THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1962

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 7th August, 1962.

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 2.30 o'clock p.m. today.

PRESENT

His Honour J. E. T. BRANCKER, Q.C., *(Speaker);* Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, *(Minister of Development, Trade, Industry and Labour);* Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P.; Mr. F. C. GODDARD; Mr. E. ST.A. HOLDER, J. P.; Hon. C. E. TALMA, *(Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries);* Hon. J. C. TUDOR, M.A., *(Minister of Education);* Hon. E. W. BARROW, B.Sc., *(Premier);* Mr. S. E. SEALY; Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON, *(Minister of Communications, Works, Housing and Tourism);* Mr. W. R. COWARD; Mr. W. R. LOWE; Mr. L. A. LYNCH, J.P.; Mr. G. V. BATSON, *(Chairman of Committees)* and Mr. J. B. YEARWOOD.

Prayers were read.

Mr. CORBIN and Mr. CARMICHAEL entered the House and took their seats.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received a statement from the Clerk in which he sets out that certain Minutes, namely, those of the 27th March, 10th April, 24th April, 2nd May, 19th June, 20th June, 26th June, 28th June, 29th June, 3rd July and 17th July are in the hands of the Government Printer, but the following sets are still in his hands, namely, those of the 21st March, 29th March, 29th May, 5th June, 12th June, 3rd July and 10th July. No Minutes can be presented to the House for confirmation until the Minutes of the meeting of 21st March have been submitted to the Government Printer.

The Clerk assures me that he has had the greatest difficulty in following the various amendments moved in by the Government during the Estimates as all stencilled copies thereof have already been used.

He has also assured me that he has completed the first six pages of the Minutes of the said meeting of the 21st March and he hopes to have them completed by tomorrow's date.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE FOR DEPUTY CLERK

Mr. SPEAKER: I also have the honour to inform the House that I have received the following letter from the Deputy Clerk:-

7th August, 1962.

His Honour the Speaker,
House of Assembly,
Bridgetown.

Sir,

I hereby ask for four weeks' leave of absence as from 14th August, 1962, from my duties as Deputy Clerk of this Honourable House.

Yours faithfully
(Sgd.) H. L. Thomas.
Deputy Clerk.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Deputy Clerk be granted leave of absence from his duties as from the 14th August according to the terms of the letter.

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

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

PAPERS LAID

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the Report of the Auditor General on the Audit of the accounts of the Island for the financial year 1960-61.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay a Statement showing the sums advanced to the Postmaster General for the payment of Money Orders, the amounts repaid to the Accountant General, and the amounts due by the various Post Offices to 30th June, 1962.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Resolution:-

Resolution to approve that the sum of $12,420 be advanced from the Public Treasury and placed at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee for the purpose of making loans to delegates and observers of the Barbados Union of Teachers to assist them to meet expenses of attending the 11th Biennial Conference of the Caribbean Union of Teachers which will be held in British Guiana in August, 1962.

I am also giving notice that it is my intention to proceed by leave of the House with this Resolution in all its stages today in Committee of Supply.

Other Government Notices were given as follows:-

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Resolution to place the sum of $1,800 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1962-63, Part 1 -

Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates, 1962-63, No. 15, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Resolution to approve the lease by the Executive Committee to the Barbados Sugar Producers' Association (Inc.) of a parcel of land situate in the City of Bridgetown together with the store known as the Bulk Sugar Store and other ancillary buildings erected thereon and the machinery and equipment standing on the said parcel of land or used in connection with the storing or shipping of sugar in bulk from the said store at the Deep Water Harbour.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: A Bill to amend the Registration Office Act, 1961.

A Bill to provide for the establishment of a Boundaries Commission and for matters connected therewith and incidental to the same.
2.50 p.m.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply at its next meeting to deal with the money Resolutions of which notice was given today.

QUESTIONS

Mr. BATSON: To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:

Is Government aware that there are still a number of houses in Farmer's Tenantry, St. Thomas, that have not as yet been removed despite the fact that the said tenantry was to have been abandoned due to the inconvenience and danger that confronted those who live there?

2. If the answer to the above is in the affirmative, will Government immediately set about resiting the same houses, as the owners are unable financially to remove same:

Mr. BOXILL: To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:

Is the Minister aware that the Government has been, and still is, paying water rates for certain blocks in the Garrison, St. Mchael?

2. If the answer to the above question is in the affirmatice, will the Minister state why in each case?

3. If the answer is in the negative, will the Minister seek to rectify this situation immediately?

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to amend the Registration Office Act, 1961, be now read a first time.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to second that.

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

On the motion of Hon. E. W. BARROW, seconded by Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, a Bill to provide for the establishment of a Boundaries Commission and for matters connected therewith and incidental to the same, was read a first time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I am asking for four weeks' leave of absence from his duties as a member of this House for the hon. junior member for St. Philip as from today's date.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the House is asking for four weeks' leave of absence from his duties as a member of this House for the hon. junior member for St. Philip as from today's date and unless there be any objection, leave will be granted.

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

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I understand that the members of the Opposition have been kind enough to agree to the Suspension of Standing Orders. I therefore beg to move that Standing Orders Nos. 5, 14, 16 and 18 be suspended for the remainder of today's Sitting.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: I understand that they have expressed their willingness to agree.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I stand corrected, Sir.

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

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Committee of Supply be the first Order of the day under Government Business. The Hon. Minister of Education intimated during the time he was giving notice, that he proposed to ask for leave to deal today with the Resolution for $12,420 in connection with the Barbados Union of Teachers.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I beg to second that.

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply, and that it be an instruction to the House while in Committee of Supply to deal with the Resolution for $12,420 of which notice was given today.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry at this late stage to have to rise to sound a note of protest against this matter. It is not a matter that I would generally be opposed to, but I am opposed to it today on two grounds: firstly, I cannot understand how the Government can be so hasty in a matter such as this as to introduce it today and ask for leave to deal with it through all its stages, and I am going to speak on the substance when it comes before the Committee, because it is a question of borrowing money; and if you are going on with this perpetual idea of lending teachers money for such things, what are you going to do for all the other people? I do not see why this should be done in such a hasty manner.

The second ground of my objection is that the Order Paper is very thin, and this is the month of August when many of us should be enjoying what people who live in the temperate climates enjoy, and that is a holiday, and those of us who live near to such climates are entitled to it. It is true that all of us do not live in this climate at all times during the year and can forego this discomfiture, but we have come to the Legislature to deal with three items one of which was on the Order Paper since April and it does not seem to be the intention of Government to deal with it; therefore they could withdraw it and leave the other two items on the Order Paper. I do not see therefore why we should make this pilgrimage to the House then to be told that we are going to deal with this matter through all its stages today.
3.00 p.m.

I am going to speak when the Resolution comes before the Committee of the House because I am not afraid of the teachers and I am going to tell the teachers where they get off because if the Government cannot tell them, somebody else must tell them. I am going to tell them because this type of favouritism cannot do. This Government can turn

down a request from an organisation and, if this is the sort of thing which is to be hurried through, then when we are going to deal with the subject I am going to say what I have to say. The teachers knew that August was going to be this month; therefore, if plans were going to be made for this thing, there should not be this haphazard sort of thing.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to answer the hon. member on one specific point, the point which he has made about the apparent rush. I think that the House will believe me when I say that I, myself, and the Hon. Minister of Finance have pointed out to the teachers that they should not have waited until the last moment to make this request. It was granted on another circumstance than the one today.

On the question of the subject matter, I do not speak because when we go into Committee of Supply, it is time enough for the Government to give its views. I would only like to say to hon. members that we are not to be blamed for the rush which now appears. We have answered the rush in proportion with the small amount of time between the making of the request and the Resolution before us.

The question that the House do now go into Committee of Supply and that it be an instruction to the House when in Committee to deal with the Resolution for $12,420 for the purpose of making loans to seven delegates and 43 observers of the Barbados Union of Teachers to assist them to meet expenses of attending the 11th Biennial Conference of the Caribbean Union of Teachers which will be held in British Guiana in August, 1962, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

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

RESOLUTION re LOANS TO TEACHERS AT BIENNIAL CONFERENCE

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, some members of the Committee here present were members of the former House, and they will recall that in 1960 we had before the House a Resolution, similar in nature to this one, coming from the Barbados Union of Teachers in connection with a Conference of the wider organisation of the Caribbean Union of Teachers of which this Union is part and which at that time was to be held in Jamaica. At that time only four teachers requested loans of $480 each, the total amount being $1,920. Before that, there was a similar request made to Government in 1956 when the Conference was going to be held in Antigua. It was a request from 22 teachers for an amount of $240 each, the total amount being just over $5,000. Before that, in 1950, when, like now, a Conference was taking place in British Guiana, there was a request which came from five teachers for $150 each, the total being $750.

Sir, I mentioned that as a preliminary because new members of the House might perhaps not know that a request like this has been made to Government before. That is not to say that this Government does not have its own specific views — I would say very strong views — on matters of this sort.

I may tell the Committee this. I have just come from speaking to a one-day Conference of the Barbados Union of Teachers held in St. Andrew, and I felt myself bound to tell them that it would be best for them if this would be the last occasion on which a request of this nature comes before the Government; so the hon. member who, I know, will speak very forcibly on this matter cannot find himself and this Government very much at loggerheads on the principle involved. I told the teachers that an organization like theirs in every two years should not put their own dignity to the test of risking a refusal which, if it would come, would be a good thing for them and which they could not complain of in the circumstances. Therefore I was glad in consequence to hear one of the Barbados Union of Teachers telling the assembly of teachers that it would be a good thing for them if they revive their own co-operative movement and that it was a bad commentary on them that the co-operative movement which they had going, they had allowed to fall into disuse. (A VOICE: How can you revive something that is dead?) The Hon. Premier asked how it can be revived when it is dead. I said that it has fallen into disuse.

Sir, the point which I want to make is that I did not waste any time in letting the teachers know how we feel and how other sections of the community would feel, and that it was expected of them as a responsible organisation that they make this their last request; and the President himself said that as far as he was concerned, they would not undertake to make a request of this kind again, Conference or no Conference.

I say that because this Government is not hiding behind any fear in talking to the teachers and letting them know what is required of them as a responsible organisation.

It would please the hon. senior member for St. Peter to know that they indulged in self-criticism which was very fitting because they said: "Why is it that a Union like the Barbados Workers' Union could make its weight felt and a much older establishment than that could not?" They were very concerned with what they could do to make the Teachers Union at least as strong, as worthwhile and as influential as the more numerous association of workers in this Island.

Now, Sir, to get to the Resolution itself, it is proposed by Government with the approval of the House to lend a certain sum of money to 50 teachers in August. They are seven delegates and 43 observers. The delegates are receiving loans of $300 each and the observers are receiving loans of $240 each.

We have attached three conditions to this and the three conditions which we have attached will give the Committee an idea of the Government's mind.

3.10 p.m.

We have said, first of all, that we cannot afford in the present circumstances of our financial affairs, to advance them loans just like that; therefore these loans will bear a 6% rate of interest. The reason for that is simple. For our own administrative requirements we have to borrow; we borrow at the rate of 7%, and it is only fair, therefore, that they should pay a rate of interest on these loans; we have fixed that rate of interest at 1% less than the usual borrowing rate which we have to meet.

The second thing is this: they must repay this money within a year. We have done that for this reason; it is a great concession which the Government is making and we feel that it would be an added responsibility on the part of the teachers if they could discharge that particular obligation as quickly as possible. As a matter of fact, some people might claim that we have no right at all to consider a request of this nature in view of the fact that more than a month ago the Primary and Secondary School Teachers have received the last instalment of their retrospective pay due to them from the 1st April, 1961, a total amounting to some $4,000. The entire total would have amounted to that. It could be argued that since these teachers have been so well done by, why do they need to borrow? With the private affairs of the teachers we are not concerned. We have approved their request, not because of the financial position of the teachers, but because of the nature of the Conference which they are desirous of attending.

Hon. members will realise that any national organization, of whatever nature, is a good thing in the circumstances of West Indian life today, and the Caribbean Union of Teachers is meeting in British Guiana at a very fateful Conference because it is understood that some of the branches of the Union from larger territories have been contemplating in recent months taking the time from their own national development and forming national associa-

tions and unions of their own — in other words, breaking away from the national body. It would be good, therefore, if a substantial contingent of teachers could be there in strength in order to persuade their colleagues in the larger territories that there is no need to break up an organisation of such eminence and value. It is for that reason that we wish to encourage this because of the wider educational significance it has and what it would mean to the teaching profession in this territory.

In moving the passing of this Resolution, I must assure this Committee that this Government feels that a request of this nature should be the last of its kind coming from the teachers. We will encourage them to streamline their organization and go on a financial policy to arouse enthusiasm for it among its members to support and encourage it. It is because of the worthwhileness and positive advantage to be gained by attending this Conference in British Guiana in large numbers that we recommended this proposal to the Cabinet and I recommend it to the Committee.

Mr. Chairman, there is one point I would like to make before I sit down and it is this; the hon. senior member for St. Peter on more than one occasion has criticised this proposal on grounds which appear to me to be good and sufficient. We have explained to him that a request made by him on behalf of the Barbados Workers' Union was not refused on any grounds except on the genuine grounds that, at that time, we could not do any better. I would not like the hon. member to feel that we have refused that request out of malice or on any other ground than that which we outlined to him, and that we are favouring the teachers because we regard them more than we regard the Barbados Workers' Union. Any request from a responsible organization in this island will be considered by the Government, whatever the results of that consideration might be; therefore it is not a question of having offhand and casually refused the request of the Barbados Workers' Union. I have explained that to the hon. member and therefore I am a bit surprised to see that every time we bring forward these things, he throws it out as if it is something bad on our part to refuse this request. I have reasons to believe that if that request is repeated at a more propitious time, it would be more favourably considered. I now beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I think I will deal with this matter at the last point which the Hon. Minister has raised. I would like to erase from his mind completely that the Barbados Workers' Union made a request; I might say that we did not make a request of this kind. The request was made on grounds of principle because other territories had made a similar request of their respective Governments. I might also say that we did not ask the other Government for this grant — we have asked this Government for a request more so than we asked the last Government. We have not asked the last Government any request because we were not going to be placed in any embarassing position. I do not like to raise this matter too much because it can become very embarrassing. The request which was made was infinitesimal. It was the University of the West Indies and not the Barbados Workers' Union which made this request. The University of the West Indies was asking the Barbados Government to send a student on something which the University was sponsoring; it was not a request made from the Barbados Workers' Union. The Barbados Workers' Union is better provided for than the request made of the Government because the I.L.O. gave more than what the University was asking. The other request was on a national basis because it was a Duke of Edinburgh Scholarship and I may say that the Government spent more money on Education Week than what the Barbados Workers' Union was asking for.

I appreciate the Minister's statement. He knows that I appreciate his explanation, but he must bear in mind that I am a public man, and any discussion which we have privately is confidential; however, the Hon. Minister was giving information for which I am very thankful.

