	<u>Hotels and Houses</u>
No. employed	50	580
Wages	\$ 40,000	\$ 327,000
Local purchases	1,000	60,000
Profits on imports	3,200	56,000
Customs revenue	1,600	32,000
Taxes	<u>1,200</u>	<u>125,000</u>
	<u>47,000</u>	<u>500,000</u>

"Each set of figures can be doubled, or even by a slightly larger figure, to give the total effect on the economy of Barbados, and therefore the increased product shown for the new proposal makes an even greater gross contribution. Throughout very conservative estimates of hotel and house occupancy etc. have been used."

Now, he gave another rough comparison of the contributions to the economy of Barbados. These are rough estimates on what you will get from the proposed use and what you get from the present use.

HEYWOODS PROJECT

CONTRIBUTIONS TO ECONOMY OF BARBADOS

PROPOSED USE	\$
200 houses @ \$4,500 per annum	900,000
146 hotel rooms @ \$6,570 per annum assuming hotel is half filled on average	say 450,000
	<u>1,350,000</u>

RECURRENT CONTRIBUTION TO ECONOMY

Direct employment: 580 persons @ \$10.00 per week, say	300,000
Maintenance labour: 45% of 5% of \$1,215,000 say	27,000
Mark-up on materials for maintenance: 33 1/3% of \$33,000	11,000
Customs revenue on imports for maintenance: 12 1/2% of \$33,000, say	4,000

SUPPLIES: Imports - mark-up, say	45,000
- customs revenue	28,000
- local purchases, say	60,000
DIRECT TAXATION: Local Government revenue	71,000
Central Government revenue	54,000
Total	600,000
Foreign supplies at landed cost less duty and profit	178,000
DIVIDENDS transferable - estimated minimum	572,000

CAPITAL CONTRIBUTION TO ECONOMY

Direct employment during construction	
45% of cost estimated at \$6,840,000	3,078,000
Mark-up on construction materials -	
33 1/3% of \$3,840,000	1,280,000
Customs revenue - NIL: Building material exempt	4,358,000

PRESENT USE

	\$
Proceeds from sale of sugar, say	80,000
Other receipts	2,000
	82,000
Wages bill (factory and estate), say	40,000
Purchase of imported materials and supplies, say	12,600
Mark-up, say	3,200
Customs revenue, say	1,600
Taxes: Local Government, say	1,200
Central Government, say	2,000
Profits, dividends, depreciation, levies, etc., say	22,000

Sir, Mr. Cadbury put down the estimates as regards gross revenue, the recurrent contribution to the economy, and the capital contribution to the economy of the island which we were likely to get as a result of the proposed use of this estate. We decided on it in the light of that.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. May I ask the hon. member if he is quoting from the Cadbury Report?

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I have already said that Mr. Cadbury gave us a paper on it.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Sir, we always wanted a copy of the Cadbury Report but they never gave it to us. The Hon. Premier actually told the House that Mr. Cadbury had not made a report in the sense of a report, but that he made certain recommendations to the Government.

Will Your Honour insist that the document which the Hon. Minister is now reading from, whatever it is, be made a document of the House and circulated to hon. members?

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes, I do not want to rob the Minister of his file, but certainly I am insisting that the part he has read be made obtainable to me in order that my office may have a copy. Anything that is read in this House is no longer a matter of the Government; it is a matter of this House. I am ruling - I am not making a request - that that passage from his file which is a report given by Mr. Cadbury on the Heywoods Project be made a document of this House. As I have said, I do not want to take it from him, I want him to give it to the House, in order that my Reportorial Office may have a copy of it.
8.10 p.m.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I appreciate Your Honour's ruling but what is worrying me is this: last week the hon. junior member for St. John quoted certain parts of the documents he had and the Minister claimed that he had taken these things out of their context.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: What is the hon. member speaking on? I am not objecting.....

Mr. CRAWFORD: I was saying that last week the hon. junior member for St. John had been quoting only parts of the letters, because these parts taken out of their context, may be taken in a different light if they were not read as parts of the whole. Nobody is suggesting that a private file be made a document of the House, but these specific parts of the report taken out of their context might throw a different light than the report of Mr. Cadbury.

Mr. SPEAKER: Those are figures.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am wondering if the Report should not be made a document of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: That deals with the Heywoods matter.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Will the hon. member make the entire part of it dealing with the Heywoods matter a document of the House?

Mr. SPEAKER: All I have heard read will be made a document of the House.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Last week the parts which the hon. junior member for St. John read were made documents of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: Nobody could give me a part of a letter. I suppose there is something in the report which does not interest me.

Mr. CRAWFORD: We want to get the entire part dealing with Heywoods made a document of the House, and not merely the figures. It is from the report on Heywoods that the Minister is selecting his figures.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not know if those are to be called the Cadbury Report. I am saying that the relative portion which the Hon. Minister read in relation to Heywoods should be made a document of the House.

Hon. M. E. COX: Why is the hon. member suspicious?

Mr. CRAWFORD: There is no suspicion; this is following on what they called for.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: What I am quoting from Mr. Cadbury can be published. It will be available to all members of the House. I am very anxious for the public to see it. Capital contribution to economy is \$4,358,000. I do not think I need quote anything more from the Report to show.....

Mr. BARROW: I gave the figure of wages at \$12 a week. When the hon. member came to the question of wages on which he is alleged to have computed the total income, he said that at a certain wage it came to so and so, but we do not have the wage. I would like to know by what stretch of the imagination could 37,000 tons of cane, which would give four and a half tons of sugar could only yield \$8,000. I asked him to check and see.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I referred to \$37,000 per annum. That is gross revenue ex farm. That was a bald statement of economic findings by this expert. He did not go into the humanities or the point of view of what its effect would be on human relationships. He did not examine any political argument. He just said that this is what the contribution to the economy is from the present use of sugar cane, and that is his estimate of what the contribution would be from tourist development. It is on those economic grounds that this Government arrived at its decision.

No one reading the opinion of Mr. Cadbury, or seeing the facts and figures which were put up to him, could possibly disagree that they were really fundamental and weighty arguments in favour of allowing this change in the use of Heywoods from agricultural land to tourist develop-

ment. There is no semblance of a slight difference which tourism would make against agricultural development. The difference is wide; one is \$47,000 and the other is \$500,000. As Mr. Cadbury pointed out, you could double that, or put it at a slightly larger figure; but however you did it, the scales are tilted in favour of tourism.
8.20 p.m.

As I said, his findings, his Report, and his estimate of the effect on the economy of Barbados weighed heavily in our minds, and led forcibly to the conclusion to which we came. Now, Sir, that was in February, 1960.

Mr. CRAWFORD: On a point of order. Did I understand the hon. member to say that the arguments by Mr. Cadbury induced them to the conclusion to which they came?

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I never used the word "induced," I said that we were influenced considerably by the Report of Mr. Cadbury, and only by those considerations, and what contribution it would make to the economy of this island.

Mr. CRAWFORD: On a point of order. Is the hon. member of the opinion that the same arguments in *pari passu* could apply to any other estate in this island with regard to tourism?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has introduced a new Parliamentary device. He is now asking a question.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The point is that the hon. member knows the same argument can apply to almost any other plantation in the island.

Mr. SPEAKER: I said the hon. member is now using a new Parliamentary device. I do not think the precedent will be upheld; a point of order is not for asking information. Information may be got in various ways. One way is by asking questions in the ordinary method, or by a *sotto voce* remark which may pass from end of the horse-shoe to the other. I do not think a point of order, as a point of order, should be the means of getting the answer to a question.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I can only say that the position does not arise anyhow. We conveyed our decision to these parties, and allowed this diversion and the use of this land for tourist purposes subject to the following general planning requirements; and this, Sir, is valid under the Town and Country Planning Act which the Legislature passed and which applied to that area.

These planning requirements were that the open character of the land and beach between the public highway and the sea shall be preserved and shall be open to enjoyment throughout its length by the general public. Some consideration might be given to specific proposals requesting special facilities on land adjoining the beach, but any permission granted in this regard will be dependent on the merits of the case and shall in no way prejudice either the right of way for the public along the beach or the predominantly open character of the coastal strip." That is the planning condition which this gentleman or any other person to which that planning condition obtains, must observe. He cannot develop the property except in the way laid down.

We heard talk about the Premier misleading the people; and that there is nothing written in the agreement. Today the House was kept back an hour listening to arguments that somebody tried to fool the public, and that we were not telling the public the truth. There are more ways to kill a dog than by hanging it. These are the methods open to the Government; and we can employ this one method when it comes to the use of land in this island. We can employ these restrictions because it is a good way, and it is a way that all Governments employ.

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

Hon. R. G. MAPP: That is a condition laid down which they must observe under the Town and Country Planning Order.

Mr. SPEAKER: Which the owners of Heywoods must observe by law?

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Yes, by law. If they do anything different, we can bring the full force of law against them; we can call on them to pull down any erection they put up, and if they do not we can do it ourselves and fine them for every day they have it up. The condition is "that the open character of the land and beach between the public highway and the sea shall be preserved and shall be open to enjoyment throughout its length by the general public. Some consideration might be given to specific proposals requesting special facilities on land adjoining the beach, but any permission granted in this regard will be dependent on the merits of the case and shall in no way prejudice either the right of way for the public along the beach or the predominantly open character of the coastal strip."

Mr. MOTTLEY: I would like to find out something. I am sure the hon. member would not mind my interrupting.

Mr. SPEAKER: On what?

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of explanation, I like to follow these things clearly. Is that an order under the Town and Country Planning Act or any agreement?

Hon. R. G. MAPP: That is a condition given under the Town and Country Planning Order relating to this project. I think the hon. member is quite acquainted with it from his association with the Town and Country Planning procedure. These are the conditions laid down so that there can be no development of the property except along these grounds and in accordance with this decision. I cannot remember what word the Premier used, but I think he did say that the right of the public would be preserved through a condition; but it is laid down there, and no one can get around it.
8.30 p.m.