3.20 p.m.

That does not mean that the explanation which the Hon. Minister gave was not an explanation I accepted, but it is a comparison that I was drawing; and I am very pleased to see that the Government is in better and more affluent circumstances, if I can put it that way, that they can grant this request, and moreover, that they can grant a request to the Barbados Olympic Association, because I want to rope in all these organizations in this Resolution.

It is symptomatic of West Indian middle-class thinking that Governments exist to aid them. I heard the Premier on one occasion here make a statement, and I should like to carry this statement out in practice. He said that there are some people with mauby pockets who possess a champagne taste. That is indicative of middle-class people in Barbados, because they allow their taste to get too far in front of their pockets; they do not want to back up their pockets, but look upon other people in other segments of society and regard them as moving too quickly. I want to say to the teachers and to everybody in Barbados that if the Barbados Union of Teachers is only a Union of Teachers in name, they should leave out the word "Union". There is no point in telling me how old the organization is when it does not possess one penny to pay its way in life and wants to ridicule other people.

Mr. Chairman, I have absolutely no respect in any body which cannot pay its way in life, but wants to bring some rubbish argument that should be in the waste paper basket of forgetfulness, and these teachers must be told that quite frankly if they cannot find enough money. These teachers say that they are learned people and know more than some of the working-class people and should even be guiding working-class people. The working-class people put their business in order and when they go to Conferences they pay for them. This is not a Government-sponsored Conference. I go to Conferences more often than any other hon. member in this Chamber, but I do not come to ask Government for money. What would the position be if every time I went to a Conference members came to the House wanting to know how much money was spent on my trip? You would have to ask those questions of the Union and the International Organization of which I am a member.

The Barbados Union of Teachers, Mr. Chairman, should have enough members in it making contributions. A member of the Barbados Workers' Union pays an average fee approximating to 20 cents a week, which is $10.00 per annum, and they work for a lower income than the teachers. The teachers want to go to their fancy clubs at night, but the Minister said that we do not want to go into people's private business. Far be it from me, but sometimes what is private can be public when you ask the public to subscribe or subsidise. You get people wanting to go to the Oasis and pay a different price for the drinks there, because they cannot go up Baxters Road and drink at one of those places; they are therefore paying for the atmosphere. I do not object to them paying for the atmosphere where they can pay for it, because sometimes it is appropriate and we have to do it at times; but if we are going to pay for the atmosphere, we cannot expect people to pay for other aspects or other things which we require. Very few of my members would go to the Oasis; they leave that for me because they feel the Head of the Organization has to pay these prices. If I have friends, I cannot carry them up Baxters Road at all times. Sometimes we have friends whom we have to entertain. The hon. senior member for the City had the Mayor of New York City, and I could not expect him to carry the Mayor where he would carry me; so it is quite understandable. We have to treat people with the dignity they deserve, and when they are strangers, they are strangers.

Mr. Chairman, I was very pleased to hear that the Minister gave the teachers a warning and that they have had a little self-introspection and realise that they must come up to terms; and if they want to have this kind of treatment, they cannot expect to have it if they have a voluntary organization. I feel that they should be paying to their organization a fee which could make provision for travel. In many countries there are travel organizations subscribing to travel clubs and travel grants, and sometimes the Gov-

ernment comes in. Governments all over the world give assistance at times; sometimes they begin by aiding and putting them on their feet; but afterwards, they must get on with the job themselves. Going to a Conference for teachers is the teachers' business; it is not a Government Conference, and the Government cannot have any direction in this matter and tell the teachers what they should do or should not do.

One of the reasons why I object to Government sponsored trips to Conferences is that sometimes when a Resolution has to come down against the Government, they express ingratitude for the same Government which came for money for them. Conferences are there to criticise. We can invite the Premier or a Minister to a Conference, and at the same Conference criticise the Government on its policy in making labour legislation with which we are not in favour, because the Government does not pay for the delegates to go to the Conference. We can do that all over the world at Regional and at International Conferences, because we go there without any Government assistance and feel free to criticise. That is the distinction between the Organization to which I belong and the Communist Organization, because Communist Organizations are sponsored by the Government and cannot criticise the donors.

Teachers have at their disposal the benefit of knowledge and learning and they should be capable of creating an efficient organization. I understand that the Barbados Union of Teachers is fifty years old; therefore it should be in a sound position financially. I am not here to advise voluntary organizations, but if it is a Union of Teachers, and the word "Union" is in it, I happen to know something about Unions, and I know that without making it into a Friendly Society, they can make it into a virile Union of Teachers with the salaries and steady income which teachers get. I cannot see why a teacher cannot pay to his organization a fee of at least $1.00 per month to pay for these things. A teacher should be able to pay twenty-five cents a week, which is the price of a rum snap and a coke, and if he starts to take a few snaps and he takes as many as ten, that is $2,50. Why should we at this stage be voting $12,000 to help teachers to go to British Guiana?

The other thing that seems to me ludicrous, Mr. Chairman, is that you are sending seven delegates and 43 observers to the Conference. Where in any part of the world would anybody send seven delegates and 43 observers if he had to pay? What has happened is this: some of these people are very clever, but now that they know the Government's intention, I do not believe they will come back again.

3.30 p.m.

Some wanted to go to British Guiana for a holiday; so what they want to do is to keep their own money in the bank. What they do is this. They come to Government and have an interest free loan to pay back as they like. May be, after this, they would not come back. If all of us were to get loans that way, we would never.....

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. I want to tell the hon. member that it is not an interest free loan.

Mr. WALCOTT: I said that may be, after this, they would not come back. May be, they are caught on this occasion because there is an interest charge to that loan. The idea was to come and have an interest free loan and therefore they would not have to worry their heads about it.

Sir, I would not have been opposed to this, if this was the first year that the teachers were coming for a loan: but it is becoming a habit and I believe the last Government has encouraged them. I remember on the last occasion when I criticised a similar loan, the Premier of that Government said that they were going to do it whenever the teachers came for such a loan. The Premier then thought that this was so consolidating his seat in here that he would be bound down for life to doing it. He said so; he is not here and I who criticised it am still here.

This is not a sound proposition. The Hon. Minister of Education read out a statement showing that some eight years ago this thing was done and it was done each time that there was a Conference except the time when it was held here in Barbados.

They said that they are dealing with Trinidad and it happens in Trinidad. I want to say this. If the Trinidad Government can decide to give teachers a grant, that is all very well for the Trinidad Government. I do not know how many Barbadians had been dealing with a matter like this, but it is a fact that Trinidadians like this sort of thing coming about. If ten people are going away, a Trinidadian would go and borrow money to go too and he would go as far as to sleep on the floor. That is his outlook. He says: "Somebody is going away and I am going too". However, I do not see any reason why we have to follow the Trinidad Government in that respect. What we have to tell the teachers in Barbados is that if it is a Conference which the Government is sponsoring, well then, I am in favour of sending teachers and Civil Servants, no matter who you are, to things for broadening your outlook. I am in favour of doing anything for the benefit of expanding a man's or woman's mind. However, I say that the teachers' organisation must be in a position to do things for its members. I am a member of an organisation. We have to go to British Guiana soon and we have to pull our pockets in order to go there. Sometimes it costs the very people who are going money out of their pockets privately because when you are travelling as a member of the Trade Union on something dealing with the Trade Union Movement personally, you are not travelling for the Government; therefore sometimes you have to spend more money than the allowance given to you from the organisation.

I would like the Hon. Minister to know that I am not drawing any comparison with my organization based on what is taking place now. I am dealing with this matter on its merits. I thank the Hon. Minister for the explanation which he has given and I think it is very wise of him to warn the teachers. I think it is very noble of the teachers themselves to come to the clear understanding that this thing should be met by them and they should not come here to ask for any loan.

Now I am on this, Sir, the Government has to make a complete re-appraisal of all its grants, gifts and subventions to voluntary organisations because it is not good enough to have in a small community like this the Government making grants and subventions and not making a study of the people to whom they are making the grants and subventions. For instance, if a blind man has some money on the bank, I do not see why you should give him anything. If he has more money on the bank than I, he is better off than I with my two eyes.

I cannot see why we should subsidise the teachers, and the Hon. Minister of Education has used a very good argument to disarm hon. members on the grounds that these teachers have just received salary increases. When you get backpay and get a piece of change like that, you can buy a refrigerator, and if the old bed wants changing, you go and buy a new mattress. This is the time of change and you take such a opportunity to make a change. No member has any antiques now.

Sir — I say quite seriously that when teachers receive their emoluments they have an obligation — and I am not dealing with backpay now; they should be paying for the upkeep of their own organisation. I am not suggesting, nor is it the business of any hon. member to tell them how they should utilise any retrospective pay which they may have got. That is only a coincidence: but I think their salary structure is such that all of them — Civil Servants, Secondary School Teachers and Elementary School Teachers — should make their own organisation powerful and financially strong in order that they can provide for these things either out of their own funds or by holding dances or other drives for money. I was in New York a couple of days ago and they had something for one of their notable Americans, Mr. Jackie Robinson. They had a dinner at the Waldorf-Astoria at $25 a plate because they said that if they go there to

hold the dinner, some people who were going there would want to see Mr. Jackie Robinson and other people who were not friends of his would still go because they would like the cost; other people would like to go there because they want to see the Waldorf-Astoria and when they attended that dinner they would bring back something as a sort of souvenir. They do all of these things so as to appeal to the taste of different people. Some organizations depend on holding dances so as to assist them. If you were to take the Barbados Cricket Association, you have some people who pay $120 into the Association and by so doing they become a life member.
3.40 p.m.

You go this night and you eat a meal. You carry home the Menu Card and you frame it in order to show that you went to this place. If you want $500, if you want to raise money, it may be a matter of having 200 people at $25.00 and that is the sort of advice I would give to the teachers so that they can raise this money. I hope the Minister will regard my criticism as not a criticism of the Government, because he knows that so far as criticism against his Government in this matter is concerned, that is a point for me to raise, because I have already raised it. The Minister has always shown me all of the courtesies in dealing with any matter which applies to his Ministry; therefore I would like to assure him that any criticism which I make is not a criticism of his Ministry or of the courtesies which he has extended to me, because he has been extremely courteous to me. Any issue which I have raised with his Ministry is not a criticism of his Ministry; it is a criticism which has to be made in the interest of the community so that people will know how public men feel about them. I take the opportunity to let the public know that such persons in the community must be prepared to shoulder their responsibility at such Conferences and affairs.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, like the hon. member who has just sat down, I, too, have found not only the Minister of Education, but, in fact, all the Ministers very courteous. However, I take a different view of this matter from the hon. member who has just sat down. I think I heard the Minister mention that they were borrowing this money at 7% and lending it at 6%. Will the Minister just tell me this before I go any further?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: To answer the hon. member, what I said was that when we have to borrow money, we usually have to pay 7% interest. We are lending the teachers this money at 6% considering that that figure is a reasonable one in the circumstances.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Are you borrowing this money? If you are borrowing money at 7% I am criticising you for lending it at 6%. If you have money you should not borrow at all, and if you are borrowing it at 7% I will criticise it for lending it at 6%. I am supporting the Resolution, but it looks to me to be somewhat extravagant with 43 observers and 7 delegates — with these 50 people, one wonders if you cannot get this money elsewhere if you have all of these people. I think the Minister said that he hoped that these observers would convince their colleagues that they would not break away. Well, I hope that the teachers will convince those in British Guiana that they should remain this way instead of going the Jagan way. Surely, you are only lending money to persons who have already got five years in the Service and not less, and if anything happens to them they would be entitled to one year's pensionable emoluments. I see from the Minister's nod that the answer to that question is "Yes". If that is so, it is the most simple thing in respect of 50 teachers who possess such security in Government as five years' service to have their salaries paid into the bank. If I know what is happening in Bridgetown with banks, there is that competition in business and the teachers must be very unbusinesslike to come to you for this money. With money paid in from the Bank at $20 a month, it would only mean that they would have to pay more interest to the Bank. I think that the time has come when these teachers should put their house in order so that they can raise money by other means.

If you say that you are borrowing money at 7% and lending this money to the teachers at 6%, then you are doing wrong. You would have to lend other organizations at a lower rate also. You should not lend teachers money at 6% when you are borrowing it at 7%; you might have to follow suit in lending people money to go out for medical reasons and so forth. You should only lend money to a person on the security that you are responsible for such a person if he dies, because he would have a year's pensionable emoluments; he will be entitled to that. Any bank would catch at this business.

As the hon. senior member for St. Peter has said, there is the possibility that the teachers are doing this because they can get this money at a cheaper rate. People would take the opportunity of lending this money to these teachers. My Party does not like the idea of people borrowing money except there are extreme circumstances such as a Civil Servant going out for medical reasons. It is not businesslike to lend money to people who are going to a Conference; you may have to borrow money to subsidise Housing or something like that. I hope the hon. Minister will give us some explanation about lending this money to these teachers at 6% while you have to borrow it at 7%. You are in power now and I hope you will not give consideration to this matter on another occasion; but that, on the contrary, the teachers will set their house in order and be able to raise the money which they require by some other means.
3.50 p.m.

It does look extravagant to have seven delegates and all these observers, but as the hon. member has said, in this trip to British Guiana, you know the duty of most observers when they go places.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I would like to deal with the points raised by the hon. member who has just sat down first. First of all, I should like to say that at least the implication which came from him is not accurate at all when he said that maybe they waited to hold back their money, because they knew they could get money from the Government at a cheaper rate of interest. I would make bold to say that the first time they will hear that they have to pay a rate of interest is now, because obviously I could not have replied to them before the Cabinet had decided, and the Cabinet could not have instructed me to reply until the House had approved; so it is in consequence of this debate that they will know they have to pay a rate of interest on it.

Secondly, the Ministry was advised, as in all things involving finance, by the Ministry of Finance that the Ministry thought it proper that a rate of 6% was desirable and did not recommend anymore. Thirdly, it is not the case that we have to borrow this amount of money to lend them. It is that the current overdraft rate is in the vicinity of seven percent, and the Ministry of Finance feels that 6% in these circumstances is reasonable for them. That is all it is and there is nothing more peculiar about it. By the way, Mr. Chairman, this much can be said: whether or not you agree that this loan ought to be made is a different matter; but so long as it is going to be made, it is going to be made to people that you employ, and you cannot say to an employer that some small facility, however slight, should not be conceded to his employees; so that it is well within the province of Government, taking every circumstance into consideration, to make that concession if they are advised on good grounds to do it.

Now with respect to the number of observers to the Conference, I myself did question that number and it was explained to me by the Union that it would be a good thing for some of the younger teachers to have the experience of going to British Guiana at this particular time, that so long as other conditions are met — and they have been met — there is no harm whatever in a largish number of young but responsible teachers taking the opportunity to attend this Conference in the role of observers.

Now the hon. senior member for St. Peter raised some very pertinent questions on the whole principle of this and he has said nothing with which members on this side could disagree. The position of the Barbados Union of Teachers, as I understand it, is that out of a possible 1,200 teachers

who could be members of it, only 400 have taken the trouble to be. It is clear, therefore, that with an organisation with a membership of one-third of what it potentially should be, such an organisation is bound to suffer certain weaknesses. I understand that the subscription which individual teachers pay is $4 a year, not even $1 a month, which by arrangement is deducted from their salaries twice yearly, in May and in October. Of that $4.00, $3.00 go as a lump-sum contribution to the Civil Service Association and $1.00 is retained by the Union itself. Well, I make no comment on that except to say that they will have to change their rules and devise ways and means of raising funds among themselves to suit their own purposes. I believe that this is actively engaging their attention.

Hon. members may have read that in Jamaica and in Trinidad larger numbers of teachers are attending this Conference and have been allowed to have advances of salary, in the case of Trinidad of $300 or two months' salary, whichever is larger. Well, in Trinidad there is a provision which obtains which does not obtain here, and that is that legislative sanction is already existing in Trinidad for the payment of advances in salaries. That provision does not hold good here, and I am not even sure that I would be prepared to recommend it; but I am only saying that if anybody reads that the Trinidad teachers have apparently been handled well by their Government, let us get it quite clear that it is not a matter of being handled well, but that the law there already exists for an advance of salary, and it is under that law that this particular arrangement has been made for the Trinidad teachers, and I believe in the case of the Jamaican teachers also.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I recommend to the Committee the acceptance of this Resolution. I will bear in mind all the criticisms which have been made by both hon. members, and I would like to say here and now as I have said to the teachers this morning: "let it be the last time", because I personally will not bring any such request from them to the Government of Barbados in future for circumstances similar to these.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a contribution that could be deemed to be in no way controversial, but hearing more than one member speak about....

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I had intended to sum up, and I did so; but if the hon. member wishes to speak, he may do so with the leave of the House.

Mr. HUSBANDS: The hon. member still has an opportunity to reply, but I do not think he needs to. With reference to the proportion of observers to the number of delegates, at first glance that does seem rather big, but I do not think hon. members should regard the number of observers in any way related in terms of money. Sir, I think that the presence of 43 observers in British Guiana at this particular Conference is a benefit that is intangible. The Hon. Minister said that there is a move afoot to break up West Indian unity as far as the Caribbean Union of Teachers is concerned, and that there are some Unions in the area that are seeking to develop National Unions. The mere presence of many Barbadian observers may mean that these teachers may be able to pull their weight and probably do the necessary lobbying that would just make a difference. After all we used to talk — I do not know if we still attempt to do so — about being West Indians, but very few politicians and West Indians really refer to themselves as West Indians. This again is the sort of opportunity that brings benefits that are intangible and would help Barbadians to know more of Trinidadians, Antiguans, people from Montserrat and everywhere else. The benefits that accrue are not just obvious and are not easily seen, but mean a lot more than the money that they are borrowing. We are not even making a grant; these observers have to pay back the money at 6%; so I do not think that there should be that sort of criticism because of the individual benefits which will accrue from the mere fact that these people are able with their presence to lobby and, maybe, make a mark, not necessarily around the Conference Table, because this is also a social affair, and not just a spree. They are making contact with their colleagues from other islands at the meeting when they are in British Guiana.
4.00 p.m.

That can mean a lot, one teacher talking to another teacher from another territory. That is a sort of benefit which is intangible and we do not know what is the amount of good we can get from that.

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

On motion of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Resolution in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD in each case, the Resolution was read a first and second time and agreed to.

THE LAND DEVELOPMENT DUTY BILL, 1962

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I am asking for leave to take Order No. 2 as the next Order of the Day.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: This Order stands in the name of the Hon. Premier: Second reading of a Bill to make provision for the imposition of duties on sales of land in areas where the Government undertakes or proposes to undertake substantial expenditure from public funds, to impose betterment charges on development of lands in such areas and to provide for matters connected therewith or incidental thereto.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, it is not unusual to anticipate criticism on a Bill in moving the second reading in this Chamber: but the Bill which we now have before us was one which was passed sometime ago by this House, and after it went to the Other Place, it went the way of all flesh because the House was prorogued and the Legislature was dissolved when the measure was suspended by the Other Place.

I think it is my duty to disclose here because of a statement which I made in public and which I do not intend to withdraw that during this period of time two hon. members masqueraded — I better not say what they masqueraded as — as supporters of the Barbados Labour Party: and therefore, as supporters of that Party, they are accepted in civilised communities as being supporters of the distribution of the wealth of the country for the benefit of the Island.

I do not intend to call any names: but the reason why I say that is because it appears to me to be a rather fatuous situation in which a Government, after an Assembly passes a Bill, would have a delegation of two persons who are supporters of that Government to discuss with the members of the Other Place — and I have all the facts before me — the Bill and make assertions which can only disclose that those members are either illiterate, dishonest or do not understand what this Bill was all about.

When the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, the Hon. Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour and I were in the United Kingdom, the Conservative Government in the United Kingdom at that time, having resisted from time immemorial — from 1946 — the very suggestion that there should be a Capital Gains Tax in that country, were then introducing and, as far as I know, have actually passed in either May or early June such a Bill. We have not reached that stage in Barbados because a Capital Gains Tax is one which I understand means that if a person carried out a business deal or a transaction in ordinary circumstances and got an

increment over what he paid for it, or an increased value, then the Government steps in and imposes a tax on that.

I would like to distinguish that situation from that in which a real estate dealer — and there are hon. members who rejoice in such a designation in this Chamber — buys a house and lives in it for one week or a month and then sells it at a higher cost and thinks that it is his private transaction; it is nothing to do with his business as a real estate dealer. But in normal circumstances that money which he has gained is a transaction which is considered as income.

The reason why I start off with that explanation is because I have seen deliberate distortions on the part of so-called responsible people; and no doubt when this matter comes up to the Other Place, there would be again people attempting to give misleading assertions about the nature of the Bill. Therefore, I think that I should let the public know in advance that these people are either dishonest or do not understand what the situation is.
4.10 p.m.

The Bill which we have before us is not a Capital Gains tax. If I were going to introduce a Capital Gains tax, I would make absolutely no apology for doing it because every civilised country in the world has such a tax. You have one in New Zealand and you have one in the United States of America. You also have one in 1962 in the United Kingdom and those countries are rejoicing or suffering under Conservative Governments. Therefore, it is very strange and hypocritical that you get people in Barbados who profess to be interested in the general and social upliftment of the country, who subscribed to the idea that there should be a redistribution of wealth on the principle of the maximum social advantage, so that the Government should cater to the needs of the people who are not in as fortunate a position as the landed gentry and the commercial and the agricultural nobles of our time. When you see that people in a democracy can deliberately sabotage the expressed desire of the members of the Legislature, that is, to frustrate a Bill which was passed without any contradiction by this House, I say that I am not going to allow them to get the opportunity of misleading the public because I will tell the public in advance exactly what the facts are. There is, in the Other Place, a hard core of opposition towards the idea of paying any kind of taxation at all. No human being really likes to pay taxes if he can avoid it; but when the elected representatives of the people decide that there is to be a tax on something, the way to do it, if you do not agree with them, is to get rid of the members by means of an Election campaign. It is no part of the democratic procedure that when Bills concerning finance or Bills relating to taxation are accepted by the elected representatives of the people, persons who have not had to answer to the taxpayers or who do not owe their positions to the free exercise of the democratic will — it is no part of the democratic procedure that these people for personal and selfish reasons — I say that deliberately because in both of these cases, both of these worthy gentlemen, using the word in its loosest sense, are people who would have to bear some of the burden of taxation. That is one of the responsibilities of being wealthy property owners. This is a matter about which I feel very strongly because as far back as 1952 when I was trying to urge on the then Government that the East Coast Road should be started, the hon. senior member for St. Andrew, Mr. Haynes at the time, who was also a landowner, appeared to have a greater sense of responsibility than the present land owners — he and I were the two people who said that the East Coast road should be built; we said that there should be a development duty and betterment charges on the land around the East Coast Road. Mr. Haynes said that he was prepared to pay 100% betterment charge whereas I was suggesting a betterment charge of between 60% and 85% at that time.

The Bill which this House passed, and which I now have to go through the laborious process of introducing again, made provision for the Executive Committee to levy a development charge of not more than 50%. One of the richest landowners in this island who was also a member of this Place, suggested that that charge should be 100% in respect of the East Coast Road because the construction of that road would be a benefit to the island and to the landowners as well.

I have mentioned that because I have made certain statements in public, and people say that I make rash statements and the Other Place has the freedom to do what they like; therefore it is dictatorship to suggest that people who do not agree with these measures should not be in that Chamber. I have precedent for that. When the Government in England was having difficulty over legislation with the House of Lords, it was only after a threat by the Prime Minister of Great Britain that the principle of a Parliament Act was accepted. The threat was that the Other Place should be abandoned. We have no control over the selection or nomination of persons to the Other Place. We know that the minority Opposition Party is well represented up there and we also know that the Official Opposition Party is also well represented; but the fact that they are represented is not due to any legal right to be represented up there. It was this Government, as an Opposition Party, with Your Honour as Leader of the delegation which went to the Secretary of State for the Colonies, Mr. Iain Macleod, and informed him that we did not consider that the other Chamber truly represented the political theories and bodies of political opinion to be found in this Place. Mr. Macleod mentioned that he would not like to spoil the non-political nature -- every one of them are members of the two political parties which are opposed to us; everyone of them is prepared to make substantial contributions to the political parties to get this Government out of power. Every time they exercise the vote, they make a political decision, and Mr. Macleod said he would not like to interfere with that state of affairs. Jamaica had insisted that the representation in the Other Place should reflect — well, Jamaica has become independent now; but because of the difficulty of dividing a man in two, an accurate reflection would not always be possible; but the Upper Chamber should reflect the various opinions in the Lower Chamber. Mr. Macleod said that such a change should await the holding of a General Election. We have had a General Election; the "outs" are in, and the "ins" are out and it is our right and prerogative to put our case to the public. We have been returned by the public and it is our right and prerogative to say how that Chamber should be comprised.
4.20 p.m.

The Chamber which we have up there is not a hangover from slavery, because it has got nothing to do with slavery at all. It is a hangover from the beginning of creation of the whole globe with its seething mass of public confusion. It is a hangover from anti-diluvian times before the flood. I say that, Sir, not as any criticism against any member up there — and I am prepared to make a constitutional issue out of this Bill — but I dare any member to sit down here and pass this Bill and say I am wrong. I find it absolutely fantastic that any Government should even condescend to sit down with members of the Other Place behind our backs. They got in here with us and passed this Bill, and I was almost ready to sing the *Nunc Dimittis*, because it had been nine years that I had been asking, and I was not unsupported, that there should be a development charge, and that we could not go on spending taxpayers' money for people to reap the improvements which came from such expenditure.

Mr. Speaker, after we passed the Bill, members of the Cabinet got together with those gentlemen behind the backs, not only of us, but of the Legislature itself that had sent this Bill to Committee and suppressed the Bill, so that by the time the Legislature was dissolved, we had been confronted with a situation when we took it for granted that we would have this matter on the Statute Book. The Deep Water Harbour has come and gone, and by that I mean that it was under construction and is now finished, and we are about to start very important projects, and I do not intend starting them until I get this Bill passed by both Houses of the Legislature and assented to by the Officer administering the Government of this country, because I am not going to take up any taxpayers' money in order to allow other people to make unjust and undue profits at the expense of the taxpayers.

There are certain people in this country who go in for Local Government and who try to get in the Other Place by ways and means best known to themselves purely in order to see that their interests are protected. That is not the idea which we have now of democratic Government, and I find it rather reprehensible that members of the Cabinet should go behind our backs and discuss a Bill which we had passed with members of the Other Place. If they did not agree, they had no right to introduce it, and that is why when people telephone or write to me and tell me they want to discuss so and so, I ask them to put it in writing, because I do not think that it is a proper thing for people to get behind the backs of the Legislature and discuss these matters. If you want to discuss the principle of a thing, you should do it here or up there; but after the House had passed the Bill, I do not really understand why these worthy gentlemen decided to canvass the Cabinet to cancel the Bill after we had passed it; and this was on the 7th January, 1961.

Now to say that this Bill is a Capital Gains tax, although in the Regulations some mention has been made of capital gains, erroneously in my opinion, is entirely misleading. The object of this Bill is to provide for the participation by Government in the benefits to be derived from enhanced values accruing to lands in areas where the Government is undertaking or proposes to undertake substantial expenditure from public funds. As I mentioned just now, this is an entirely different situation from a person who, let us say, has won a sweepstake. That is a capital gain because you spent 50 cents and won $50,000. I know that in the United States you now pay a tax on that, and I do not know whether the date of the coming into force of the Act has actually been proclaimed yet in the United Kingdom: but I have reasons to believe because of the debates which took place there in April, May and June that it is now the law in the United Kingdom. If you win a sweepstake, you may have to pay part of it over to the Government, quite apart from the taxes which the Turf Club or the person running the tickets has to pay. That is the purest illustration I can give of capital gains. Sweepstake earnings are not income earned in Barbados by anyone. The sale of property by real estate agents comes under the heading of income; but as a private individual, if you owned a house and you decided to sell it and get three times as much money as you paid for it, the Income Tax Commissioner cannot touch that at all, and that is still going to be the law in Barbados. That is really a Capital Gains tax. But where the Government now has gone into an area and your increased value is due to the investment by Government at the expense of the taxpayers, that is where your development duty comes into force, and that is all. The Government will spend money in roads, water, electricity and so on. If the Government builds the East Coast Road and puts in sodium lighting as at the Deep Water Harbour, a ten-inch main, a proper carriage-way and all the other facilities in the revised areas, and somebody comes from Canada and offers $120 an acre for land which you could not sell for $3 five years before, even if you wanted to give it away at that price, that increased value of the land is directly attributable to development which the Government has carried out. All this Bill says is that you pay 50% after making the necessary legitimate deductions over to Government. That is why I really do not understand how people could be so hypocritical as to disagree with a Development Bill which is in the United States and the United Kingdom, both Conservative Governments, because in the United States it is only a question of which Conservative Government is in power at the time, whether it is the Kennedy Government or the Eisenhower Government. I think everybody in America accepts that. There is no Socialist Government in the United States.

When you hear people who have been elevated to a position of responsibility disagreeing with a Bill like this and saying that it is like the thin edge of the wedge of Communism, therefore they were supporting Communism in Barbados all these years, because it was the Barbados Labour Party that introduced this and that is the Party they were supporting all the time. Are they now disillusioned by that Party? Has the Party done something in the face of outside world opinion or of what is being done in Jamaica, Trinidad and everywhere else and finds itself forced to carry out measures which every civilised country does, and because we do not go slow on progress in the Island, they describe it as the thin edge of the wedge on the road to Communism? 4.30 p.m.