It is perfectly right to say that the rights of the people to use that area as a beach and for fishing purposes, such as mooring their boats, will be preserved in this planning requirement.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of information. Are we to understand that that order of the Town and Country Planning Ordinance applied to Heywoods Estate before the final conveyance of the property to these new owners? I ask that because if they acquired the property before the Town and Country Planning Act applied to the area, the present order does not apply. (A VOICE: No. We can make them pull down anything.) (ANOTHER VOICE: You do not understand what you are saying.) You cannot teach me anything about it.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is breaking the Rules of this House by standing. If the hon. senior member for St. Philip has risen on a point of order to have some matter elucidated, why should the hon. member turn aside and make asides?

Mr. CRAWFORD: Your Honour has asked why. No matter how much I try to, I cannot suffer fools gladly. I asked the Minister if when the final conveyance was carried through, the Town and Country Planning Act applied to Heywoods. I went further and said that if these people had acquired Heywoods before the Town and Country Planning Order was extended to include that area, then the order could not apply at all.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is the hon. member's legal opinion. He may be right or wrong.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I have not yet finished my question. While it is true that under the Town and Country Planning Act you could not make them pull down this and that; you can only do it if the Act was in operation in the area before.

Hon. M. E. COX: You do not know a thing about it.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not like legal opinions in this House.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Sir, it is unfortunate that the hon. senior member for St. Philip would not ask questions before making a statement. He is entirely wrong. He asked a

question and then talked about a conveyance. A conveyance is a legal document between two parties: one being the person who is selling the land and the other the party who is buying the land. In this case, it is the Heywoods Estate. These people having bought Heywoods estate, they have applied to us for permission to carry out their project; I do not know if the hon. member thinks that these people could have gone ahead with their project without consulting us. If they knew that they had a legal right to go ahead, they would have gone ahead; but they knew that they did not have such a right because in the meantime we had extended that Town and Country Planning Order to Speights-town. They had to come to us.

We are not dealing with the former owners; we are dealing with the present owners. Actually, Sir, that is one of the difficulties with these tenants now. We had the same sort of thing in St. James when it was proposed to put a hotel in Holletown. While you may lay it down as a planning decision for any new development that the owners develop it in accordance with your decision, and you say to them to find an alternative site for the people there, you cannot make the order apply to the previous owners because the new owners can well tell you that they have bought the land completely free.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order to have a matter elucidated. The Hon. Minister is correct. The present owners of Heywoods having bought the land and the Town and Country Planning Order having now been extended to that area, before the owners can erect anything, they must apply to the Government. That is correct. What I want to get information on is this: Can the conditions in I want to get information on is this: Can the conditions which the Town and Country Planning Order sets out override the fact that the man has already owned that strip of land? And while you can prevent him from putting houses on it, can you prevent him from not allowing people to pass over that land?

As I have said, the Hon. Minister is absolutely correct as far as extending the order to the area and that the owner of that estate must comply with the requirements of that Act. The owner dare not put up any houses there unless Government tells him to do so; and if the buildings are not erected to suit you, you can send and pull them down. I am at one with the Minister on that. According to the Act, the Town and Country Planning Officer can, if a development has not been carried out in accordance with the provisions of the Order, serve on the owners an enforcement notice; but if you do not put into a deed a proviso that this must be open property, how can you get around that?

Mr. SPEAKER: That is more than a point of order.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Sir, I am no fool, I can talk. Do you want me to sit? Do you know where members of the Government made the mistake?

Mr. SPEAKER: Your point of order is only to elucidate a point. It is not a speech.

Mr. MOTTLEY: What I want to know is this: Having enforced your Town and Country Planning Order to say that you cannot put up houses on the four and a half acres on the beach, can you tell the owner that he cannot prevent anybody from trespassing on the land?

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, this is an area of land which you regard as a whole. You do not take one party by itself and another by itself.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Has the hon. member seen a plot of this land?

Mr. SPEAKER: I will not allow that. If members want that information, they should give the Hon. Minister a reasonable time to collect that information. If hon. members want information, they should not rush the Minister in such a way that before he can answer one question, he is plied with another. He would be confused by so doing. Give the Minister a reasonable time to collect and collate. Let him dispose of one question and then turn to another and we will have order in the House.

8.40 p.m.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: The laying out of the entire development shall be subject to planning approval. The beach forms part of the development.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think that the hon. senior member for the City went out of the course of development and was putting another question about right and continual usage.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: The Planning Officer may lay down a condition relating to one piece of land and say that, unless you carry out the development of the property as a whole along the lines laid down by him, which includes that little piece, you cannot develop the whole property. If hon. members want to get legal opinion on the matter, let them do so. I can counteract that at any time.

Mr. BARROW: On a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: Not yet. If the hon. member was on this side of the House, he would not like to be treated in that way.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: The Town and Country Planning Officer may say: "This is the condition relative to the beach front; this condition relates to the development of the entire property. If you offend in respect of this portion of your property then the rest of the property is affected. You would not be allowed to do anything else if you break this condition in that little part." The open character of the land and the beach between the public highway and the sea shall be preserved. Any permission granted in this regard will be dependent upon the merits of the case and shall in no way prejudice either the right of way for the public along the beach or the predominantly open character of the coastal strip.

Mr. TALMA: On a point of order. For the purpose of elucidating the position, I would like to say that in order to grant any right of way, or easement, it can be done either by grant or prescription or reservation. You can make a grant for use for twenty years by prescription or reservation but there must be actual writing; there must be a document to that effect. Inasmuch as the Government was not a party to the original conveyance from the owners of Heywoods Plantation to the Canadian firm, the Government cannot get any easement or profit whatever. There must be a distinct document conveying this right between the present owners of Heywoods and the Government.

Is there any such document? If there is no such document, then there is no legally binding easement granted to the Government on behalf of the public. Is there any such document in existence signed by the present owners of Heywoods, granting a right of way or access to the sea for the benefit of the public at large? If there is no such document, I want to know on what is the Government relying. Town and Country Planning is a condition for the development of the area.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will not accept any opinion or clarification; I think that the hon. member has elucidated already.

Mr. TALMA: I want to know if the Government has received a condition or undertaking or covenant under seal which is as binding as an easement itself. Is there a condition or covenant? If there is a condition, then that would be tantamount to an easement, which is binding in writing.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I think there is a bit of satirical verse in reference to lawyers. It goes:

"Woe to the weal where many lawyers be,
For there is sure much store of malady."

That was composed by Joseph Hall, an English satirist, who must have had in mind that Party opposite. The trouble with that Party is that there are too many lawyers in it. The hon. member has asked if there is such a document as he has mentioned. I do not know if there is any such document; there might be. I am here to administer the Act; the Act says this:

"Where an application is made to the Town and Country Planning Officer, in accordance with the provisions of an Interim Control Order, for permission to carry out development or for any approval under this Act or any subsidiary legislation made thereunder, that officer may grant per-

mission or give such approval either unconditionally or subject to such conditions as he thinks fit, or may refuse permission or approval."
8.50 p.m.

The argument is that unless there is something in that conveyance which gives the Government permission, or some power, authority, or right to allow people to go on using that site, we cannot come along and refuse them permission to develop the property.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order. The hon. member knows well enough that I never suggested anything of the sort.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is that a point of order to have that matter elucidated?

Mr. MOTTLEY: The Government has a right to say you must develop along certain conditions. My contention is that you grant permission to develop along these lines and under these conditions, but if you do not develop, or whatever you do, this land is part and parcel of Heywoods Plantation; and the Minister says that all he is interested in is the point of view of the Town and Country Planning Officer. The position is that these people want to take 200 acres of agricultural land out of agriculture and use it for hotel development.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not a point of order.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I know, Sir. What we are asking over here is whether there was a condition when the Government made its decision that this land should go out of agricultural production, that portion of that beach be given over to Government for public use, of which the hotel people or whoever go there would form part of the public. If they have not done that, nothing in the world can stop the people from developing the area.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I do not think the hon. member was here when I read certain correspondence which showed that these people had an option up to a certain date, and had it extended, because they were awaiting a decision from us. The deal as is referred to, was not closed until after they had received our decision. (Mr. MOTTLEY: And was that a condition of your decision?) It was.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order. Was it a condition in your decision that you would only allow Heywoods land to be taken out of agricultural production and developed if they deed to the Government that portion of land on the beach for the use of the public *ad infinitum*?

Hon. R. G. MAPP: There is no necessity to do that for the simple reason that so long as we laid this down as a condition when they bought the property, it would be covered in the conveyance. They could not use the whole property unless they adhered to this condition regarding the beach.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a further point of order. My question is very simple. Some people bought Heywoods and they must get a conveyance; but they could not buy and the deal could not go through because they had to wait on the Government. I am asking them a straight question which is nothing to do with development, because.....

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not a point of order.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I want the hon. member to answer the question as to whether when it came to his Ministry, they said they would let the people develop Heywoods only on the condition that this four acres of beach land which has been used from the days before slavery for bathing by the general public, be retained by deed for the use of the general public of which the hotel owners and the people there would become part. The hon. member said there was no need to do that. Let him answer that.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: That is really repeating the question all over. I cannot go any further than I have already gone.

I have pointed out that this matter was not finalised as far as I know, and no legal documents were signed; they had a date of option which had to be extended because they were waiting on us; and one of the conditions for developing the property was that the beach should be reserved as an open beach, where the public would be able to go as before the property was bought for hotel purposes. If they did not do that, they would not be able to put up the hotels.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Was the Government therefore a party to the sale?

Mr. SPEAKER: That is out of order.

Mr. MOTTLEY: With the greatest respect to Your Honour, the hon. member said it could not be done.....

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has said that he cannot further elucidate on the matter.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I would like to ask the Minister for the purpose of elucidation whether he would say what time elapsed between the conclusion of the sale between the two parties and the granting by Government.....

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not permissible. That has not yet arisen in his speech. If the Minister says something in his speech and a member wants something elucidated, he can do that. This is not "Question Time" in the House, so the hon. member is out of order.

Mr. TUDOR: Again on a point of order.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I have ruled that it does not arise.

Mr. TUDOR: This is something different.

Mr. SPEAKER: Something different is worse.

Mr. TUDOR: But it has not arisen yet, and Your Honour has not heard me.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not have to.

Mr. TUDOR: As Your Honour pleases.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I will continue, Sir.