Let them come out in the open because they have been accusing Mr. "Josh" Haynes who was one of the Leaders of the Conservatives. Every member of this House, not one dissentient voice, passed this Bill in 1960 and agreed with it because we all have to pay taxes and we do not see why one man should benefit to the exclusion of other persons. Their principle is that the Government is designed for them and the Government must pass such things as would enrich them. I do not like to mince matters. We must pass things to make them bear their share of the burden in this country. Here they are raising a human cry and frustrating the intention of the electorate and frustrating the expressed decisions arrived at in the democratic Chamber. I do not understand why we put up with that kind of institution at all because if a nominated Chamber – and this is my view – has power, then it is undemocratic; and if it has no power, then it is useless; so whichever way you look at it, I do not see the necessity for perpetuating that sort of thing.

Sir, this Bill has two separate and distinct but closely inter-related measures. First, the imposition of a development duty on all sales of land in such areas; and, secondly, the levying of a betterment charge on increases in the value of all land in such areas. Broadly, the development duty should be levied on the difference between the value of the land at a specified base date and the value of the land at a specified development date, and the specified date can be anything up to one year before the coming into operation of the Act.

This is not really retroactive legislation at all. The hon. junior member for Christ Church had asked me whether the provisions of this Bill would be retroactive and I take this opportunity to tell him that in this sense it could be considered to be retroactive; but I know of no project in this Island now which this Bill would really affect because we have not undertaken any development such as this Bill contemplates within the past year; therefore, I do not think any property owner would be adversely affected through the specified date coming into force one year prior to the Act.

The reason why I believe provision like that was inserted was when this Bill was under discussion, the Deep Water Harbour was well on the way to completion and this Bill was originally designed to take action on that matter as well as the East Coast Road. However the Deep Water Harbour is out of it now and the access roads which have been built, have been built more than a year ago.

I was just explaining the principle on which the development duty would be levied. Let us say that we chose the 1st May, 1962. You send in your valuers or assessors, whatever you feel like calling them, and you carry out a survey of the area and you say that the land is worth so much per acre or square foot. If at any time within ten years of that date the landowner sells the land after the Government has carried out an improvement – and that is a very important factor in this measure – that is, subsequent to the Government beginning an improvement, it is not a charge on the falling off in the real value and the increase in the sort of money price you get.

People do not understand purchasing power. It does not mean that if you purchase something for £500 fifteen years ago, you are necessarily better off because you sold it last year for £1,500. You may be worse off because £500 fifteen years ago may have greater purchasing power than £1,500 today. We know that since 1938 the cost of living has risen well over 300%.

The Government is not taxing that. What Government is taxing is the increased value which you are getting as a result of the improvement; and having fixed a specified date to carry out the improvement, if sometime within the development period, which under this period would be not more than ten years, – if you sell the land after ten

years and no development order is made, then you will be entitled to all. But according to the Development Bill, having carried out an improvement, Government then can make an Order saying that you pay a sum of not more than 50% of the increased value of the land. Therefore, if the land is worth $1,000 on the specified date – the date fixed by the Order – and two years from then the owner sells it for $1,500 and the development of the land costs him $100, his net increment is $400 because he has got $500 more and spent $100 on the development of that land. Therefore, he pays $200 to the Government and he is still $200 better off, and that $200 is in effect an outright gift given him by the Government because if the Government did not carry out the improvement, then he would have to carry it out himself which in most cases he cannot do. Therefore, he is better off from the taxpayers. Far from the taxpayers taking something from that individual, the taxpayers have given him something.

Sir, that is the approach which you have to take to a problem like this.

4.40 p.m.

Certain people like to present to the public a picture of gloom and make people believe that the whole community is dependent upon them and that the Government is doing something wrong. I have tried to explain the matter of development duty and I will now make an attempt to explain the question of a betterment charge. I am not going into this in more detail now because we have already had this exercise in 1960. We have accepted the principle of the Bill by passing it and we sent it up to the Other Place and that was the end of it. The then Government said nothing to us at all and the Bill died a natural death. They have died a natural, political death and I hope that they remain in that way for a long time.

A betterment charge is put on the difference between the value of the land at the specified base date and the value of the land at a specified development date fixed sometime in the future. You may very well ask: "What is the difference between those two things? You have carried out development and why should you have two different types of duty?" I want to put it in untechnical language and I hope I will keep it as accurate as it is possible to do. The development duty is paid on the increased value at the specified date and the time when the land is actually sold, but the betterment charge does not depend upon that at all. You really have two specified dates. If you look at the Bill carefully, you will see that in the betterment charge you have two specified dates – the original specified date and a further date and the development has got to be paid at any time between those two dates. If you fix, for instance, the first of May, 1962 to the 30th June, 1965 – if you decide to go to sleep on the land, you may not sell the land at all. You have to take care of a situation where a person has so much money already or he has so much other land that he can dispose of and he decides that he will squat on this land and he is not particularly anxious to sell it. He has also profited by the improvement because he can drive in his car without damaging his tyres. He may not elect to dispose of the land because the Government builds a road and there is where a betterment charge would come into force.

The "Objects and Reasons" of the Bill state that where land has been sold during the valuation period and has, in consequence, incurred development duty, the future development charge will not be related to the base date valuation but to the price at which the land was bought. In other words, let us look at it in this way; in the development you fix the valuation and in the development charge you fix two dates; but the land may change hands several times, and every time the land is sold you do not charge 50%, but the difference between the assessed value on the specified date and the price paid in the conveyance and otherwise, because if it is to be something outside the conveyance price, that is taken into account as well; but you pay a development duty and a betterment charge on the difference between the price at which you bought the land and that at which you sold it. You may have bought it at a price in excess of the value on the specified date and therefore you have not got to suffer this burden of paying for somebody else's profit. From the specified date to the time when you actually sold the land, you were the last purchaser although you were the vendor. You are the person who is actually making the sale to another purchaser, but you were the last purchaser before the new transaction. You may have bought the land for £2,000 and you may sell it for £3,000; but on the specified date the land might have been valued at £500. You may pay £250 in duty when you got £1,000 in profit. That would be negligible. You pay a betterment charge on the difference between the buying price and the selling price; in other words, you pay on the profits.

On the question of development, whereas you do not pay on the profit, you pay a notional profit because you may get more profit than the development duty. You may have had the land for 50 years and done nothing with it. We are not concerned with whether you bought the land at a certain price, but we are concerned with what is the value of the land as at the specified date. In most cases the average landowner in Barbados will not be paying anything like 50% duty; in most cases he would have bought the land for appreciably less than the valuation. He may have bought it yesterday and naturally the value which would be fixed on that piece of land is yesterday's value if today is the specified date.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think it is necessary for me to go into the details of this Bill. I have outlined the general principles of the Bill.

4.50 p.m.

We have over $540,000 to be spent on the East Coast Road by 31st March out of a total of well over $2 million. We never know what the eventual cost is going to be because we can only make estimates of these things. If we spend $2 million and can get back even $750,000 this way – and I am confident that in the long run, it might not happen within twelve months, we can get back most of the money by the device of development duties and betterment charges – you can see therefore that we can divert funds in the next three years to some other sector of the economy to carry out some other improvements; but we cannot undertake these colossal items of capital expenditure purely to benefit private individuals, whether those private individuals happen to be members of the Legislature or otherwise. We cannot afford that kind of thing in an economy like Barbados'. I cannot say now that there would be anything like a toll, because I know that if a Barbadian had to pay a toll of 25 cents to use the road, he would prefer to spend $1.30 for two extra gallons of gasolene to drive all the way round to make sure he did not pay that 25 cents. He would spend $1.30 to avoid paying 25 cents toll, because although this is done all over the world, he feels he is giving you 25 cents and getting nothing for it; but if he pays $1.30, although he is going to arrive back at the same spot, he feels he has had the privilege of driving out his $1.30.

Mr. Speaker, although I have heard some members of the House from time to time and even some members of the public venture that it would be a good idea to have a toll road, our present thinking is that a toll road would be impracticable when you take the Barbadian psychology into consideration, and therefore we have to make people who can afford and who are benefiting also subscribe towards the cost of construction of projects like the East Coast Road; and the device which this House chose over two years ago, and which unfortunately was frustrated by being sent to a Select Committee which never reported and never passed the Bill in the Other Place, we are now presenting again with the same sense of purpose as we voted for and supported it and as we argued about it for nine years, and urged the last Government to do something about it, and with the same serious intention of carrying out these improvements for the benefit of the Island.

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

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

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, as the hon. Premier has said, this House has dealt with this Bill in the last Session, not the same House, but it was dealt with by many of us in here. It is nothing new and we all realise that if develop-

ment of this nature is to take place, somebody must pay for it. The taxpayers are called on to pay out the money, and that means everybody. Development in St. Lucy will be paid for by the ones in Christ Church, because they are the general taxpayers; so I see nothing wrong. Where there is development by Government on projects like the East Coast Road and things of that nature which will benefit directly properties around there, why should people not be called on to pay something of that expenditure? Now let us keep it as a betterment charge and development charge with which we all agree. We agreed with it in the past and we agree with it again. But this is what I wanted to put to the Premier, because I do not know whether there is provision in this Bill for it. If a development costs $2 million, say on the East Coast Road, and a betterment charge and development charge to go over a period of years whether it be five, ten or fifteen years should benefit the Government to the extent of 50%, I think Government at that point should drop any further charges of betterment. In other words, it is just like a toll bridge; you must not go on paying for a toll bridge all the time.

Mr. Speaker, Governments must have toll bridges, and the general user contributes his quarters, 50-cent pieces, dimes or whatever it might be, but when that bill has been repaid with interest and sinking fund, then they are open to the public. That is how I look on a development of any nature. The general taxpayer must have the money, he has to pay sinking fund and interest, and those directly concerned in and around a development must contribute; so I agree with it by way of a betterment charge and development charge. However, I would like a clause to be inserted whereby we will keep it as a betterment charge and it would not be a Capital Gains tax. It is not a Capital Gains tax, because if it were, every property in Broad Street that was sold for more than it was bought for would have to contribute to the revenue of this Island by whatever percentage the Government put on it. It is not so, and I am not one who is convinced that it is; but I do claim that it would be better if after 50% or 75% even including interest should be returned to Government any time over a period of years, that area should be released so that the normal buying and selling may continue. Personally I think it will appeal to everyone, because one area will not have *in perpetuum* to bear a tax gain of any sort.

I think the Premier will understand what I have said, Mr. Speaker, and I feel that a Clause to that effect would allay any fears. There are many parts of this Island that are crying out for development. How can you expect the general taxpayer to pay for roads, water and develop an area so that just a few people around there should benefit? It is absolutely wrong and therefore I agree with this Bill with those reservations. We have been through this at great length in this House and passed it. I voted for it then and I will vote for it again, but I am asking the Premier to consider what I have stated, and so release an area that has been described in the Schedule as a development area if and when the returns by way of revenue from betterment charges and development charges has reached 50% or 75%, because the general taxpayer must contribute something as he has to use the road. But after that has been reached, it should be released so that the normal method of buying and selling land and property can take place, because it is going to be land today, but it is going to be land and a house tomorrow.

5.00 p.m.

I do not like to see any area, having reached that and paid back Government what they have expended on it, being hurt because it is going into the Government. If you review any particular area, you are forever burdened with something between buying and selling because there are other areas where you are free to go.

I think I have made it clear and I think it would appeal to anyone. I said 50% or 75%. You should not pay back 100% and it should be free in the normal course of time. With these few remarks, I have great pleasure in supporting the Betterment Charge Bill, because from this I think the Government would proceed more freely in the development which is envisaged in this Island.

There are many places which are crying out for development. The economy of this Island needs speeding up and it needs the infusion of capital. We have improved our buildings, schools and water supplies: but we need an improvement in our houses and this Bill would open up areas which are inaccessible by means of Government stepping in and building roads and putting in water and electricity. Then private enterprise can come in and put up their own houses and thus speed up what Government is now doing in its housing estates.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, it is known that I have revolutionary views on land matters. That is only a palliative. You can see Barbados in better perspective when you go out of Barbados and then come back. Barbados does not appear to you so big then. You step into a plane and fly for four hours before you get to the place, and when you land in Barbados you can reach any point in less than an hour; therefore, after doing that, it makes one feel that Barbados should think very much about its land development.

When I heard the last hon. member who spoke, he said that Barbados is crying out for development and that there are a lot of undeveloped areas in Barbados. There are no underdeveloped areas in Barbados. Barbados is an overcrowded area, but what it wants is re-distribution of the population. The hon. senior member for the City does not like me to say that you have your Chapman Lane and your Golden Square. (Mr. MOTTLEY: Why do I not like you to say it?) You do not mind having these eyesores when you are going to die: but if you want to live longer, you would like to have these eyesores removed and they can only be removed by re-orientation of your thinking.

I do not subscribe to the concept of lawyers, or to the view that mortgage dealers, real estate brokers have about free enterprise in land fetching its market value. Land has no market value; it has an artificial value. What market value is there for land in a small community like this which is based on low incomes? Will you tell me that the market value is that which an American coming from the U.S.A. is willing to pay for Sandy Lane? I calculated the cost for that plantation. After cutting up and selling in lots — 100 acres — of that land, it brought such a fantastic price that you could not believe it. I went down there and saw that they were asking for some fancy prices for land, and when it worked out, it was something like nearly a $1/4 million for the few acres of land.

What I have been criticising all the time is that an estate would be sold out and the money paid out, and then those people would go to the Agricultural Bank and borrow money for running the estate. You have these peculiar machinations of business people in this island. You sell an estate for $200,000. The purchasers then go to the Agricultural Bank and borrow $50,000 of that amount for the running of the estate. The crop is perennial; so there is no point in saying that you have a crop of canes on it. You say that you are borrowing this $50,000 so as to work the land which is now included in the purchase price or is part of the capital cost, though it is not the capital cost from the point of view of the way in which you borrowed the money. I do not consider these systems of land dealings in Barbados modern. It is a problem which we have acquired because it is a system which we have borrowed from the English people.

I do not believe many people like what is known as the Capital Gains Tax, but I am in favour of it because I do not see any reason why, if you do something which you get a gain from, you should not pay a tax on it. Why is it that a man must be permitted in Barbados to have an acre of land where he spends not one penny on that land, but because the Public Works stepped in and put a road through that land, he can go and sell it and get great profits from it without paying a cent to the Government? I do know, Sir, that Barbadians generally look upon this as some sacred or divine blessing which they get. Let us, for instance, go through Thomas Gap, Westbury Road — a place which we all know. Thomas Gap, Westbury Road, was a gap where you had some old tots and old pans about the place, and

now Thomas Gap is a highway with bright lights, water and so on. With all that money which the Government has spent on putting a road through there, surely a man would get his piece of land there sold more quickly than before. He can go and sell it for a lot more money than he paid for it. What has he done to earn that money? How has the change come about? Just because the access road to the Deep Water Harbour runs through Thomas Gap, up goes the price of the land there. The land in Thomas Gap will be sold so dear now that all the people who lived there for all their life, if they lived on rented land, would have to leave it because they would be unable to buy it.

What I am worried about is that the cost of land is rising in Barbados above the normal income level of the people generally. If you make an examination and an analysis of the salary and income of people with the price of land on the other side, the graph will show you what has taken place. You will see that the price of land has outstripped the other things by more than 300%.
5.10 p.m.

Twenty years ago a man who owned property would not be able to do it. It is not like having a cow or something which you are feeding; the land is the same place. You have instances where people have bought land and they have not even put stones on it and they get four times the value for it because the Government has installed water and light. It may be that you paid $500 for a piece of land and it is not unreasonable for somebody to be running you down with $3,000 for it. People may not want to build on land which is left for them by their parents: but, on the Leeward coast of this island you will find that gradually the people of Barbados are being removed from their own landmarks and very few Barbadians will be able in the future to have land in Barbados, especially so on the Leeward coast. You will become an alien in your own community because people who are able to own the land will own it. Some people will pay a better price for land, but the Government has to see to it that land is kept at a price so that people can make use of it. I find that there has been a lot of removal of people from land, and if the Government is called upon to purchase land for housing purposes, the Government has to pay a terrific price for such land.

That has brought to my mind two important matters. With the proposed entry of Great Britain into the European Common Market and the outlook for sugar, with the Immigration Bill and the reduction of the number of people going into the United Kingdom, those are two important economic factors which will have a great impact on the Barbadian and the West Indian, and particularly on the Barbados economic community. With our population density which is one of the highest in the world, you will find that in a country with a population density of 1,400 people to the square mile, land density must be considered in the political and economic life. It is not only a question of a Capital Gains tax or a betterment charge, but it is a question of the utilisation of the land space for the population which we have. I would say this; on the last occasion I said that the time is seriously drawing to a close when Barbadians — it is commonsense that you cannot afford to have people occupying large areas of land and we may have to set up a Committee to go into this matter. We have people living on large areas of land: and while we do not want to expropriate them, in the interest of the community it is not in keeping with present-day circumstances. I have nothing against people who live in big houses, but there are some over-sized houses and properties. Within the context of 166 square miles and our density of population, I cannot see myself that this state of affairs should obtain. If you set a special line at Culloden Road — there are two houses between Culloden Road and the Garrison Savannah and Collymore Rock — everybody knows the area at Dalkeith and at Culloden Road. If you go from Culloden Road to Brittons Hill, you can measure the area of land and tell me how many people are inhabiting these places *(ASIDES)*. Somebody says that one of these places is a school.

Mr. Speaker, my geography is dealing with Culloden Road running towards Brittons Hill. I have not jumped over the road; I am keeping to one side of the road. If you go to Bishop's Court Hill and keep to the right all the time, you will see what I am talking about. I would not like people who own these houses to go to sleep tonight with any fear that somebody is going to expropriate their land; but we have to come over to this now; otherwise it may be too late because a new generation can become different in its thinking. I may say that our whole thinking must be changed if we want to develop things along the proper lines. What is regarded as Barbadian is not in consonance with what is required today. It was regarded as some particular privilege when you could inherit these large areas of land; but in Barbados, when we have so many people struggling for an area of land on which to live, and where the Government is struggling to provide housing for people, it does not seem logical to me that you should still maintain such mansions. A study should be made of this matter in order to bring it into line with modern thought.

In Puerto Rico, many years ago, the Governor of that island, Mr. Munoz Marin, proposed that holdings should be restricted in order that there may be a redistribution of land without in any way spoiling the economy of the country by fragmentation. I do not say that plantations should be cut up into half-acre or one-acre lots and that they should be given to people for the purpose of carrying on kitchen gardens and then the economy of the people will be developed; you cannot get a virile economy on that basis because you would require to have a lot of money in reserve until that begins to work.
5.20 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, I know that there are systems other than the Barbadian system in which land holdings are not on a plantation system. For example, cocoa is grown in Ghana on a profitable basis, and Ghana is one of the big cocoa-producing countries in the world on a system different from ours where there are a lot of independent farmers. I am not suggesting the fragmentation of our agricultural land, but what I am saying within the context of these betterment charges and development charges is that I can see quite clearly that they are a means of carrying out a real and important development programme. I do not know what plans the Government has for the East Coast Road, but as I have said repeatedly in this House, I go to the East side every year: and whenever I look at Bathsheba I regard it not as development within the context of a housing area, but as development as a tourist resort. That area opens up on the Atlantic side, and I cannot see why we could not beautify that area by making it into something that Barbadians themselves can be proud of and can utilise.

I hope that the Government will bear in mind, Mr. Speaker, that in developing a country they are developing it for the people who live in the country also; and to that extent, as I have said already and will repeat, Barbados is so small and accessible with good roads that I cannot see why it should not be possible for any Barbadian to get to what is a natural asset. We say we do not have many of these things; we do not have any mineral resources; but we have the sea, the sunshine and good climate and we should utilise it. Therefore I think the development of our beaches should be one of the priorities in any betterment scheme, and these lands should be kept at reasonable costs. I do not see why it should not be easy for us at any point to get to the sea and be able to have facilities at these places. I have read the Development Plan and I do not know what the local authorities or Government proposes to do, but I would like to see in these areas right around the country facilities made for people to live a more healthy and decent life.

I am sure the Premier is aware that on several occasions there are excursions in this Island, and I do not think that in our time we should borrow or perpetuate any of the habits which our predecessors allowed our people to acquire, because they regarded the masses of people as something apart. I do not consider it proper that these conditions should exist, and I believe that because this was a sugar producing area, the concept of certain necessities and certain normal amenities were regarded in our community as how life is regarded in certain parts of China and Formosa in which it was said that manure was

such a natural thing produced by human beings, that they did not go in for artificial manure, because they had plenty of the human kind.

As I travel around this country when there are excursions, Mr. Speaker, I see large areas where buses park and I look carefully to see what facilities you are providing for human needs, because there are men, women and children. I do not see how you can develop a community without developing these normal facilities, and I would admonish Government that part of its facilities and part of the development programme should be a complete re-orientation in our thinking. You cannot go anywhere in the United States or in any civilised community and say you are going to the sea and not find bathing sheds for women and men to undress and bathroom and toilet facilities. Here in Barbados it does not seem as though these facilities should be provided anywhere. I do not know if I am old fashioned, but those of us who have wives would like to take them out for a bath, and even though some of us as men can get behind a car door or behind a big branch and undress, sometimes the watchful eye of onlookers is not looking for us, but for the female when she is going to undress, and we have not become so liberal in our outlook that we like that kind of exhibition for our females. I would like to see a little more privacy and protection being given to them.

Since I have returned here, Sir, I understand that one of the places at which we have provided privacy has become a place for the watchful eye. You have little boys and children in any community who play these pranks, but in these circumstances you must do what I see is done in big countries. They put the women so far from the men that you would have to scale a wall, and you would have to have a very good excuse to be in that area. There are no partitions; there is always a wall or baths running between the two sections, and the question of Peeping Toms really would not arise. I say that because in the whole phase of development, I am sure that Government is going to be pressed more for this type of development in our tourist line than for development in agricultural production; and when it comes to the East Coast Road which is going to be developed, I feel there is land there which will come into production and we should watch that.

The point that the hon. junior member for Christ Church made on the face of it would appear reasonable. The burden of his argument is not to make charges of betterment on land that would become burdensome for normal transaction of business. You do not want to stultify the buying and selling of land or property, because people do buy and sell things as a matter of course. Some people buy land and hold it to sell again, and you do not want to be too restrictive in that. I agree with him that you do not want to stultify the normal processes of selling and the normal process of business, but at the same time you have to be extremely careful in watching betterment charges. I see that here in Barbados the average cost of doing roads has increased. It is not my business at this stage, Mr. Speaker, to say that there are still avenues from which you can get money in this Island, because I was not here for the Budget Debate and it is not now my business to recapitulate on the Budget Debate, because everybody has his own point of view, but I would say that in Barbados the time has come when we have to analyse our taxation policy with a fine tooth comb and see that the taxation is spread over as wide a basis as can reasonably bear it. That is the only way in which we will get the progress that is essential to this era.

Now that we are dealing with betterment tax on land, let us be quite fair and let land owners be aware that if they have to pay tax for this, they should accept it as part of the price they have to pay for development in this community.

5.30 p.m.

I will not harp over those who were lucky in the past, those who were able to benefit by our not having this betterment charge. In some instances you may say that some of them have utilised the money which they got from this in further investment. You may say that some made some money on cheap labour and invested it in another way. Though we do not believe in exploitation, I would say that if the money which we received in taxation is utilised wisely, I doubt very much in the process of time that people would be vexed about it. What people get angry about is not because of taxation as such but the way of the utilisation of the taxation. In any community which is spending money wisely, it means that the taxation is utilised in a way which means more to the community. Fiscal policies show all over the world that you withdraw money from the community and you put it back into the community in a way in which, if the holders had held it in their hands, they would not utilise it. It is well known that when individuals in a particular place own the land, they do not think of building proper roads over which they can pass. It is left to the Government to step in and put in the roads. You therefore withdraw the money for making the roads, and from that you have been able to send out people and have them qualified as engineers and that is how you get a new professional class of people. The same thing happened with the medical profession. First of all, the people used to prescribe their own medicines. After that, they paid taxes to have a hospital and a medical service and then they found out that if they must have a medical service which is efficient, it would cost money; therefore, they sent out and trained people to be skilled in that profession to attend to these hospitals.

Even with the capital gains, I think it is a question of thinking. Sometimes it may be a question of opinion and the stage at which you find that you can afford it. It is a question of complete re-examination: and I think the hon. junior member for Christ Church should not be too dogmatic at objecting to capital gains in land dealing because there is a capital gain in business; not in the selling of the business, but if you run a business and somebody comes along and says that you should pay more money.

I am of the opinion that if I invested money on land and the hon. junior member for Christ Church is in business, I feel that, although the income tax people had made increases on the relative difference on the sale of land, the Capital Gains duty is merited. However, you should watch it. There is another reason why Capital Gains duty should not be disregarded. It is because it is a means of protecting a community and is a means of holding land in trust. I believe that you hold land in trust for future generations. I do not believe that any of us in this generation owns land with the idea that it is an inherent right to hold it because we all have come about owning land through various means. We are therefore only holders of land for future generations because we are not here forever. The people who come after us will occupy the land on which we are living and will be carrying on the work which we are doing now; therefore, we are only trustees of land for future generations. Land and its appurtenances should be so governed by law that they should not become burdensome for future generations to have the same privileges as we have.

I repeat, the price of land has outstripped all of the other things that have taken place in this community, such as wages, salaries and cost of foodstuffs; and we must put a stop to it, else our successors would find it impossible to own a home. I do not know what hope there is for the average working class man of owning land if land value is going to continue to rise at the spiral at which it is rising today. I will not even come down as far as the man with average pay because the capital income of the country is less than $500 per annum. That man will never be in the house-owning class at all. When you go as far as people in the higher income, their average income is something which is not more than $240 per month. Many years ago, the average working class man struggled to own a chattel house and a piece of land: but people today now depend on winning a sweepstake in order to be able to own a home. Take for instance, the hon. member on my left.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. senior member for St. Peter referring to the hon. member on his immediate left?

Mr. WALCOTT: Yes, Sir. The hon. member lives in close proximity to the Garrison pasture and you will very

well know from that that he is a believer in seeing horses run and I understand that he pins his faith on that. I understand that he has been successful on one or two occasions, and I also understand that it is only because his weight in his earlier days was more than what it calls for to qualify in participating in racing in a more active fashion; else he would have qualified.

However, I feel that we cannot at this stage ignore these facts which stare us in the face about land values, and I hope that close attention would be paid to all the facets of development and land dealing in accordance with the needs of our community. As the hon. junior member for Christ Church has said, we all welcome this Bill. It was passed here already and we hope that now we are examining it that the points which are raised would be closely examined. I feel sure so far as our community generally is concerned that this is something which is done in the interest of the community generally.

The last point made by the Hon. Premier when he spoke about the toll tax is something which I was not clear as to what he meant. I do not know if it was a rhetorical statement which he was making. I think it is one of those things to which people do not grow accustomed. I know that it was mooted one time that you were going to bring in a toll tax, but one of the problems is how much money can you get from the introduction of such a tax. You will have to block up so many roads because there are one or two places where you can take another road to get back. You generally have to go back the same way which you came from.

5.40 p.m.

There are only one or two places to which you could go in Barbados and you have to come back in the same way. If you go to the parish of St. Lucy, in your constituency, Mr. Speaker, in order to get back to your residence you have to make a big detour. You will have to make a big pilgrimage in order to save the toll tax if it were put at Holetown. If you want to avoid that tax, you will see the pilgrimage which you will have to make, or you will have to block all the entrances at the points which you will have to go. In the United States of America, where you have millions of people travelling, the imposition of this tax makes sense; but in Barbados, the administration is not worth it. In Jamaica the Minister of Finance found that the administration of collecting a bicyle tax was not worth the tax being collected. There was a bicycle tax of 32 cents a wheel in Jamaica but there is no such tax now. Mr. Nethersole had some calculation made and it proved that it costs more to collect the bicycle tax than they were collecting in this taxation, so that they stopped collecting this tax. In any taxation which you impose, you have to be careful that the administration in collecting the tax does not cost you more than what you are getting from the tax. We, in Barbados, would have to go easy on the question of a toll tax. Unless you are going to put a toll tax on Baxter's road, for instance, where so many people have to pass every morning, you are not doing anything. The question of a toll tax was raised in connection with the Deep Water Harbour; some person mentioned something about paying a tax to see the Deep Water Harbour. I said that that was because of the novelty of it; but when you have people going away you would have other people asking: "Is this what they are asking us to see?" I think that the Government would be wise not to impose a tax for that.

I do not think that we have so many avenues for taxation and we have to rely on the more orthodox methods of taxation. As the hon. junior member for Christ Church has said, I think that we will all agree that this Bill is one with which we agreed already. Although we have differences of opinion, my difference of opinion with the hon. junior member for Christ Church is a matter of detail and not of principle. If the hon. member had to impose a tax he would vary it, but I am still a believer in a Capital Gains tax on land. One hon. member has said that if people want land they could get around the tax; but if you get a tax on them it will be to the benefit of the community. I commend the Government in bringing back this Bill dealing with this tax and I wonder what has been taking place to cause the delay in re-introducing this legislation.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Speaker, I must say that a Bill of this sort is worthwhile. We have been hearing quite a lot concerning land in Barbados. I do not think it would be wise for me just to sit here and not say something about the land, because I myself am a landowner and I know plenty about the land and how it is situated in Barbados. This betterment charge is something which is worthwhile and I will give you my reason for saying that. Even the very people of Barbados do not realise the full value of land in Barbados, but those who come from outside know the value of the land in Barbados. I see that the land at Sandy Lane was sold out. I cannot now quote the figure at which it was sold, but I am certain that today it is being sold at between $14,000 and $16,000 an acre. I am quite sure that if this policy were in force, the Government would have profited much as a result of these developed areas. I am certain that when the East Coast Road is constructed - there are thousands of acres of land on that coast which are standing idle today because of the absence of that road. Since people have heard that the East Coast Road is coming into existence, thousands of people are walking from Bathsheba to St. Andrew and choosing spots and selecting areas for their houses. If the Government is seeking to regain some of the money which it proposes to spend on the East Coast Road by way of betterment charges, then I think that they are doing something which is good.