Mr. CRAWFORD: On a point of order. The Minister has said that they cannot develop the remaining portion of the estate, Mr. Speaker, unless they agree to preserve the beach rights for the public. Now what legal document has the Government got for insuring after they have developed all the building sites they want to on the land side, that they will continue to respect this undertaking and let the public use the beach.
9.00 p.m.

I hope you understand my position. The Hon. Minister has said that the new owners are not going to get permission to construct anything on the land side unless they agree for the public to pass over...(Loud Asides by hon. members.)

Mr. SPEAKER: Let me hear the hon. member. The Hon. Leader of the House has invoked the provision of Standing Order No. 5 in order to carry on with the business of the House, but let me warn him that he cannot prevent me from adjourning the House because of disorder.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The Hon. Minister said that he is not going to allow the owners to develop the land part of the estate unless they agree to let the public enjoy the beach rights. The question is this: What steps can be taken in the absence of any legal document to ensure that the public would be allowed to use that land?

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Sir, the same thing would be done as in the case of where a man was granted permission to erect a building without a fence around it, but went and erected a fence around it. You would carry out your enforcement order. That part of the Act reads as follows:-

"If it appears to the Town and Country Planning Officer that any development has been carried out without grant or permission or approval in accordance with the provisions of this Act or of an Interim Control Order or without any conditions or limitations to which such grant of permission or approval is made subject having been complied with, then he may serve on the owner or occupier of the land a notice hereinafter in this section referred to as an "enforcement notice".

It is the same thing as if you were going to erect a building and you came to us and we said that it should be so many feet from the road, but you ignored this order and you put it, say two feet nearer to the road. The Officer can carry out the enforcement notice.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order for the purpose of elucidation. Is the Minister aware of the fact that in the ordinary course of granting rights, such as in the case of an owner granting the Government rights to put underground drains, this is done by way of writing and that a document would have to be drawn up to grant the Government the right to construct the drain?

Mr. SPEAKER: Out of order.

Mr. TUDOR: Sir, I rise on a point of order for the purpose of elucidation. Are we to understand from the Hon. Minister that the new owners of this property are subjected to developing the entire property or any part of it? What I want to know is this: Can they develop all of it, most of it, or part of it?

Mr. SPEAKER: I deem that to be a question not to be answered by the Hon. Minister.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I am asking a question.

Mr. SPEAKER: Under Rule 28 (1) no member shall interrupt another member except to elucidate some matter raised by that member in the course of his speech provided that the member speaking is willing to give way and resume his seat and that the member wishing to interrupt is called by the Chair. I think that I must have given a lot of latitude.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Sir, in this matter, we should be given a lot of latitude. The hon. member has made it clear that he is relying on the Town and Country Planning Order. What I asked the hon. member is, where the present owners do not develop the estate under the conditions of the Town and Country Planning Order, will the land of Heywoods still be under private ownership and will not be used by the public?

Mr. SPEAKER: That is a legal question. That is not a matter of policy.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Sir, I anticipate a lot of questions because I understand the anxiety of hon. members to elucidate matters. Quite recently, we had to carry out an enforcement notice on somebody who was represented by some member opposite. I am not going any further, but obviously it can be seen that things are not very clear. (Mr. MOTTLEY: By whom?) I am not going any further. The hon. member is not a lawyer, therefore, why is he so anxious?

Sir, I will continue. The matter did not end there. I believe that it was a little after that Mr. Hough came to see me; I do not remember the exact date, but I know that Mr. Lashley of the Housing Authority was present; I think it was around May. It was as a result of a letter which we wrote him on the 17th May, in which I said that the Minister was disturbed by this matter of the persons who rented land from the plantation having been given notices to quit. He came in person to see me, and in a discussion with Mr. Lashley and myself, he gave me the assurance that provision would be made for the tenants.
9.10 p.m.

I remember during the discussion, he informed me that he himself was most surprised to know that these people had not been moved off by the previous owners; he thought the land was clear when he bought it. Although he had paid a price higher than what would have been paid, had it been intended for agricultural land, he was willing to give up this area of land for the use of these tenants. I was very strong on that particular matter. Soon after that, he gave an assurance to the Housing Authority; he called on the Housing Authority and offered to lease to the Authority or the Government, this was around July, 3.29 acres of land at Heywoods at \$1 per annum for twenty-five years in the first instance. This was good level land which was suitable for housing; this was the same acreage which was mentioned and which formed the subject of a petition.

That offer was accepted. Last Tuesday it was alleged that this offer was made, but that the Government was buying Forde's; that we wanted to put these people on Forde's instead of taking advantage of the offer. Mr. Speaker, nothing could be further from the truth. The transaction as regards Forde's was going on long before this. I made it plain to Mr. Corbin and to Mr. Hough that alternative accommodation must be found for the tenants. Mr. Hough thought that he was given the land free, and he was very surprised when the position was not settled.

There is a letter here from which the hon. junior member for St. John quoted three times today. This letter is document No. 9 from which I will read. It says this:

"Re your second letter dealing with your meeting 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 would they 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 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 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."

The hon. junior member for St. John made a lot of the expression "However, we are keeping this as an 'ace in the hole' and if the Government got tough". I would make a lot of it too in reference to him if I were not in Parliament. The letter goes on:

"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."

I am not responsible for that, this is not a letter to me; this is commonsense on the part of a wise man. Why should this gentleman come down here and assist the hon. member who may be opposed to him for political reasons? The letter goes on:

"In the meantime if the Government are willing to purchase land and re-locate these people elsewhere, I think this is the simplest solution to it all, and certainly the proper one". Later on this letter states:

"Regarding Shepherd, there are times when I sometimes wonder a little about Shepherd, but on the whole it is to Shepherd's advantage for this deal to go through for us at Heywoods since, if we come down there and get involved in hotels and housing, we will most certainly get interested in trying to pull industry in there which, as you know is our first love."

Surely, as regards motives we have no proof, but Mr. Shepherd was an official employed by us at the time. Mr. Shepherd was acting on behalf of the Development Board with which the Minister is concerned. The letter re-emphasises the question in another part where it refers to Mr. Shepherd and how he knew that Mr. Hough had developed industry in Scarborough.
9.20 p.m.

The suggestion was that Shepherd was also in this deal. I will read the paragraph again:-

"Regarding Shepherd, there are times when I sometimes wonder a little about Shepherd, but on the whole it is to Shepherd's advantage for this deal to go through for us at Heywoods since, if we come down there and get involved in hotels and housing, we will most certainly get interested in trying to pull industry in there which, as you know, is our first love. I am going to write to Shepherd this afternoon and lead him along on our thinking regarding industry in Barbados and it may be that he becomes a little more enthused after that."

Here the last letter shows that there people were on the verge of becoming frustrated, asking why doesn't the Government take action and why they are putting up opposition, as well as whether we want tourist development, and that they can put up industry somewhere else? Letter after letter was quoted in this House, and we were held up to the vilest insults, taunts, abuse and all the invectives, innuendos, suggestions and undertones so that somebody can go downstairs and say nasty insulting things about us. It is no wonder that Dr. Nkrumah had to treat the Opposition as he did. You know that people in Government are fighting for development, and you are putting doubts in people's minds about their character. These doubts are based on what you read into the letters rather than what is there.

Mr. Speaker, any member can oppose me on a matter of policy; you can throw me out of the House tomorrow on that; but, I am willing to go into a Police Court when it comes to a matter of my character. Some time ago I tried to get evidence against that same member when he spoke in the Lower Green from people who were there, but they did not have the courage and guts to stand as witnesses. If it is the last thing I do with the few cents I have, I will get members like him in a position where I can hold them in a Police Court before me, expose my business to the public and let him know what I have. I swear that before the House and before God tonight. Let him swallow it if he likes. It will choke him one of these days.

I have never got on a platform and imputed anything about anybody; the hon. member for the City I am sure will agree with that. (Mr. MOTTLEY: You said that I got money from Da Costa's for bringing Pan American here.) I never said so. Mr. Speaker, I will continue to read from Document No. 9 written by Mr. Hough.

"I agree with your thinking entirely regarding the hon. Mr. Mapp — a difficult man is often handled much easier alone without witnesses and I have the utmost confidence in your ability in this regard so carry on."

This is the letter to Mr. Corbin. Am I responsible for the way in which this man thinks? This may be the methods employed in Canada. Whatever suggestions may be put into that, I do not put the vilest suggestion, nor am I responsible for what he puts to Mr. Corbin about this business. Mr. Corbin hardly knew me and Mr. Hough does not know me.

It may be that in Canada or America this is how you go about it; but that was on December 15th, and by January 21st they were saying that they were disgusted. On December 15th, he is telling Mr. Corbin to try this method, but by January 21st which is in Document No. 10 he says "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. I can see nothing but complications arising on every hand in the development of the property if Government support is not 100% behind tourism development. We have enough problems at home without going 3,000 miles to run into larger headaches."

Mr. Speaker, everything he tried had apparently failed by this time; he tried to get around this difficult Minister by making suggestions, and the last letter shows that he is still frustrated; but the hon. junior member for St. John read out that part as if to say "you know Mr. Mapp, he can be difficult; but brother, don't get witnesses!" That is the implication read out by the hon. member. Some people are a combination of Mrs. Fiddle-Faddle and the Censorius. These are typical creatures in English villages; they are creatures mostly typical of gossipers and they yap like women and repeat all kinds of gossip. Some people are given to that kind of thing, but I would think that when you get up in a House of Assembly of this sort where you carry on serious business and represent the people at the highest level that you would leave all your fiddle-faddle and censorius attitudes outside.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot afford to take these things lightly when we hear an hon. member who, because he is opposed to us, reads all kinds of things into matters like this. Furthermore, in answer to an aside, he said he was sorry he was not in on the deal too to get some of the money that passed.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I have listened to the diatribe of the hon. member.....

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has risen on a point of order. He cannot begin by making a precis or description of the hon. member's speech. Please get to the point of order. The word "point" is something which geometrically has no sides, but now I am getting all sorts of magnitudes in these points of order which I hear.