Right now the land does not profit the people anything because there is no road. You can see from Bathsheba to St. Andrew and *vice-versa;* you can see from one end to the other; but you cannot get there because of the absence of a road. The construction of the East Coast Road would be a boom to this Island. Thousands of houses will be erected, and there will be plenty of work opened up for carpenters, masons, painters, domestic servants and all types of employees; all of these people will be able to obtain employment. When that road is constructed you will have one of the best areas in the island. A doctor has told me that when you open your mouth at Windy Hill you will receive the iodine from the sea. There are those who go all over the world and when they come to Barbados they must testify to the fact that here we have the best formed land throughout the world.

5.50 p.m.

People can enjoy health from each corner of Barbados. I can walk from one beach to another, and lie down and sleep until morning without anything interfering with me - neither the cold, wild animals, or mosquitoes; and I see the time coming, Mr. Speaker, when tourists from all over the world will come to this Island. I think the Premier did a good thing when he brought this Bill before the House, because I know the thousands of dollars that will go into the Treasury from this Bill. A lot of people in the past got away with murder. They buy a piece of land today for $500 and within the next six years they sell it for $4,000 or $5,000. I can assure you, Sir, that at Walkers in St. Andrew farmers have sold land at $720 an acre, and I saw the same land sold at $33,000 an acre.

When the East Coast Road is erected, Mr. Speaker, people from all over the Island will put up resorts there, and those who have land around that area would be just glad to pay some of the money they receive to have the road built. I remember that in 1960 when I was in this House a Bill similar to this was passed by this Chamber, but I do not know whether it has gone into the sea or in the fire. I am glad to see that this Bill has come back to the House. There is nothing in the world which causes a man to fall more than false promises and pride, and any man who comes here and presents a Bill for the benefit of the people and then throws it away, is a fraud and cannot be trusted in any capacity, because the adjustment screw to his heart is already worn.

Mr. Speaker, I have great pleasure in associating myself with those who commended this Bill. I do not have much more to say on this, but I hope it will be passed unanimously, because when it comes into force, it will be for the betterment of the people of Barbados, and from the construction of the East Coast Road thousands of acres of land will come into cultivation. Anything which this Government brings that is wrong, I am going to point out to

them, because I am here for justice; and the day they do not take heed, they will meet disaster. As I said before, Sir, pride is a dirty thing. I remember some time ago when Mr. Cox who is not here now, used to come here with his bosom as stiff as a donkey's collar, but now it has gone down like a sad sack. That was only through pride. The Lord seeth the proud afar off, and it is He who is ruling today. He tried the Conservative Party and the Labour Party, and He is now trying the Democratic Labour Party, and if they do not do good, He will come down and take over Himself. I hope that my Party will continue with strength and I extend to it all good wishes. I thank you, Sir, for your patience, and I trust that this Bill will come into operation in due season for the benefit of the people.

Mr. SPEAKER: Before the Hon. and Learned Premier replies, is there any other hon. member who proposes to speak on the second reading? Apparently there is none. Let the Hon. Premier proceed.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, a point was made by the hon. junior member for Christ Church in which he expressed the fear that the development charge or betterment charge might continue after Government had recouped itself for the expenditure incurred in carrying out the development. There is nothing in the Bill, Sir, which prescribes the period or the amount of the development charge in relation to the expenditure which has been undertaken; but as far as I can see from the opinions expressed by the experts, namely the Town and Country Planning Officer and other people concerned with the carrying out of the provisions of this Bill, going right back to 1959, the better opinion appears to be that Government having recovered the expenditure would not be concerned about any further development charge. Actually some figures are quoted in relation to the cost of the development which, as you know, we intend to carry out as a mortgage insurance rental scheme, and the figures quoted there are actually twice as high as I think the recent calculations have disclosed. At that time way back in 1959, it was calculated that development in Cave Hill would amount to 16 cents per square foot, and it was clearly expressed - and I am not binding the Government or anyone when I say this; I am merely telling the hon. member what I understand from my study of the files on the matter — that the development charge would either be 16 cents or 50% per square foot, whichever was less. I have tried to work this out, and it does not work out as far as I am concerned, because if it is 16 cents per square foot and the development charge was 50% of the increased value whichever is less, it means that Government might not recover the full amount of development, but that is what was expressed at one of the meetings which were held to consider this matter.

6.00 p.m.

The recent figures, as far as I can gather, - and I am not now speaking from the files - would be an average of seven cents a square foot which the hon. senior member for the City can tell us would cost about $3,000 an acre to develop land in Barbados. That is taken as the general figure, but the scheme would have its own sewerage system, it will have shopping areas, schools and playgrounds, gardens and a park. All that would be part of the cost of the development. It will also have a green belt area along the edge of the northern strip to which the general public would have access. That is not a figure which was quoted to pin anyone to the development charge of seven cents per square foot - but after that, the Government would not be normally interested in any further development in that area. The betterment charge would be on a slightly different basis because you have valuation periods and you may not recover the whole thing in any one year. It may take the Government twenty years to recover what it costs them.

This is not a device to get increased annual revenue; this is a device which is designed purely to recover the cost of the expenditure. Then, after we have finished with that area, that ceases to be a development area.

I would just like to correct the hon. senior member for St. Andrew on one thing. We do not intend if an individual landowner makes application to the General Board of Health to develop his land himself that any development charge should apply to that area; therefore this Bill is not designed to stiffle development by private enterprise. I think this was one of the points which was made by one of the members of the Other Place. This Bill does not in anyway interfere with a person developing an area. Where Government is spending money, Government must be assured recovery of at least part of the expenditure.

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

On motion of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. BATSON in the Chair.

Clauses 1 and 2 were called separately and passed.

Clause 3 was called. It reads as follows:-

3. (1) Subject to the provisions of subsection (2) of this section whenever the Government undertakes, or proposes to undertake, in any area, expenditure from public funds which in the opinion of the Governor-in-Executive Committee, is substantial, it shall be lawful for the Governor-in-Executive Committee, by order -

(a) to declare any such area to be a special development area under this Act and the provisions of this Act shall apply in relation to land in that area; and

(b) to specify the specified base date which shall not be more than one year before the publication in the Official Gazette of the order; and

(c) to specify the development date which shall not be more than ten years after the specified base date.

(2) Every order made under this section shall as from the date of publication in the Official Gazette be of full force and effect:

Provided that every such order shall be laid before both Houses of the Legislature as soon as may be, and if within the period of forty days beginning with the day on which any such order is so laid before it either House of the Legislature resolves that the order be annulled, it shall thenceforth be void and of no effect:

Provided further that in reckoning any such period of forty days as aforesaid no account shall be taken of any time during which the Legislature is dissolved or prorogued.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Sir, hon. members will remember that when this printed Bill was presented some time on 2nd May, this year, amendments were circulated, but they are not in the printed copy of the Bill.

There is an amendment to Clause 3, subsection (2). The whole of Clause 3 (2) is deleted and instead of "Every order made under this section shall as from the date of publication in the Official Gazette be of full force and effect: I have decided that it would be more equitable if we have it done by Resolution. Therefore, I am amending that subsection so that any order made under this section shall not come into force unless it is approved by both Houses of the Legislature. The amendment will read as follows:-

"(2) No order made under this Section shall come into force unless it is approved by resolution of both Houses of the Legislature."

The provisos will not now apply because we are doing it by Resolution.

I am sure the hon. junior member for Christ Church and the hon. senior member for the City should be aware that that Clause is coming out and a new Clause substituted. We are not making the Orders from date of publication but we are saying that the Orders must be brought to the House and approved by both Houses of the Legislature. They will only be approved after both Houses of the Legislature have passed them.

6.10 p.m.

That will call for a consequential amendment to the "Objects and Reasons" of the Bill. The Objects and Reasons, of course, do not form any part of the Act when it comes into force, because it is not part of the Bill no more than the Preamble is. In fact, the marginal notes will appear in the Act. The "Objects and Reasons" do not appear, but the consequential amendment to the "Objects and Reasons" should read:

"An order made under Clause 3 must be approved by Resolution of both Houses of the Legislature before coming into force."

Therefore the words "Every order made under this Section shall as from the date of publication in the *Official Gazette* be of full force and effect "will have to be deleted. I am asking leave that those words be deleted.

There being no objection, leave was granted.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: With that deletion, Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 3 as amended stand part.

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

The question that Clause 3 as amended stand part of the Bill was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clauses 4 to 25 inclusive were called and passed.

Clause 26 was called. It reads as follows:-

26. (1) Every person, whether or not he is liable to pay development duty or betterment charge, upon whom the Commissioner may cause a notice to be served requiring him to make and deliver a return of such particulars as may be specified in the notice, shall, within fifteen days of the service of such notice make and deliver to the Commissioner a return as aforesaid.

(2) The Commissioner may, by not less than fourteen days notice in writing, require any person to attend before him and give evidence with respect to any transaction in relation to land in a special development area.

(3) The Commissioner may require any person to furnish a statement of receipts and expenditure by such person in relation to any land in a special development area and, where the Commissioner is not satisfied with the statement delivered by any such person, he may serve on that person a notice in writing requiring him to do any of the following things, that is to say —

(a) to deliver to the Commissioner copies of such accounts (including balance sheets) relating to the land as may be specified or described in the notice within such period as may be therein specified, including, where the accounts have been audited, a copy of the auditor's certificate;

(b) to make available, within such time as may be specified in the notice, for inspection by the Commissioner all such books, accounts and documents in his possession or power as may be specified or described in the notice, being books, accounts and documents which contain information as to transactions in relation to the land.

(4) If any person on whom a notice has been served under this section fails, without reasonable excuse, to comply with the requirements of this notice he shall be guilty of an offence against this Act.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I beg to move that Clause 26 stand part of the Bill.

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, this sub-Clause (1) sets out that every person whether or not he is liable to pay development duty or betterment charge, upon whom the Commissioner may cause a notice to be served requiring him to make and deliver a return of such particulars as may be specified in the notice, shall, within 15 days of the service of such notice make and deliver to the Commissioner a return as aforesaid. Does the hon. member think that that period of 15 days as set out in this sub-Clause is sufficient time or does he not think that that period should be be extended? I think that that period of 15 days is a fairly short time in dealing with a matter of this sort. I am wondering if the Premier does not think that that period should be extended to a period of 30 days. The Government does not stand to lose anything; as a matter of fact, they rather stand to gain because of the number of places which they may be developing. I am thinking that there should even be an extension of 21 days in connection with the delivery of this return to the Commissioner of Inland Revenue. A man may not be able to get the necessary particulars within this period of 15 days. Particulars may be required from the Registry and possibly they may be required from abroad. I am not throwing any reflection on the Solicitors or anything like that. I am suggesting or I am asking if the Minister does not think that an extension of 21 days would not make it much easier for the average citizen.

6.20 p.m.

I have read the Bill, Mr. Chairman, but it has been drawn to my notice that a person may give a reasonable excuse, but anyone who does not give a reasonable excuse shall be guilty of an offence against this Act. The definition of "reasonable excuse" is purely for the legal interpretation of the Judiciary, and I am still asking that the fifteen days be extended to twenty-one. I would like to hear the Minister on this, because there is no point in making a motion unless I can get support. I have discussed this matter with Mr. Stevens whom I find very knowledgeable on it, but I feel that the time should be extended.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, in Section 27 of the Jamaica Act of 1958 which I have before me here, it gives fifteen days from the date of service of the notice for the person to reply to the Commissioner. The information which the Commissioner would normally require from a person is not information of a technical nature at all; it is simple straightforward information which, if the person had a telephone, he could get over to the Commissioner. But these things are required to be in writing, and if a person wanted to consult a Solicitor, all he has to do is to say so, that he is not certain about certain things and ask for further time, or tell the Commissioner that he will provide further information when he gets it. In a matter like this, we cannot have unnecessary delays, and it is not technical information which would be requested of any person at all, but simple, straightforward information, probably as to how long a person had been in possession of the land. That should not be very difficult for a person to answer in fifteen days. The period in Jamaica is fifteen days, and the period here is exactly the same as in Jamaica, and we have not heard that it has operated as any hardship against landowners or occupiers of tenantries in Jamaica. Quite honestly, this would now entail so many different consequential

amendments that I think the hon. member would agree with me that it would be better to leave it at fifteen days and see how it works, rather than tinker about with it just thinking of a number and saying that a period of thirty days is better than fifteen days, because my experience, with all due respect, is that to certain worthy gentlemen in this community, there is no difference between thirty days and fifteen months. If they are going to work, they are going to work; but if they are not going to work, fifteen months are not good enough.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I should like to tell the hon. member that he should not take Jamaica as an example, because the title and boundaries of land are very easily defined for the purposes of this particular Act in Jamaica. I know for a fact that the type of question which would be asked here could be answered in fifteen days, but as the Premier has said, there are certain worthy gentlemen who might take fifteen months instead of fifteen days. I myself feel that it it should be at least 21 days.

The question that Clause 26 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clauses 27 to 35 inclusive were called and passed.

The Schedule was called and passed.

On the motion of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill with amendments in Committee, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On the separate motions of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded in each case by Hon. C. E. TALMA, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

6.30 p.m.

RESOLUTION re REPORT OF THE EAST CARIBBEAN FEDERATION CONFERENCE, 1962

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 1, stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Education: to resume debate on a Resolution relative to the Report of the East Caribbean Federation Conference, 1962.

Last week, the hon. senior member for the City was addressing the House and apparently he has not yet concluded his address.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, before you go on to that, I would like to draw to your attention that there are several Bills before Select Committees and the House is going to be adjourned for the summer recess on the 28th August, this month, this year. There are a large number of matters before Select Committees and it appears that when measures go to Select Committees, the members of those Select Committees never meet and it is rumoured that this is a way of dismissing the measures altogether.

I want to get through the Order Paper, including the Answers to Questions. We have no control over Private Members' Business; therefore, before going back to Order No. 1, I would be very grateful if those hon. members who are now on Select Committees — and this also goes for the Clerk of the House — would give attention to those matters and have them finalised. I think it is very undesirable to have Bills held up in Select Committees for such a long time.