Mr. BARROW: I think, Sir, that in the interest of hearing what the hon. member had to say, we have listened to him on this side. That is really introductory and is not the point of order; but I am merely pointing out why I feel myself constrained to rise at this stage. The hon. member despite everything has made a statement that I said I was sorry I was not in the deal to get some of the money that passed. Can he read that out from the debate, Sir? Is the hon. member saying that he had some money and I said I wanted to get some? Honestly, they get in here and make some of the most fantastic.....

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member wants to know if that is in the debate. I will answer that. (*Several members were talking.*) If hon. members want to go home immediately, they can. I do not enter into competition with hon. members when I am in the Chair. I will do that on another occasion. (*Voices from Opposition side.*) Order! (Mr. MOTTLEY: That's better.) I do not think the hon. member was serious when he said "that's better".
9.30 p.m.

I am very glad that the hon. junior member for St. John has raised that point of order. I want to inform this House that I have given definite instructions to the Reportorial Staff, to shun, to leave out and to omit the inclusions of asides. Asides are not directed to me; and every particular, every subject must always be directed to me. Anything which is not directed to me does not concern me or this House, therefore, such remarks will not be read again in Hansard. I want Hansard to appear like a clean Hansard, something which this Parliament and this country will be proud of. I am absolutely ashamed myself of some of the asides which appear in Hansard. I have quite recently given definite instructions to have every aside — that means

such things as are not directed to the Chair - omitted from the Hansard.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I am very glad to hear what Your Honour has said just now. The hon. member claimed that I said on the floor of the House: "I am sorry that I was not in the deal." I did not say that. The first reference of money came from him. He said, "You are sorry you are not in the deal," and I said: "You mean to get some of the money too?" The hon. member has attributed the remark as coming from me, when the remark came substantially from him. Let us get the record straight. If the cap fits him, let him draw the string.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I made no such aside, I made no such remark.

Mr. BARROW: You are the biggest.....

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I did hear the aside, but I certainly did not make it.

Mr. MOTTLEY: It was an aside.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: The hon. junior member for St. John made that remark while on his feet.

Mr. SPEAKER: Just let us get the record straight. Hon. members sometimes are on their feet and yet they make asides. When an hon. member is on his feet, sometimes he deliberately turns around and replies to an aside neglecting the Chair for the time. That has happened in this Chamber. I want to make it clear that there are asides which are made when hon. members are standing on their feet.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, I think it is safe that you should ignore them.

Sir, I have developed this reply at length, and I do not think that it is necessary to say much more. I have read the relevant portions of correspondence which apply to this matter, and I was looking forward to hearing some more of the correspondence read to the House, of having more documents placed in my hands to read; but unfortunately, the hon. member's case has broken down.

Sir, I do not think there is anything else in the letters which were read which I have left unanswered or not cleaned up. All of them, except one or two were addressed to Mr. Corbin by Mr. Hough. There is nothing in them which means anything, except what you would read in them. I dealt quite fully with the extracts of these letters which were taken out of their context by the hon. junior member for St. John.

We, over here, when we heard those things said about us, those charges and motives laid, did not lose any sleep. So long as your conscience is clear, I do not think you have anything to fear. At any time, we are able to reply and to face anything whatsoever. What we deplore is the length of time wasted in this House on this matter. The reading of those letters by the hon. junior member for St. John certainly led to a waste of time in this House and to a prolonged debate on a matter which is quite straightforward. Forde's Pasture has nothing to do with this project at Heywoods. I am not going to take up much more time on this; I think I have covered the case. Probably, a lot of good has come out of it, inasmuch as we made issues quite clear so far as Heywoods is concerned.
9.40 p.m.

I am sure that the people and the people of St. Peter and those who are so vitally affected will rest satisfied that we have done everything in their interest; they will feel sure that we have done everything to preserve the interest of the island as a whole.

Mr. BRANCKER: On a point of order. In reply to an enquiry made by the hon. senior member for St. Philip, Your Honour intimated that a document purporting to be a portion of Mr. Cadbury's Report will become a docu-

ment of the House. I am enquiring as to whether or not that order has been complied with.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, before the Minister replies, I would appeal to the House, or ask permission to say a few words in view of the fact that I was involved in this question. (A MEMBER: How were you involved?) The hon. member referred to me as having written letters.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member asking for permission to speak again?

Hon. M. E. COX: Yes, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is asking permission to speak again.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I would just like to say that I would not object to the Minister replying as he claims that he was involved; I do remember that the Minister of Communications was definitely involved.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the Hon. Minister explain how he was involved?

Hon. M. E. COX: The hon. junior member for St. John said that I had lunched with Mr. Hough; and he also made certain other insinuations. I regard that as a very serious matter, I was one to whom the hon. junior member for St. John referred as having written letters to Mr. Hough so far as the development of the area, and the wining and dining. I have some information to give to this House.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is asking permission to speak again; and unless there be any objection, such permission will be granted. (*After a pause*) There being no objection, such permission will be granted. (*Asides*)

Mr. BARROW: We are objecting over here. As soon as the hon. member sat down, we said that we were objecting. The hon. senior member for the City was grumbling down here, and that is why Your Honour did not hear when we objected.

Mr. SPEAKER: Here I am about to grant permission to the Hon. Minister to speak again, thinking that permission was granted; but hon. members are making such a noise, I am unable to hear someone who claims to have made objection. The matter will have to be resolved by the question being put to the House. The question is that leave be granted the Hon. Minister to speak a second time. Hon. members in favour of that will please say "Aye", those against will please say "No". I think the "Ayes" have it.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, first of all, I would like to thank the House for granting me permission to speak again. Every hon. member against whom such allegations were made, should have the right to speak. When I spoke on this matter on the first occasion, none of this information was given to the House; I do not think that the hon. junior member for St. John was then in this House. Since this information has been subsequently brought before the House, I think it is absolutely important and essential for Ministers to be given an opportunity to put the facts before the House.

As far as the development of this plantation is concerned, whatever the Minister said is correct. This matter was given very serious consideration by the Government. As the Minister pointed out, it was only after we had had first-class and expert advice on the matter that we decided to allow this estate to be developed. We realise, and we have figures to substantiate, that in this island the population is increasing every year. The population is being increased by approximately.....

At this stage, Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER took the Chair.

The population of this island has been increased by approximately 4,000 souls; that means that every year we have to look for food, clothing, education, and all sorts of things for the increasing population of this island. The island is not getting any larger. In fact, it is getting smaller;

a lot of land is being used for building houses, and therefore that land cannot be used for agricultural production. We have been advised that it is absolutely essential to develop this country industrially as well as by way of tourism. I think I am correct in saying that when Professor Arthur Lewis made an economic survey for Trinidad, he pointed out that tourism was the one development that could bring immediate relief to the people of that area; and that tourism would employ more people per head, in so far as the Federal Capital is concerned, than any other industry. 9.50 p.m.

I am one of those who some years ago was not convinced about tourist development. I opposed it, and I spoke on every occasion against it up to 1951; and of course, the Opposition even sent around circulars to the electorate saying that I was opposed to tourism and so on. Of course, it didn't make any difference, because I still beat them three to one at the polls; and I will always beat them. One of my main reasons for opposing tourism at the time was because, when you get strangers coming into a country in large numbers, the natives lose their identity. The natives are treated as serfs; and people concentrate on the dollar and the dollar alone. I am not one of those who would ever subjugate my identity to dollars, even if I died from starvation. I opposed tourism because I know how our people are apt to be treated by European people and people of a different pigmentation coming into this island.

I have found, Mr. Deputy Speaker - and I have been convinced in recent years since about 1952 - that it is absolutely essential to the economy of this island, if we are to maintain a reasonably good standard of living among our people, that tourism must alongside of industries be developed in our country. We have had expert advice on this question; and this Government backs tourism today 100%.

The hon. member pooh-poohed the idea of our allowing this agricultural land to be developed, and allowing retired Canadian and American business people to come here and build houses to live in. He has ignored the fact that when these people come into your country, they do not take anything from you; they bring something. The dollars they earned in their country are now transmitted to our country, to be spent to develop our country. As a matter of fact, rather than take anything from us, they perhaps pass on something to us.

That is the type of tourist to which we have always catered - the retired businessman who will stay six, eight or nine months a year, or two or three years as the case may be. That is the real tourist; not the man who comes in on a ship in the morning and leaves six or eight hours after. That is not the man to whom we are catering; we are catering to the man who is going to establish himself and live here. As I said, his pensions and other things which are brought here will be used to the benefit of this country. In addition to that, if that individual dies in this country, we have a chance of getting death duties on property which he owns in the country from which he comes; we get death duty on part of what he leaves in the other place.

We have gone into this question thoroughly. Mr. Deputy Speaker. We have decided to back tourism and industrial development 100%. Further, it must be understood that when tourists come to the island and establish themselves in similar projects to this one, it means that industry also follows; in other words, interests gravitate to these various developments. After Mr. Cadbury had gone into this matter very thoroughly and advised us, we decided to accept the expert's advice. Anybody who listened to the hon. junior member for St. John when he was delivering his speech on Tuesday night must have concluded that we are the biggest crooks, thieves and dishonest people that God has ever allowed to live; but tonight he has completely changed his tune.

Mr. BARROW: On a point of order. Did I call the hon. member a crook, a thief or a dishonest person? And did I change my tune today? I presented certain docu-

ments to the House; they were very irritated about it; they still appear to be irritated. Does the Hon. Minister attribute things to me that I have never said? Did I call him a crook? He may be a crook for all I know, but I never called him one. Did I call him a thief or a robber?

Hon. M. E. COX: Anybody who listened to his speech here the other night, his overtones, his undertones, insinuations and all sorts of things, would come to the conclusion that this was something fishy. People of his vulture mentality are capable of behaving like that; and from the time he became a member of this House....

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I know you belong to the Government Party, but you are the Deputy Speaker of the House. A member should not have to rise when you get that type of attack in the House, of accusing members of having a vulture mentality. It does not matter to me what the hon. member says. As I have said before, it is an occupational hazard to be in the House of Assembly when you have to look on the countenance of the Ministers or reply to them. In the normal course of events no one would know they exist, unless one reads the *Barbados Advocate*.

One has a duty to perform in here. A member is not entitled to get up and villify and accuse another member of having a vulture mentality. A vulture in the true sense is a bird of prey. I have taken nothing from the Minister at any time; if he wants to draw that inference it is a matter for him. Those who do not have something on their consciences.... (ASIDES) I am not taking any ruling from him. When you want me to stop I will stop, Sir. I have never been down to the waterfront and piloted....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Will the hon. member please address the Chair?

Mr. BARROW: I have never preyed around the harbour or otherwise.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member is breaking the Rules of the House.

Hon. M. E. COX: You cannot be clean if you try.

Mr. BARROW: I rise on a point of order. You should ask the hon. member to sit down. It is only because I am in this House... 10.00 p.m.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Make the point of order.

Mr. BARROW: The hon. member said that I have a vulture mentality. I object to it.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member did not call the attention of the Chair to it. You went ahead and started to make a speech. You did not rise and object to the remarks.

Mr. BARROW: How do you mean? In such circumstances, a member should not even have to rise to object; your attention should have been caught by such an expression.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: But did you object?

Mr. BARROW: I rose. I am objecting now.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: But you made a speech already. You got up and made a speech. You went so far that you went all down the waterfront. Can I sit here and allow you to do that, and then let you make your objection?

Mr. BARROW: I rise on a point of order. Whether you belong to the Government Party, you are the Deputy Speaker. Whether you choose to take my advice or not, it is your duty when you hear such remarks used by an hon. member not to wait until the other member rises to object.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Deputy Speaker, when the hon. member referred to me and read those letters about lunch and all that sort of thing, he read part of the letter and not the whole thing. I appealed to the hon. member all along to read the letters in full. I do not remember if you were present, but this is what the hon. member said whenever I appealed: "You are anxious to hear about yourself; I am keeping the best for the last."

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. That is absolutely not true. The letter which was written to the Hon. Minister of Communications which was not replied to was read *in toto*. The hon. member asked me to read the letter to him, and I said that I will keep the good wine for the last. I also said that there were 250 pages of correspondence which I had here. To say that I did not read the letters *in toto*, is absolutely untrue.

Hon. M. E. COX: This is the letter of November 20th, 1959, which was addressed to me.

"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."

Mr. BARROW: I read the whole of that letter.

Hon. M. E. COX: Please note the words: "to have lunch with us."

The letter goes on to state:

"Further to our conversation 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 as 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."

LGH/LW.

(A VOICE: All of that was read.)

There was another letter to which the hon. member referred. This is what the letter said:

"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 a copy of our letter of November 20th, 1959."

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

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

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am in possession of one letter from Mr. Hough. As you will see from the second letter that was just read by me, it was indicated that the first letter was not received by our office. This is the letter which I am responsible for; and this is what I received on the 4th December, 1959. I have copies of this letter which I intend to make the property of this House. This is what was said:

"Dear Mr. Cox,

Further to my letter of November 20th, re the Heywoods Plantation.

We have now commenced formal negotiations for the purchase of this property, and as stated in my letter of November 20th, the purchase will be contingent upon us receiving permission from the Minister of Communications, Works and Housing releasing this land from agricultural production. We are now enclosing for your information a copy of the letter sent to the Minister of November 27th requesting this permission.

If there is anything that you can do to expedite an early decision on this request, we would be most appreciative of your efforts."

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

This letter was dated the 30th November, 1959, and as I have said, we received it on the 4th December, 1959. I will just pause here to say that the first time that I have seen this letter is since this matter was raised on the last occasion in this House.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order to have a matter elucidated. I would like to get this thing clear. I would like to find out who is the proper authority. Is the Minister of Agriculture the proper authority for releasing land from agricultural purposes? The Hon. Minister read a letter just now in which was stated: "I expect to be writing to Mr. Mapp, the Minister of Communications, Works and Housing, re having the plantation released from agricultural use."

I am trying to find out the procedure of the Cabinet. Did it strike you then that the Minister of Agriculture and Director of Agriculture were the proper persons to deal with that? Where does Mr. Mapp come in?

Hon. M. E. COX: I said the other night, when I was interrupted, that the Government came in because of the Town and Country Planning Ordinance.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Sir, I am not inferring that the Government did not have to come in. The Government must come in. Here it is, in a letter directed to Mr. Cox, you are saying to Mr. Cox that you are trying to finalise a matter about the purchase of this estate. What I am trying to find out is why the Minister of Agriculture, the Minister with whom you are to deal when taking land out of agriculture along with the Director of Agriculture, had not been called in. Where does Mr. Mapp come in? I can quite see where the Hon. Minister of Trade comes in. 10.10 p.m.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Deputy Speaker, had the Hon. Minister of Agriculture been present today, he would have also put the point of view of his Ministry.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order. There is no communication addressed to him at all.

Hon. M. E. COX: I am not saying that. I am only citing what came to me. This is my reply on the 22nd January, 1960:-

22nd January, 1960.

Sir,

I am directed to acknowledge your letter of 30th November, 1959, addressed to the Hon. M. E. Cox, Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour in connection with negotiations between you and the owners of Heywoods Plantation for the purchase of their plantation, and to inform you that the matter will receive the consideration of the appropriate Ministry.

2. I would add that your letter of 20th November, to which you refer in paragraph 2 of your letter under reference has so far not been received by this Ministry.

I am, Sir,

Your obedient servant,
F. J. ODLE

Acting Permanent Secretary,
Ministry of Trade, Industry and Labour.

L. G. Hough, Esquire,
President,
Commercial Land Developments Limited.

I never saw this letter; my Permanent Secretary replied to it on my behalf; the first time I saw this letter was since this question was raised last Tuesday. Anybody who heard the hon. junior member for St. John last Tuesday....

Mr. BARROW: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in the same way that I made these letters documents of the House, is the Hon. Minister going to make that letter a document of this House? Last Tuesday, as soon as I finished quoting from a letter, the Marshal came around to me and I handed the letter to him. Certain documents are to be made documents of this House, and up to now they have not been handed over.

Hon. M. E. COX: Here are the copies of the letters.

Mr. BARROW: I did not hand in copies of those letters.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Deputy Speaker, we do not do our business like how the hon. member does his business. Letters which are sent to us are minuted from front to back; we have to see if there are any omissions in these letters. I was saying, Sir, that anybody who listened to the hon. member with his diatribe the other night - when he was lambasting this side of the House.....

Mr. BARROW: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to know when are we going to get these documents handed over.

Hon. M. E. COX: Anybody who heard the hon. member the other night would have thought that there is something fishy about this matter. Let us deal with this question of wining and dining. I have never been asked by Mr. Corbin either to wine or to dine with him. It appears to me that this deceased gentleman was building up something on the other side. I do not know if the others wine and dined with him. The hon. member gave an indication that with a little wining and dining he would sell out the inhabitants of this country....

Mr. BARROW: On a point of order. I have heard his accusations today, accusations which I never thought I would have heard. The expression "wining and dining" is contained in one of these documents. In another document Mr. Hough said that he thanked the Minister for the lunch and hoped that he would be able to extend hospitality again. He is wining and dining and leaving out the lunch. I did not make any imputations; I read out what the people said about them, what the public would say would be unprintable.

Hon. M. E. COX: I admit that I had lunch....

Mr. BARROW: The hon. member now says that he had lunch. He found wining and dining to be obnoxious, but a little lunch was all right!

Hon. M. E. COX: The hon. member will twist anything. He is a born twister.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister must not make such remarks.

Hon. M. E. COX: All right, Sir, I withdraw them. I admit that I had lunch with Mr. Hough; I would lunch with him again - but not with the hon. junior member for St. John. I would lunch with any decent, respectable person if I am invited to do so.

Mr. BARROW: You would not be invited.

Hon. M. E. COX: This whole matter is the result of a disgruntled widow who feels that these people who owned this property had not given her a square deal. She had the hon. junior member for St. John as her legal representative, and....

Mr. BARROW: On a point of order. Other members on this side of the House are accustomed to the hon. senior member for St. Michael abusing them in the foulest possible manner. (Hon. M. E. COX: Not as foul as you.) How can the hon. member abuse somebody whom he has described as a widow, and her husband is not even alive to represent her, and then make this statement?
10.20 p.m.

That belongs to another planet; it does not belong to the kind of atmosphere to which we are accustomed.

Hon. M. E. COX: Only he would interpret what I said just now as abuse. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have absolutely nothing to hide or be afraid of. I knew Mr. Corbin; he has visited my office on several occasions and discussed the development of tourism. He visited me - just like Banks Brewery and other industrialists who come to this island, as well as those who are in the island - discuss various projects before submitting applications. There is no secret about that. People cannot go to members of the Opposition because the Opposition do not run anything; they have to come to the person directly concerned with these items and issues.

The hon. member referred to my sending a letter of condolence to Mrs. Corbin. That is true. When I heard some time after that Mr. Corbin was dead and buried, I asked my Secretary to draft a quick letter of condolence, signed it, and sent it off. But this is what afterwards happened: Mrs. Corbin telephoned me one day and told me that the people who had owned this property had not given her a square deal; I think she said they had only given her \$1,000. She said she did not know me, and I replied neither did I; and she told me that her husband used to say how he used to come and talk to me about all this development and so on.

After she spoke in tones of disappointment, I suggested to her that the best thing to do was to see a solicitor. She was disgruntled and disappointed. She got in touch with the hon. junior member for St. John, and he became her legal representative.

Mr. BARROW: Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, on what does the hon. member base that? That is absolutely not correct.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member did not say what he rose on.

Mr. BARROW: On a point of order. The legal representatives of Mrs. Corbin are Messrs. Yearwood and Boyce, Solicitors, in James Street; and there is a member of the firm here.

Does the Minister make statements like that hoping that I will come out and tell him certain things? I have never employed the Minister, because I am careful about whom I employ; so how can the Minister get up and say the lady came to me because he said so and so? Let him stick to the facts on which he can speak with certainty. Do not get up and make statements like that.

Hon. M. E. COX: Ask him how he got all those documents?

Mr. BARROW: That is your business. Try and find out.

Hon. M. E. COX: What happened is that she engaged him at first, but then she dismissed him.