I have no objection to our proceeding with Order No. 1, I only want to say that we do have all these matters to clear up on the Order Paper, and we hope to be able to get some progress. There is one Bill in the name of the hon. senior member for the City — the Bill to change the name of the Leeward Island Conference of Seventh Day Adventists — which has been before the House before the dissolution of the General Assembly last year and it was voted out at the time of the dissolution. Now it has come back up, and since 10th July, it was before Select Committee.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I would just like to draw to the Hon. Premier's attention that, as far as I am concerned, I appreciate the fact that this Bill was sent to a Select Committee on 10th July but it must be advertised; that is to say, it must appear in the *Official Gazette* for two weeks before we can pass it. It might have been before the House during the last Session but I have just brought it in. As soon as the time is up, I will be calling on the Clerk to call a meeting of the Select Committee. As I understand it, it must be advertised two weeks before we can deal with it in Select Committee.

Sir, as far as I am concerned, any Bill which stands in my name will be dealt with as expeditiously as possible as long as I am given the opportunity and the time to do so.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is the Select Committee's Report on the Bill to amend the Representation of the People Act, 1957, on which I think, we were awaiting the arrival to the Island of the hon. senior member for St. Peter to whom this House granted leave and who has returned a week ago; and it is likewise in the case of the Select Committee to report on the Bill to amend the Bank Holidays Act in which we were awaiting the return of the same hon. member and the Hon. Minister of Development, Trade, Industry and Labour who has been on Government business outside of the Island.

Mr. WALCOTT: So far as my Bills are concerned — I do not know if I am right, but as regards the Bills to amend the Representation of the People Act, 1957, I had some communication about this Bill from the Government to the effect that the Government intends doing something about it. If it is not this Bill, it is one of the other Bills which stands in my name. Government has communicated to me that it proposes making some other amendments to the Act. Therefore, I was of the opinion that the delay in that matter was because something was taking place at Bay Street.

Mr. SPEAKER: As regards the Select Committee appointed to consider the Bill to amend the Trade Union Act, 1939, both the hon. senior member for St. Peter and the Hon. Minister of Development, Trade, Industry and Labour were out of the Island on important business.

Mr. WALCOTT: As regards that measure, I have a letter from the Government to the effect that they intend making comprehensive amendments to that Act and requesting me not to proceed with that Bill; so I feel that the Hon. Premier should be aware of these things.

Mr. SPEAKER: Item 3 on the Order Paper deals with the third reading of a Bill further to amend the Bank Holidays Act, 1905. That too, is also awaiting the report of the Select Committee.

I would just like to say that hon. members must not pay any heed to any announcements in the Press or otherwise as to what the House would be doing on a particular date, as that is not dictated to by the Press or by any other section of the public, Rediffusion or otherwise. The House decides the business which it would do on any day upon which it meets.

The only matter remaining on the Order Paper is the matter to which I just hinted and on which I explained just now that the hon. senior member for the City was addressing the House when it lastly adjourned.

Mr. WALCOTT: Sir, as this is a matter which was raised by the Hon. Premier, he should be in a position to

say to hon. members what is the position on these matters, because so far as I am concerned, I am quite prepared to go through with all my Bills; but, as I have said, I have had this communication. It really has got me dumbfounded to hear what the Hon. Premier has said, after receiving this communication.

Mr. SPEAKER: Perhaps the matter may be resolved between now and the next meeting of the House by reference to the proper files.

The hon. senior member for the City may or may not now continue. There is no obligation.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I accept the invitation to proceed with my remarks on this matter. On this question, to resume debate on the Resolution relative to the Report on the East Caribbean Federation Conference, 1962, the Resolution which stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Education reads as follows:-

"RESOLVED that this House approve the Report of the East Caribbean Federation Conference, 1962, held at Marlborough House, London, from 9th May, 1962 to 24th May, 1962, with the proposals and recommendations contained therein."
6.40 p.m.

As I said, this Resolution stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Education and it invites this House to approve the Report of the East Caribbean Conference; and not only to approve the Report, but to approve and agree to the recommendations contained therein. I take it, Sir, that really and truly sufficient time has certainly now been given to every member of this Honourable Chamber to scan as fully as possible the Report of this Conference which was held at Marlborough House and get the necessary information, data and follow up and give very careful consideration to it. As I said on the last occasion, as an individual and as the Leader of a Party, we are not opposed to a Federation; but I made it quite clear that in going through the Report which is really a summary of the views or the majority views expressed by the leading Ministers of the eight territories, in it I do not necessarily see the views of other delegates, because as I said, they are the majority views. Barbados was represented by the Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour, the hon. and gallant Premier and myself, as a member of the Opposition, and other observers were present.

I said then that it was not anything to which I, as a delegate, had appended my signature and therefore there was not everything to which I actually agreed in every Section or in every paragraph of that Report. In point of fact, looking thoroughly through paragraph 38 of chapter 7 of the Report, I think I mentioned the way in which it reads. And this is how it reads:-

"The Federal Government would have made available to it revenues from import duties, postal services, Court fees and currency profits. Any surplus of import duties deemed to exist by the Federal Government would be returned to Units on a derivation basis."

My memory serves me very well on this particular point because it was at this point that the learned and gallant Premier made a very strong speech when it was argued that instead of returning such funds you should have a reserve or a balance. I do not recall at any time the words so used or of hearing, speaking subject to correction, the words "deemed to exist" having been used. I am somewhat worried about the use of this phrase. "The Federal Government would return any surplus of import duties deemed to exist by the Federal Government." I do not remember, and I shall await the hon. member's reply, if he has anything in his papers, because I cannot find anything about that in my papers. I think that there was a very strong speech made by the hon. member as regards keeping reserves, that Barbados did not agree on the grounds that we, or at least the Hon. Leader of the delegation had agreed in his Manifesto to bring about certain social reforms in this country and we have to be very careful about this matter. I see that it has been put in very shrewdly. I am not accusing anybody of anything, but if you agree to this — only those surplus import duties deemed to exist by the Federal Government — in other words, after using what you need for the Federal services, the balance must be returned.

The phrase "deemd to exist" is rather elastic, and in my opinion, it confers a tremendous lot of power. There have been quite a lot of things in the Press which deal with the question of a strong centre; there has been a lot mentioned also by the Chamber of Commerce about a strong Federation or a strong centre. Any one who reads this Report, if he would look at Chapter 5, I believe, he would see there the entire structure of the Federal Government and the form of Unit Government; and that in itself shows what type of structure there will be, whether it is going to be strong or not. I am very — I do not want to use the word "suspicious" — but I am very critical of this particular point because when you read through this Report very thoroughly you will find that we will be agreeing, if we agree to this Resolution today as presented by the Minister of Education, with the number of seats in the Federal Legislature — I believe there will be 18 of which Barbados will have only five.

Thinking of a strong centre, I am wondering what will be the position of Barbados. Dealing again with the Report more thoroughly, you will see that the only means by which the Federal Constitution could be amended would place Barbados in a very different position with five members and the combined Leeward and Windward Islands having 13 members. The only way in which we could amend that would be by an absolute majority.
6.50 p.m.

I remember distinctly, in discussing this matter, we tried to get, and I think we did get, the difference between an absolute majority and a simple majority; but the more I have gone into this, the more I see still that an absolute majority could be formed with the Leewards and Windwards, and Barbados need not even be at the meeting of the Federal Legislature at that particular time. I want to repeat that I am not opposed to a Federation of Barbados and the Windwards and Leewards. I am not among those who stand here and say one thing to members of a Government and then walk about for any personal reasons to canvass people against Federation at this stage, because I feel that somebody in Barbados or somebody in Antigua might become Premier or the like. These things have been brought to my notice and I understand they are going on. I am dealing with this matter as a matter of principle, and as I see it, therefore, Mr. Speaker, there is more than we can normally agree upon this evening just by saying that we agree with the Report or approve the proposals and recommendations contained therein.

Mr. Speaker, it is my feeling that there should be some proviso. Now it has been argued that if the Second Eleven goes to the Federal and the First Eleven remains at home, the Federation must fail; but I believe myself as I have been following these islands and their developments within recent years and coming into contact with the leading Ministers, these gentlemen have really made great contribution towards the progress of these islands in the Leewards and Windwards. I know what I am going to say now is not going to be very popular, but I am going to say it because I feel down in my heart that it is honest and true. Looking through this Report, Sir, and following the constitution of other Federations, it prohibits members from holding dual seats; it prohibits members from serving in the Unit territories and at Federal level. If we leave out Barbados for the time being and take from Antigua back down to

Grenada and St. Vincent, I want to say that the majority of these leading Ministers have made great strides and contributions to the progress of these colonies, and it is my view that even if it is going to be unique in the history of Federation, opportunity should be given to members to serve for at least the first five years in both Houses provided that they could only draw one salary. I am going to be told possibly by learned members of this House that that would be creating a precedent, that this is something which could not happen; but I believe if you want this Federation to live and last, or if this is to be a Federation at all, you must give that opportunity. Human nature being what it is, I cannot imagine some of the gentlemen whom I have met as leaders in these islands taking instructions from some of the persons who might be put up by Parties and catch the eye of the electorate by being elected to Federal Parliament.

Mr. Speaker, if you read the section which deals with income tax, for instance, I think it is section 26, you will see that it says the Federal Government would lay down the types of allowance on which relief from personal income tax could be claimed, but the Unit Governments would determine the rates of such allowances. Anybody with a nodding acquaintance of running a country and of what income tax means to a country, must realise what that means. I do not want to be unduly critical of it, but I am certainly in a position to say what it means and what will happen. To solve this matter, I believe that if you allowed members to serve at both levels for a given period, the Federation would have a chance.

In going through this Report, and in looking up some information on it, I came across a book entitled "Modern Constitutions" by K. C. Wheare, with which I think the Hon. Minister of Education would be acquainted, and I should like the permission of this House just to quote from this book for the simple reason that people will appreciate when they talk about a strong centre and giving them power with money and the like, what it means. This is what it says:

"Another strong force towards centralisation is the development in recent times of a series of policies known usually as 'the welfare state' or 'the social service state.' I prefer to use 'the social service state'. "It has come to be accepted by the citizens and by the rulers of certain states, particularly of those in which universal suffrage exists" — such as exists in Barbados and the Leewards and Windwards — "that it is the duty of Government to ensure that all citizens should be provided with a minimum standard of welfare, whether they can afford it or not."

Whether or not they can afford it is an important point. He goes on to say:-

"They should be provided with education, with health services, with maintenance in times of sickness or unemployment or old age.

7.00 p.m.

"A fair share of the food that is available should be allocated to each citizen at prices which he can afford to pay. These policies have two characteristics of importance. They are expensive to carry out, for they call for a great provision of buildings and equipment and they require, for their execution, a large force of salaried workers — teachers, nurses, doctors, administrators, visitors, and inspectors — and their wages and salaries bill is consequently high. In the second place the welfare services are needed most by those who can, as a rule, afford them least. It is the rich, the healthy, the employed who must supply the funds from which the poor and the sick and the unemployed receive their assistance."

Now, this is the important point:

"Only a central government can ensure that these welfare services will be available wherever they are needed in a country. They have access to what wealth there is and they can transfer it from the better-off citizens or regions to those where the need is greater."

Now, Mr. Speaker, that must mean something to every thinking Barbadian. From St. Kitts, Anguilla, Nevis, Montserrat, Antigua and Dominica to St. Vincent and Grenada — and this is no bombast nor is it that I am boasting — I think it is universally known that if you take these islands of the Eight, Barbados has the highest standard of living. There is this thought about a strong centre, this thought about giving up a lot of right, this thought of not having Ministers: but I am just making my position abundantly clear. You have to weigh it and look at it this way. There are eighteen members to form the Federal Government. I am not going to mince any words on this. It would mean thirteen to five; therefore, it is an absolute certainty that the thirteen members representing the seven small members, if you take Barbados on this level and put Montserrat, Nevis, St. Kitts and the others on the other level — that their majority is going to run it and they would run it because under this report the only way you can amend the constitution is by an absolute majority — not a two-thirds. There might be other means of putting it. Otherwise, it means that Barbados need not to be at a meeting at all and by an absolute majority, they can run it.

I cannot agree to it that way. By an absolute majority you can amend. You must remember that when they take the view that Barbados with its present standard of living — not that it is much higher than the other of those islands and they have the majority in the Federal Legislature — you are quite certain that they are going to do what I have said and read here from K. C. Wheare. They would have access to what wealth there is and they can transfer it from the better off citizens or regions to those where the need is greater.

If the present Government with its social reform has gone to the people and made promises, and if the present Government in Barbados has to raise taxation, loans or whatever the case may be, let me impress upon you that you do not have the absolute majority. There are things which I would not like to say here now because someone may say that they would tend to interfere with the coming together of these units. Therefore I refrain from saying them. However, I have lived for three weeks in England and I watched and watched carefully and studied carefully. For those reasons, I believe that the Resolution by the Hon. Minister of Education should not be passed without an amendment.

I am therefore moving that the words "with the proposals and recommendations contained therein" be deleted and the following provisos added.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. senior member for the City moving an amendment to the motion?

Mr. MOTTLEY: Yes, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will you wait on the Clerk? Let the hon. member continue speaking until there is a Clerk to write it down.

Mr. MOTTLEY: All right, Sir. As I was saying, with the availability of the resources of this Island and having an absolute majority to work with, I find that I could not vote for this Resolution this evening as it stands. I do not suggest that it was hurriedly drafted, but I do believe myself that when the Hon. Minister gives more thought to it, he

would see that the amendment which I offer will give Barbados more confidence in the situation.

As I have said, we have found that more people in Barbados today are interested or understand more about Federation than they did on the last occasion, because even with Polling Day declared a Bank Holiday, only 25% of the electorate turned out to vote at the Federal Elections. But surely Barbadians are not going to be interested to the extent to join in a Federation like this because, after all, this is political unity; this is not a Congress of Bishops or a Congress of churches meeting at which we observe the injunction of Holy Writ in which it is said: "Ye who are strong should bear the infirmities of the weak." This is nothing that you can go to Montserrat and say: "Well, we who are strong are going to bear the infirmities of the weak." This is if you can come together and if they can carry their share of taxation.

I said, may be, the Hon. Minister of Education or the Hon. gallant and learned Premier might destroy all I have to say from the point of view that the Federation coming here and putting that amount of money in circulation would compensate for what we in Barbados are going to contribute. I say, no.
7.10 p.m.

If you take the figures, we will be contributing one-half. It may be thought that I sent for Bustamante and that I am trying to pull out Barbados. However, I am not prepared to pass this Resolution as it stands and therefore I am moving this amendment.

Mr. SPEAKER: Has the hon. member got copies of the amendment?

Mr. MOTTLEY: Yes, Sir, I have copies which I have had circulated to hon. members. The copies of the amendment which I have passed around read as follows: I may say that I am not challenging the hon. member on the parliamentary structure of any document, but I say that I can use my commonsense at least. My amendment reads as follows:-

"RESOLVED that this House approve in principle the Report of the East Caribbean Conference 1962 held at Marlborough House, London from 9th May, 1962 to 24th May, 1962."