Mr. BARROW: The hon. member says I was engaged and dismissed. The hon. member is entirely wrong. I cannot tell him any more. He is fishing, and he can go on fishing the whole night!

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am not wrong; I am perfectly correct on this question. I told you that I suggested to the lady to see a solicitor. The hon. member was representing the lady; and it is from that lady that he got all those documents he brought into this House. Since then, the lady has dispensed with his services.

Mr. BARROW: Again on a point of order. I want to get the records straight. The hon. member is making statements which are completely misleading, incorrect, inaccurate and untrue. (Hon. M. E. COX: How did you get the documents?) I am not going to tell you. If that is what the Minister is trying to find out, he is not going to get it by telling lies in here, or by forcing me to get up and say it. I would like to ask him in what case I was engaged, and at what stage I was dismissed. Let him produce one document to show I had any case for this lady.

Hon. M. E. COX: I did not say that he had a case. I said the lady had first engaged his services, but later on dispensed with them; But of course I know the hon. member; I have had contact with him.

Mr. BARROW: On a point of order. I see the hon. member is capable of smiling. It is some game he is playing, but I am not going to rise again. It is beneath my contempt.

Hon. M. E. COX: How did you get those letters?

Mr. BARROW: The hon. member can write me a letter and I will tell him.

Hon. M. E. COX: I am not writing anything because you will twist it. He got hold of the documents from the lady, has not returned them, and therefore decided to come and spread them out in the House and accuse us of being dishonest, and of being mixed up in this deal.

Mr. BARROW: On a point of order. When did I say that the hon. member was dishonest? I am not saying that the hon. member is honest or dishonest. I particularly told His Honour at the time I was presenting these documents, that I had authority to read them; and other members are here to judge. I would like the Hon. Minister to say at what stage I called him dishonest, or honest, for that matter.

Hon. M. E. COX: His innuendos, his overtones, undertones, insinuations and the general way of putting his case to the House was such that it was suggested that we have not been straightforward in this deal. He asked how we got into this; and he went so far at one time as to suggest that we were holding back these people from developing this land when we did not have any legal right to do it; and that it was only so because we were waiting to get something out of the Canadians.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order. When did I say that? The hon. member should listen to his own Ministers. The Minister of Communications and Works admitted that at the first stage of the negotiations they had no authority to interfere; and that they extended the order. I said that they had no right to interfere, but I could not speak on the question of their honesty; that is entirely for them, for you and for anybody else. I have formed my own opinions of their honesty and dishonesty a long time ago, and not on this deal. The Minister of Communications and Works today said that he was not afraid to say that at first they had no authority, and that the Order was extended to St. Lucy. 10.30 p.m.

The Hon. Minister is accusing me of saying all kind of things against him. If he had any sense, he would play a soft pedal on that.

Hon. M. E. COX: I am glad that the hon. member has retreated from his position on Tuesday last; he has almost eaten every word he said on the last occasion. I am not going to tire the House any longer. I will say this: If that sort of behaviour continues, if people can come to this House and accuse members, whose shoes they are not worthy to unloose, of dishonesty and things of that sort, no decent, honest, upright man would ever want to come to this House.

When one knows that one gives of his best, when one knows that one is honest, truthful, fair, upright and straightforward in everything which one does in the interest of the community, and when one gets these political "dab chicks" saying and making all these slanderous and dishonest statements against you, I say that no decent, honest man would want to be a member of this House. I go further and say that God help us if we were to get such a bunch running this country.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I will close by saying this: I read - I think it was two years ago - of a man who was referred to as one who was born in discord, brought up in disharmony and subjected to illustrations of cruelty and promiscuity. I say no more than that.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: Sir, it has now come my fortune to close this debate. I regret that so much time has been wasted on this Resolution. I share the feeling of hon. members, even those on the other side, that we have reached the stage where the spirit of the debate indicates that all this talk has really nothing in it. The Resolution was purely a simple formality asking that this land in St. Peter be acquired; and I feel that less than twenty minutes could have been taken to give sufficient consideration to it. However, I think the Government has come out very much better than we felt.

It is now for me to clear the atmosphere of one or two unpleasant remarks; to assure the House of the need of coming down with this Resolution to acquire this land compulsorily. This file which I have in my hand, deals with Playing Fields for St. Peter; and in it there are 216 entries of minutes and correspondence. It begins with a letter which dates back to the 7th February, 1949, from the then Colonial Secretary, Mr. Stewart Perowne. That means that last month was exactly twelve years that this file for getting a playing field for St. Peter was moving in and out of the Ministry.

The hon. junior member for St. John thinks that this Resolution was timed to synchronise with something ugly. It is unfortunate that we have had no end of trouble in getting this matter come to a conclusion. When you consider the years which the Vestry of St. Peter took in an attempt to get a simple decision for the allocation of funds for the erection of a social centre and playing field for that parish, you would hardly believe that a body of people elected by the people could be so callous.

This letter was written on the 7th February, 1949; and two years later - on the 5th February, 1951 - the first request came. It took the Vestry of St. Peter two years to reply to a simple request when we were considering allocating a block vote of \$300,000 from the Labour Welfare Fund to the several parishes for rural amenities. This letter was sent to the Social Welfare Officer and signed by Mr. Corbin, the then Clerk to the Vestry of that parish. It reads as follows:-

"Dear Madam,

The Playing Field Committee beg to state that they have selected a part of Heywoods Plantation about 6 acres North of the old windmill bordering on the Highway as a suitable spot for a Playing Field for the Parish of St. Peter.

"They now beg that you approve of this spot and also beg to mention that their Clerk has interviewed Mr. R. Challenor, attorney for the above Estate, and it appears that this six acres may have to be obtained through the Land Acquisition Act.

"Our Clerk, Mr. Corbin, will be pleased if you would visit this spot, he can accompany you any Tuesday or

Thursday that is suitable to you. You may call at this office on those days between the hours of 10.00 a.m. and noon."

I am sorry that the hon. senior member for St. Peter is not here to hear this; I know that his heart is in this debate. One month later, in March, 1951, the same Playing Field Committee through Mr. Corbin, who is still alive, wrote this:-

COPY

Parochial Office,
St. Peter.
March 6th, 1951.

Miss Arne,
Social Welfare Officer,
Garrison.

Madam,

The Playing Field Committee beg to state that they have gone into the question of obtaining a piece of land above the New Coleridge School at Ashton Hall and that they have been informed that this has already been sold to peasant proprietors.

They beg therefore that you place before the Central Government their original plan: "6 acres at Heywoods North of the Mill".

I have the honour to be,
Madam,
Your obedient servant,
(Sgd.) Corbin

Clerk, Playing Field Committee, St. Peter.

In the beginning, they were talking about six acres of land at Heywoods. They moved to Ashton Hall to discover that the land was sold to peasant proprietors, and asked that the original plan of six acres of land at Heywoods, north of the mill be put up to the Central Government.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Sir, I rise on a point of order. The hon. senior member for St. Peter is not here, and I think he was Chairman of that Committee. Was that former site abandoned? I think that this next one is an addition to the first one. Let us hear how that letter reads in full.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: Do you mean the first letter?

Mr. MOTTLEY: The first letter said that they asked for six acres of land at Heywoods. Was the second letter because of the idea of abandoning the six acres, or was it that they were coming for this two acres at the other site in addition? I understand that it was in addition.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: It was not. This is how that letter reads:-

COPY

Parochial Office,
St. Peter.
5th Feb. 1951.

Miss B. Arne,
Social Welfare Officer,
Garrison.

Madam,

The Playing field Committee beg to state that they have selected a part of Heywoods Plantation about 6 acres North of the old windmill bordering on the Highway as a suitable spot for a Playing Field for the Parish of St. Peter.

They now beg that you approve of this spot and also beg to mention that their clerk has interviewed Mr. R. Challenor, attorney for the above Estate, and it appears that this six acres may have to be obtained through the Land Acquisition Act.

Our Clerk Mr. Corbin will be pleased if you would visit this spot, he can accompany you on any Tuesday or Thurs-

day that is suitable to you. You may call at this office on those days between the hours of 10.00 a.m. and Noon.

I have the honour to be,
Madam,
Your obedient servant,
(Sgd.) Corbin
Clerk to the Playing Field Committee,
St. Peter.

They spoke to Mr. Challenor, who is the Attorney for that plantation, but he was not interested in selling. Mr. Corbin said that it would have to be compulsorily acquired at about £500 or £600 per acre under the Land Acquisition Act. The allocation from the Labour Welfare's block vote at \$1.50 per head of the parish population for St. Peter would work out to \$13,696.00; while the land, six acres, at £500 per acre, would work out to \$14,400. If you had wanted to buy that bit of land, then you would have had to level the field and build a pavilion or a social centre.

The then Chief Secretary suggested to the Vestry that it would not matter; he could stretch the fund to cover the cost of the land, but other things such as the social centre or pavilion and the fencing and levelling would go to the account of the Vestry. In the meanwhile, for the next three years, the Chief Secretary was trying to get some action from the Vestry. On the 19th April, 1951, in reply to a query from the Vestry, the Acting Financial Secretary wrote the following letter to the Clerk of the Vestry:

Sir,

I have the honour to refer to your letter of the 6th March addressed to the Social Welfare Officer and to say that the proposal to establish a playing field in the parish of St. Peter by the acquisition of six acres of land at Heywoods plantation is receiving consideration.

I am, Sir,
Your obedient servant.

Here is the first minute of the hon. senior member for St. Peter written in 1951: "This is a matter which the Executive Committee should decide. I have spoken to my colleague and he agrees with the purchase even if it takes the total allocation." The hon. senior member for St. Peter was therefore willing to spend the entire \$13,696.00 on the purchase of this playing field; but it was not for the hon. member to decide, it was a matter for the Executive Committee; and no doubt the hon. member had had his heart on the Heywood's site.

It was a matter for the Vestry at the time to decide whether they would put the additional funds required for this playing field and social centre, but we got nothing from them; and after a passage of time they came up with a new scheme for the purchase of three acres of glebe land at the Rectory; but it was discovered that this land was under canes and not at all properly located. It was not particularly suited to the centre of St. Peter.

The Vestry suggested to us that we should acquire the little theatre in Speightstown - I think the name is the Caribbean Theatre - but on investigating we discovered that there had been a long-standing agreement for the sale of this land. Subsequent to all this, a new recommendation was made by the Vestry to purchase Mr. E. R. Corbin's building in Church Street; but there was not enough land there for a tennis court! Hon. members will recall that, by now, the Vestry was only thinking of a social centre. At this point I joined the Ministry, and on my first visit to Mr. Corbin's place I decided against it since there was at the moment operating an Assembly Hall in Speightstown, on the first floor of the Post Office.

The whole picture is again shifting. This is the first official letter which came to me as the person in charge of the Ministry. This letter is dated 9th July, 1957, from the Clerk of the Vestry. It says:-

Sir,

The Chairman of the Vestry of St. Peter, begs to state that a meeting of the Vestry held today 9/7/57 that the

following plots of land were approved of for the purchase by Government in order to make a playing field for the parish of St. Peter.

The plots are as follows:-

A. Mrs. O. Gill's Plot at Church Street

or

B. Mr. P. Whitehead's Plot situated at the North side of the Parish Church.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your obedient servant,
(Sgd.) Corbin
Clerk of the Vestry
St. Peter.

As I said, I did not go into the Ministry until the end of 1956. I called a meeting with the two members for St. Peter in the Assembly and we looked over Mrs. Gill's plot. I got enamoured with this land; there were beautiful trees, slopes, and a water course. After this visit, I was inundated with letters including a petition from the people in that area against the purchase of Mrs. Gill's land. That visit was on the 18th July.
10.50 p.m.

The lady herself, Mrs. Gill, as a sad person and with tears, on a number of occasions asked me to desist from buying the land, since its income was used for the education of the children; but I pointed out to her that, much as I sympathised with her, I had to be concerned with the people who had lived in that area. Being persuaded with her point of view, plus the letters asking us not to buy the land as a playing field, we decided, on that same day, in the company of the hon. senior member for St. Peter and His Honour the Speaker, to visit three other sites. Having abandoned the idea of Mrs. Gill's plot, I must show where we are on all-fours long before there was any thought of using Heywoods as a hotel site. We had decided on Forde's. That was two years before there was any consideration of this hotel.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order. I want the Hon. Minister to catch his breath; he is going at such a rate! All this was in 1957 and 1958; and you are telling this House about negotiations between the Vestry and the Government. Am I right in saying that it was in 1956 that the Government, by an Act of the Legislature, froze all the activities of the Vestries? I might be wrong, but I believe that in 1957-58 the activities of the Vestries had been frozen and they could do absolutely nothing. Is that so or not?

Hon. F. E. MILLER: Even if that is so, it is my nature to be highstrung! The point is that, even if the Vestries were frozen, they still had the right to recommend. It is true that they even took over a playing field at Indian Ground during that time. I myself wrote a letter to you as Churchwarden.

Mr. MOTTLEY: May I say when the Hon. Minister makes reference to that, that it was a matter of taking over one playing field and substituting another. The playing field at Indian Ground was substituted for the Princess Alice Playing Field, if the Hon. Minister remembers correctly.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: The playing field at Carrington's Village was a new project. The hon. member was still Churchwarden then.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member is addressing his remarks more to the hon. senior member for the City than to the Chair.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: I am addressing the Chair, Sir!

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am not interrupting unnecessarily; I am sure the Hon. Minister

would not think so. He says that the picture is shifting, so he has moved from Heywoods to Forde's, then behind Mr. Skinner's to Princess Alice and now to Carrington's Village!

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: That is why I said he is addressing you and not the Chair!

Hon. F. E. MILLER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, you will remember that in my opening remarks I mentioned that in this file there are 216 entries. If I had to deal with all the minutes and correspondence, it would take seven or eight hours. The hon. member will forgive me if the scene changes from Mrs. Gill's land across to Forde's and then to up by the Church. Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, you must give me an opportunity to clear this matter.....

Mr. MOTTLEY: Your name was not called. Everybody beside you was in this "do".

Hon. F. E. MILLER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I will go on to Document No. 7, which is a letter written by Mr. Hough to Mr. Corbin. I have never met Mr. Hough or Mr. Corbin. I know neither of these gentlemen; and there was no reason on earth for them to come to my Ministry for discussion on this matter. It was a matter for the Minister of Communications and Works, and the Minister who deals with tourism - but there again I was accused.

The paragraph says: "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 that it did." The debate in House we had in 1959 about the use of Forde's was referred to here. How did that bring me into it? I have never seen Mr. Corbin, nor do I know what he looks like; but the hon. member came and accused the whole Government and said that the only Minister who was not connected with this, including the Premier, was the Minister of Education. Certainly they were including me in this racket. (Mr. MOTTLEY: Put the question.) The hon. member wants to close the debate to get out of it.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order. What I said to the hon. member did not mean that I wanted to close the debate to get out of something. I refer to the fact that two Ministers have already defended the Government, and I wondered what he rose for. The scene has shifted from Heywoods to Forde's; and I said that this high pressure salesmanship does not work, and asked you to put the question. I am sure you would agree with that suggestion, won't you, Mr. Deputy Speaker? I object to the hon. member saying that I want the question put to get out of something. What am I to get out of? I was never in it.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, this is my right; I have been accused. It is for me to decide when to put the question. I must have an opportunity to reply; it is my Resolution.

Anyhow, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we invited Mr. Percy Whitehead to come to the Ministry and have a discussion re the purchase of Forde's. Mr. Whitehead came to the Ministry and after the matter was discussed he asked what we wanted. I told him that I was not concerned with the good land on the hillside, but would be willing to take five or six acres of the marginal land at the bottom, because we had had an engineer's advice on it. He said that he would sell the five or six acres; and with Mr. Charles Springer, we decided to start the ball rolling re the purchase of the five or six acres of land.

Not more than a week later, Mr. Percy Whitehead telephoned me and asked for an audience because he wanted to discuss this matter further. When he came in to see me, he said that he was not selling the five or six acres anymore, but that if we wanted to have it, we would have to buy all of the land.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order. The Hon. Minister said that the engineers went down there and recommended it. Is it a fact or not that the engineers and other people who went there and took levels and depths recommended against the purchasing of it?

Hon. F. E. MILLER: It is not correct to say that; the reverse is the case. Anyhow, Mr. Whitehead came to the Ministry and said that if we wanted to buy this land, we would have to buy all. I would be the last person to use the force of law, but.....
11.00 p.m.

Mr. BARROW: The Hon. Minister says that he would be the last person to use the force of law. Is it because the Government used the Land Acquisition Act against him to acquire his land in Speightstown?

Hon. F. E. MILLER: Sir, when on Tuesday last this debate started in here, the hon. member pushed his hands over his head, flung a lot of papers and said that he was going to tear the Government down with charges of corruption.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I have already replied to them. What I am asking the hon. member is this: Is it not a fact that the Government had to acquire his land by compulsory purchase?

Hon. F. E. MILLER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, of course the Government bought a bit of land from me in Speights-town. Does that necessarily mean that I wanted to use the law? He must make these interruptions; these interruptions are his only face saving devices. The moment that the Hon. Speaker had those letters circulated, he realised that his charges in the debate were torn assunder. Within eight days, these documents were in the hands of hon. members; and he is now like a defeated animal with his tail between his legs, knowing that he cannot recover from this.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The only animal in here is the hon. member. I merely asked the hon. Minister whether or not it was a fact that the Government had to acquire land from him by compulsory purchase, and he has called me an animal.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: The Government acquired land from me for an esplanade by compulsory purchase; but because that is so, do you mean to say that I must apply it in every opportunity?

Negotiations were started in 1955 re the purchase of this land from Mr. Whitehead. We were for three years toying with this person. (ASIDES) The hon. junior member for St. John can interrupt me after the reactions he has had; he has not recovered from the boomerang since the Speaker saw to it that copies of these letters should be given to hon. members. He is like a balloon deflated and fallen apart. The hon. member is getting up and down in dismay and in some cases, in disgust.

A letter was written in August 1957 by the Permanent Secretary of my Ministry to Mr. Whitehead. It reads as follows:-

15th August, 1957.

Sir,

The question of the acquisition of an area of land in or around Speightstown for the establishment of a Community Centre and Playing Field for the parish of St. Peter is receiving the attention of this Ministry.

2. It is understood that you own a plot of land situated on the Northern side of the Parish Church which may be suitable for the purpose. The Minister would be grateful if you would call at the Ministry at 10 a.m. on Saturday 17th August to discuss the matter.

I am, Sir,
Your obedient servant,

Permanent Secretary,
Minister of Social Services.

Mr. P. Whitehead,
Queen Street,
St. Peter.

Mr. Whitehead did not keep this appointment and the following letter was sent to him on the 20th August, 1957:-

Dear Mr. Whitehead,

I am enclosing a copy of my letter dated 15th August, which does not seem to have reached you. I wonder if you would be good enough to phone me at 2181 - extension 20, so that we can fix a date which is mutually convenient to yourself and the Minister.

Yours faithfully,

Permanent Secretary.

The years were rolling on, and yet we did not get any further. The Housing Authority was still trying to negotiate with Mr. Whitehead. We move on further in the 216 entries on this file. I was uneasy about this whole thing, not because I had reasons to fear anything, but because I know what people of this community are apt to think. It was God's mercy, and more so to you, Mr. Speaker, which caused the turn in the debate. You know how I felt, Mr. Speaker. I felt as though the hon. junior member for St. John were marching the Government down to the pillory amidst the shouts of angry crowds, crying to behead that man; and the Chief Judge was so minded to behead him too. But the Clerk of the Court advised that the man was stone-deaf, deafened by the steeple bells of Notre Dame; and this mercy plea from the Clerk of the Court caused the Chief Judge to send the hunchback to the pillory for a day instead. You will remember that at the pillory, in the midst of the hunchback's misery and thirst, it was the petal-like hands of the lady who gave him water to wet his parched lips. (Laughter)

Even this mercy was not shown to us on Tuesday night by the hon. junior member for St. John. Think of the picture the hon. member presented as he waved the 250 letters with both hands overhead. I liken him to a town crier in a French city, ringing his bell and inviting the citizens to come to witness the scene at the Guillotine. This is the day at the Bastille! he cried. Executions! Corruptions! (Laughter).

May I, Mr. Speaker, depict this character? Think of him as I see him, with a dusty, sallow complexion and pinched nostrils, with all the ugly marks that life leaves. He is off-the-face bald, and the locks of his hair which fall to the back of his head like a horse's mane covered with the city dust from the steel wheels of the carriages and cobbled streets, are covered with prison lice. (Laughter) Take another look, Mr. Speaker, and you will observe the two stumps left in his mouth, mahogany in colour, and with that sadistic and cynical grin. Oh what a character! (Laughter)

The hon. junior member for St. John waxed warm and carried a big handful of papers; but when the next day came, and with the letters made available to us, and that it was clear that there was nothing in his accusations of corruption, he fell on the smokescreen of getting up every moment to interrupt, with the hope of finding a way out. Now that we have robbed him of his fine prime feathers, he is like an animal with his tail hanging between his legs, his coat drenched in blood since it was torn in several places; he is looking back with the corner of one eye with his teeth bare, as if he is willing to do battle again, although in truth and in fact he is searching for the cover of night to make good his escape. Now the hon. member can climb the stairs and repair to the attic in search of solace from the cobbler.

Mr. Whitehead was asked on several occasions to assist in finding the landmarks of this property. It was on the 19th December 1960, three years after a number of letters were written to him, that the Deputy Director of Public Works in a note to the Ministry stated that the survey was completed. You will remember that I was hospitalized at that time; and on the gallery of my little cha-teau, convalescing, my Permanent Secretary sought approval of the Cabinet's paper to acquire this land compulsory.
11.10 p.m.

The Cabinet agreed that Forde's Pasture should be compulsorily acquired under the provisions of the Land Acquisition Act and used as a community playing field, and also for housing development. That was on the 13th December, 1960.

Now I come to the end of all tears and cries and miseries following the whole scene. There was a Resolution to be introduced for the compulsory acquisition of land at Speightstown; the 16th of last month was the final Cabinet decision. I could not get into the Ministry; I had bandages on my body. Here is the Resolution with the Addendum approved by the Ministry of Social Services. The hon. junior member for St. John said that it was done to synchronize with the corruption at Heywoods. There is something deep down which would vibrate; he says that there is the sum of \$60,000 for the development of the area; a bit of land released to the Housing Authority for the removal of tenants is costing \$60,000.

Mr. BARROW: On a point of order. The Hon. Minister's flights of fancy has taken him somewhere near Venus! I want to get him back on the earth! The Housing Authority did put in an estimate for removing 38 houses for \$60,000. I am saying that that is fantastic. Allowing \$11,000 for roads and \$1,500 for the removal of these houses, I said that it should not have come to anything like that.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: That is the trouble. You hear these things, you worry about them, you do some research, and then there is shilly-shallying in the end.

Mr. BARROW: On a point of order. I said the estimate was put in for \$60,000. Well, was it put in or not?

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order. I said that the estimate was \$12,000. If that brings any relief, it is open to hon. members to ask any questions.

Mr. BARROW: I invite them to ask the Chairman of the Housing Authority whether the estimate was not for \$60,000.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: There was the sum of \$12,000 for the roads.

Mr. BARROW: The hon. member said \$12,000 for the roads. I never said it was \$60,000 for the roads; I said that the estimate was \$60,000 for developing the area and removing the houses, and then if we allowed \$24,000 for the roads it still meant that there was an amount of \$15,000 for the houses.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: The land is released to the Housing Authority at a pepper corn rent. The cost of the removal of the houses will be treated as a loan, except in special cases. (ASIDES).

Mr. SPEAKER: There is disorder.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order. I hate to think that the hon. member is correct in what he has said. Is the Minister saying that the removal of these houses is to be paid for by the people when they are removed? That is not so. When these houses are decanted you would be hard-hearted in telling people to pay for removing these houses. Government should pay for the removal.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: You have the exceptional case. I am told that they are putting in roads and \$12,000 is the estimate. I know that the estimate is \$12,000 I have checked with my colleagues.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order. I enjoyed the Minister more than anything else here tonight, but this is a serious matter. Are you telling me that if you have forty houses to be removed from there, and you have land at a pepper corn rent, you are lending these people money for the purpose of removing these houses instead of finding money to remove such houses? That is not so.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not a point of order. The hon. senior member for the City has just made an observation.

He cannot ask a question on that when he is not addressing the House. The hon. senior member for the City is making an observation; he is also stating with what he would agree, but in raising a point of order the hon. member cannot voice his sentiments. That is the sort of thing which the hon. member would do when making a speech, but this is not the time for that.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I heard a *sotto voce* remark about Kensington.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not want to hear it.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I remember that the hon. member mentioned something about \$60,000; but if the Minister said \$12,000, he also said that the people will have to pay to remove their own houses and Government would lend them the money to do so. If that is their policy, then I will have to vote against the purchase of Forde's. 11.20 p.m.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, I am involved in this as a Minister to a certain extent. I do not understand how Forde's got into this matter at all. Here is a piece of land given up by the owner, at a pepper-corn rental, to these people at Heywoods. The people are moving from a spot where they are paying rent now, every quarter, or month, as the case may be. Why should the Housing Authority spend public funds in moving them there free, when they do not treat other members in such a manner? Why should we not charge them with a loan when they are getting the land free?

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order. You have that to deal with in St. Peter.

Mr. SPEAKER: That phase is now closed. I will allow the Minister to continue on Forde's.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: I think I have concluded the debate on Forde's. The acquisition of Forde's is a routine matter; it is nothing to do with Heywoods other than that it butts and bounds on the lands of Heywoods Plantation. It was fortunate that, in the seven or eight days since members of the Government had in their hands these very important letters, we were able to look up our files and prepare replies which I hope did bring some comfort to some of us in the Assembly today. The hon. member for St. John has lost not only the bones but the meat as well; and if this would salve his conscience and give him some peace of mind, I wish him well in respect of what he has said. I think the Government has done a wonderful job, and now I think the hon. member can go back to the attic and discuss new tricks with the cobbler.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, let us be assured that the documents taken from the Cadbury Report which was read by the hon. senior member for St. Thomas is at least in the custody of the Clerk. When some time ago I reminded you about it, you told us that the Clerk was absent. Now that he has returned, I would like to see that Your Honour's instructions have been carried out.

Mr. SPEAKER: It will be dealt with.

Mr. BRANCKER: There may be some intention of not carrying out your instructions.

Mr. SPEAKER: I can never have that.

Mr. BRANCKER: It happened some time ago when the hon. member for St. Thomas left without leaving a document. That would not happen with the hon. senior member for St. Michael of the hon. senior member for St. John.

Mr. MOTTLEY: As Speaker of this House, Sir, and not a member of the Government as such, I would say.....

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am speaking on this matter.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let me just check.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am speaking on the matter of the Cadbury Report, because I would be lost speaking after the Minister of Social Services! What I was thinking of, Mr. Speaker, is that as Speaker of this House and not a member of the Government, just as you have said that the letters read by the hon. junior member for St. John were to be in the custody of the Clerk and members were entitled to see copies of them, I am asking you to rule that that Report read by the hon. senior member for St. Thomas be also left in the custody of the Clerk so that we can receive copies of it. I have not seen it.

I would like you to rule that in the same way the Opposition must put in something which they read in the House, so too must the Government; because we feel that if it goes out of here tonight, it would not have been done the right way. You cannot rule one way for the Opposition and another way for the Government. If you give an order that something must be done, it must be done. I understand the Minister said he will send a copy of it; that is disobeying an order given by Your Honour. If you gave an order that the document read out by the Minister should be put in, and he says he will send a copy of it, that is against your ruling and cannot be done. If it is not put in, you cannot expect us to give the same obedience to the Chair.

Mr. SPEAKER: Do not expect?

Mr. MOTTLEY: If the Government is allowed to do that, I will demand that the Opposition follow that example, though it might be a bad one. I do not think that Your Honour will allow such an example to be set. You must see that the Hon. Minister puts in his document.

Mr. SPEAKER: Hon. member are at times amusing. I made a ruling that in the event of any paper document being part of a Minister's file, I would not attempt to rob - if I may use such a hard word - the Minister of anything that is the content of his file; but I would demand a copy. I have in my hand here now what members are making a fuss about; it is in my possession.

The question that the Resolution do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:-

AYES: Mr. BRYAN; Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS; Hon. M. E. COX; Hon. R. G. MAPP; Hon. L. St. A. THORNE; Hon. F. E. MILLER; Mr. SEARLES; Mr. STRAUGHN and Mr. SMITH - 9.

NOES: Mr. MOTTLEY; Mr. TALMA; Mr. TUDOR; Mr. BARROW and Mr. BRANCKER - 5.
11.30 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House re the setting up of a Select Committee to go into the matter of privilege complained about by the hon. junior member for St. John that I have appointed the following to serve on that Committee:-

The Hon. Leader of the House (Hon. M. E. COX), the hon. junior member for St. Joseph (Mr. STRAUGHN), the hon. senior member for Christ Church (Mr. TALMA), the hon. senior member for St. Philip (Mr. CRAWFORD), the hon. junior member for Christ Church (Mr. GODDARD), the hon. senior member for St. George (Lt. Col. H. A. DOWDING), the hon. senior member for St. Peter (Mr. WALCOTT), and I myself am happy to be associated with the Committee.

ADJOURNMENT

The Order Paper having been fixed,

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I intimated to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition that it is the intention of the Government to meet on Thursday, 9th March, 1961, at 12 noon, to consider the Estimates. The Hon. Premier will deliver his Budget Speech on that day. We may also pass two small Resolutions. I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Thursday, 9th March, 1961 at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Mr. BRANCKER: I agree with what the Hon. Leader of the House has said. After the Budget Speech has been made by the Hon. Minister of Finance, copies of his speech should be circulated to member so that we should have the opportunity to study it. When we next meet, we would be fully *au fait* with it just as happened last year, and which met with Your Honour's approval.

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

11.35 p.m.