You will notice, Sir, that I have left out completely the words "with the proposals and recommendations contained therein". You are asking us to say that we agree with these proposals lock, stock and barrel, hook, line and sinker which we cannot do, because we must think. I say that we should approve of the principle of the Conference. My amendment goes on to state this:-

Provided that this House reserve the right to reconsider the position of Barbados in a Federation of the Eastern Caribbean if the Fiscal Commission reveals that the cost of such a Federation will involve further financial burdens on the island of Barbados to the detriment of the present standards of living of the inhabitants of this Island.

Provided further that steps are taken to ensure that Britain's entry into the European Common Market will in no way affect the guarantees of the Commonwealth Sugar Agreement thereby endangering the economic position of Barbados and undermining the financial capabilities of Barbados to contribute to such an Eastern Caribbean Federation.

Provided further that Paragraph 13 of Chapter 4 of the Report is amended to provide for dual membership of the Legislatures of a Unit and of the Federation on condition that only one Ministry be held by any one representative and only one salary paid to each representative."

That, Mr. Speaker, is the amendment in its substance which I should like to move to the Resolution as proposed by the Hon. Minister. I shall now formally beg to move that amendment to the Minister's motion. I counsel hon. members that what they will be agreeing to in my amendment will be the principle of the Report and that is what we should agree to. The principle is that you will have a Federation, but you want to know this. We are having this Federation all right, but we would like to know if it will entail any further financial burdens on Barbados. I would ask the Premier if it would be likely for us to go into Federation if it would be a financial burden. I do not remember the position exactly, but if it would cost money which we cannot afford, we have to consider that we will need money for our social services in this country. If you were only to read the speech dealing with this matter in London you will realise the reason why I am putting forward this amendment and why we should support it.

Speaking for the members of my Party, we are not opposing the principle of Federation; but while we are not grant-aided, as I was saying a few days ago, we are given a subsidy for sugar which, if we did not receive, we could not exist. Our social services could not go on without that subsidy, and the British delegation has said in this Report that they will be willing to help, but they are not willing to do so until after a fiscal survey has taken place. I ask if thinking men who are representing this colony and to whom we owe a great debt are expert in these fields, if the British delegation says "We will help but we must have a fiscal survey first", if they can say that, why should we say that we agree, lock, stock and barrel, hook, line and sinker with everything in the Report? We will await this survey. We should say, as I have suggested in my amendment, that we agree that this House approve in principle the Report of the East Caribbean Federation Conference provided that this House reserve the right to reconsider the position of Barbados in a Federation of the East Caribbean if the fiscal commission reveals that the cost of such a Federation will involve further financial burdens on the island of Barbados. We agree in principle with the Report provided that the Federation does not involve any further financial burdens on the island of Barbados to the detriment of the present standards of living of the inhabitants of this island.

Nobody who is elected by the people of Barbados would want to see that we join anything which would retard the progress of the people of this island. The feeling in the West Indies is that you should strike the chest and say: "We are a nation; we are independent." It is all well and good to say: "I am not longer a British West Indian; I am independent", but to what extent? Up to now, the only fiscal survey which has been made has been that made by Professor Arthur Lewis and he considers that we should be viable in another five years. Well, with the view of this economist, I differ; I cannot see that we will be economically independent within the next five years unless sand will bring a tremendous price and you will move it from Barbados to Montserrat. Ever as to his recommendations about tourism, I must confess that I cannot see the economic viability of which he speaks in another five years. We should not pass the Resolution moved by the Hon. Minister as it stands; we should not pass that Resolution which is asking us not only to approve the Report but to approve the proposals and recommendations contained in that Report. I shall agree to some of the proposals and recommendations, but we must have a proviso.
7.20 p.m.

The Hon. Minister of Education could not face the St. Lucy electorate and say that he could no longer carry out his promise in St. Lucy of feeding children because we have got to give money to the Federal Government or have got to build more schools in Montserrat, Anguilla or St. Kitts. This is no Congress of Biships; we have not got to let the injunction of Holy Writ guide us. We have got to be hard businessmen and politicians, realising that the votes of the electorate in Barbados put us here, and as a result, we

should do nothing or join into anything if it would mean our having to spend so much of our national revenue outside of Barbados. I am all for Federation with the provisos which I have put in. Why should we give our word or agree to all the proposals before a fiscal survey has been made?

Mr. Speaker, I might possibly have to answer a tremendous lot of people who might ask why I have said that Ministers should be allowed to serve in both the Unit Governments and the Federal Government. I am saying that because I seriously believe that if on the last occasion the best men had gone forward, we would not possibly be in this. This thing you call jealousy is a very serious matter, and personality is another very serious matter; but say what you will, whether you went to Oxford, Cambridge, Leeds or any other University, you have got to bow to the men in the West Indies who are not men of letters, but who have done their part. As I look at these gentlemen from the Leewards and Windwards, I came to the conclusion that something must have happened that they could come along to lead. Do you think they are going to give up like this? I say "no". You should give them an opportunity still to go on, but gradually over a period of five years, younger people will come in and take over, and we would lose nothing because one salary would be paid. I would go further and say that you should only hold one Ministry and not be a Minister in the Federal Government and a Minister in the Unit Territory.

It is possible, Sir, that someone would attempt to say this is an admission of a dearth of intelligence, but it is not. There is a big difference between intelligence and leadership, and the Hon. Mnister, I am sure, will be the first to agree with me on that. He has undoubtedly met some superintelligent men in his own lifetime and career who are not at all leaders, and therefore a difficulty will arise.

Mr. Speaker, I think I have said enough on this very important matter. I counsel hon. members not to take this just as a mere Party issue and to approve of the Resolution just because the Party asks them to approve the Report with the proposals and recommendations contained therein. My strong appeal will be to the Hon. Premier and the Ministers to reconsider this and to give serious consideration to my amendment. I am not an opponent to Federation, but I am an opponent to any association of people or states, whether or not it is a Federation, that will mean taking the revenue so badly needed in Barbados or such proportion of the revenue, which we could not afford, to spend it elsewhere. I am not saying that if we go into Federation we will not have to spend money, but I say for the last time that if Britain can say that she must take a survey to see what is happening, we should also know what must take place in Barbados.

No one person can deny that this country is taxed to the hilt. Some people think of taxation as merely paying income tax or paying on a house, but recently we see that it is not so. There is direct and indirect taxation. As someone said, the very air you breathe is sometimes regulated by your politics. I have moved the amendment to the hon. member's Resolution, and hope that as this debate will not be concluded tonight, members will have an opportunity to consider it carefully. We agree in principle with the Government, but we cannot agree to everything. If two men can agree at all times on everything, it does not take the Hon. Minister of Education to tell you what one is, because everybody in this country would know. Therefore whether you are a backbencher, member of the Opposition or Government Minister, you are bound to read this amendment carefully.

Only a few nights ago, Sir, I read the Report in conjunction with the Manifesto of the present Government Party, and I looked through my files to see the crops of Barbados in the last ten or fifteen years, and to see the money estimated from the United States, England and so on. From these figures we are much better off than the other islands, and we should try to pull them up. You cannot come and say in your Manifesto that these are the things needed, and then from this Report say that they will have the power to say they are going to make loans. We in Barbados have 126 schools and the gift of progeny, but the people in Montserrat can say that although they are not getting as many children as we are, the matter rests that they still need schools.

Yesterday I opened a Fair at St. Stephen's School and I was very proud to hear the Vicar in charge say, after showering praise on the Minister, that he was so happy that when he first went there about 13 years ago, there were 350 pupils at the school, but today the number is over 950 at this school. Can you imagine that? You are looking for money all around to spend on these things, and I would throw this out as a warning: anyone who would sacrifice the social amelioration and progress of Barbados today for Federation, although I am not opposed to Federation but with the provisos I have suggested, will pay the penalty. Sometimes we wonder why Trinidad with all its great wealth came out. You will remember during the War the great source of oil supply from Trinidad on which the British had to depend, and Jamaica with its vast acres of bauxite. As I have said all along, it is not the politicians in the West Indies who want Federation, but it is quite clear that the British Government wants to have no more trouble with us. 7.30 p.m.

There must be no more trouble with us and therefore, they get all the views expressed. They will help, but they must wait to be sure what the position is. The British people say that we will go in but they must wait to be sure what our financial position and obligations will be.

Sir, I have much pleasure in moving this amendment to the Government's motion and hope that there will be a compromise somewhere along the line. This is not just passing a Resolution for the sake of passing. This has come after giving great study to it. This is not expressing the view of the Chamber of Commerce or of anybody in this country at all. This is not getting together in my Party and saying anything. Talk strong centre or whatever you like. Sometimes I think that if you talk strong centre it would be the worst thing in Barbados. When you talk strong centre and then look back and see that it is a question of thirteen to five — two-thirds — an absolute majority can amend the whole constitution, that is a serious matter.

Sir, mine is now an appeal to the Hon. Minister of Education. Let him consult with other members of the Government. You cannot pass this as it is. Barbadians tonight all over the Island are listening to hear: are we to give up getting better schools which we have been promised? Are we to give up what we have been promised and longed for such as this assistance with a hot meal for school children? Are we to give up all the other things, or are we going to find the money to do these things and the other things under Federation? Sir, I am not opposed to Federation, but if the British delegation with all its superintelligence, with such brilliant men, cannot make their minds now and they have told us to wait and see, I say that we in Barbados must also wait and see.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the Hon. Minister of Education will give serious thought to this amendment of mine. This amendment is nothing against any member of the Government. I know that there is a rumour around here about preventing somebody from becoming Prime Minister. I have no part in that. I am interested in Barbados. I was born here; my ancestors were brought here and I am entitled to stay here, I am tied here and I am going to die here. I hope so.

Mr. Speaker, that is my contribution to this debate. I hope I am not unduly critical.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, ...

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. senior member for the City having moved an amendment to the motion, he is entitled to have a seconder to the motion. Is the Hon. Minister seconding the motion?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: No, Sir. I was speaking on my motion.

Mr. SEALY: Mr. Speaker,.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the Hon. Minister giving way to the hon. senior member for St. Michael?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: No, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Then the hon. senior member for St. Michael is reserving the right to speak later on.

Mr. SEALY: Yes, Sir.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on the main motion because it stands in my own name and by arrangement with my colleague, the Hon. learned and gallant Premier, I gave way to him several weeks ago when this motion was brought to the House because he had been more intimately concerned with these matters than I was. Of course, I had long wanted to make my contribution and I now have the opportunity of so doing.

I would like to say, Mr, Speaker, at this point that I do not propose to say anything at all except by implication on the amendment which has just been moved by the hon. senior member for the City because I have not discussed its terms with my colleagues. I have my own personal view upon it. I will only like to say that if my colleagues accepted it, I would have to leave the Cabinet on a matter of conscience; therefore, I have to address myself on the main motion and not on the amendment moved by the hon. member.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we are debating a motion against the background of events and happenings in this part of the world which are as important as anything else there can be. As I speak now, the people of Jamaica are celebrating their newly won independence. That is one of the aspects of the background which we have to take into account. We are debating this motion when a first attempt at national unity has floundered, when the first striving after nationhood has come to nothing, at a time when Great Britain herself is showing plainly that she is more than concerned with her own national fortunes than the Commonwealth, at a time when rival ideologies seem to tear the world apart. All of that is only part of the background against which our own situation is to be judged.

Now, Sir, I cannot debate this motion in a vacuum. I have to see the motion and our situation against the wide canvass of happenings and events in this part of the world, and the only reason why I stand to speak is because I care and care deeply about what is happening to the West Indian people. I am not saying that I care more than anybody else or that anybody else cares less than I do, but I care and care deeply.

This is the situation as I see it. In round figures the world population is two billion, four hundred million, and that large population is divided roughly into highly developed territories, territories of intermediate development and territories which are entirely underdeveloped. The highly developed territories consist of the North-western part of Europe, the United States, Canada, Australia and New Zealand. Their proportion is about 375 million people or less than one-sixth of the total world population. Those countries in the intermediate group represent a population of 425 million or a little more than one-sixth and they include seven countries in Europe, Japan, Israel, the Soviet Union and South Africa.
7.40 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, when you come to the remaining two-thirds among whom we are numbered, that one billion six hundred thousand, you get all the countries of Asia and Africa, all but five of the countries of Latin America and the entire West Indies. If you see, as I do, our own situation as being cast among the underdeveloped countries of the world, among that one billion six hundred thousand, it matters little how much higher is the standard of Barbados as against that of Montserrat. Therefore it seems to me that in tackling this problem as to whether this country should enter into Federation or not, two facts stand out — one of them economic and the other political. The economic fact is that because the West Indian people are numbered among the two-thirds of the world's population, that one billion six hundred thousand which comprise the underdeveloped masses of the world, because we are so numbered, our economic levels are far below the levels of the more favoured countries, certainly below the level of the intermediately developed countries and obviously below the level of the highly-developed countries; and the disparity in income per head of population is as wide as wide can be.

In the United States of America and Canada the income per head of population is a little over $1,500; in Montserrat, it is well below $100. Another factor is this; we cannot attack this problem in a vacuum and we cannot believe that, because for certain historical reasons we have been fortunate enough to live in this country without any trouble, relatively speaking, we are all that better off. We are not. Trinidad and Jamaica, which are now independent countries, are among this two-thirds of the world's population, this under-developed mass. The United States of America which has 6% of the total population of the world in rough figures, produces some 40% of the world's wealth; Europe, which can account for another 25% of the world's population, produces another 40%; it therefore rests with Asia, Africa and most of the Latin American countries including the West Indies to produce 20% or 22% and yet we have 65% of the world's population. That is the West Indian situation. If you look at the matter from the point of view of numbers we are among the under-developed countries, and from the economic point of view, we are still among the underdeveloped countries. If there is any way in which we can at all climb from the underdeveloped masses into the intermediate and, consequently, up to the level of the most highly-developed countries it can only be by acting in concert with one another. The whole recent history of the world has proved that acting by ourselves we cannot do anything.

Mr. Speaker, I pause here to say that we ought not to lament the temporary fragmentation of the West Indies because it is only temporary, and most of us who are living now will live to see national unity re-established, in the process of time, with Jamaica and Trinidad resuming their places with the rest of us as one nation. It is perhaps providential that they have broken away because they have rendered it more necessary for the rest of us to fight our way through from among the under-developed countries to our own place among intermediate countries and then among the highly-developed ones.

Mr. Speaker, at this point, since I have not even reached one-eighth of what I have to say in relation to this debate, I beg to move that the debate on this motion be further postponed.

Mr. BATSON: I beg to second that.

The question that the debate on this motion be further postponed was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS CONCLUDED

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, that concludes the consideration of Government Business for the day.

ADJOURNMENT

The Order Paper having been fixed.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next 14th August, 1962 at 2.30 o'clock in the afternoon.

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

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, speaking on the adjournment I only want to throw it out to the hon. senior member for St. Lucy that if it is his intention to adjourn the

House until 2.30 o'clock next Tuesday, we will have to carry on with Private Members' Business first. If the Hon. Minister does not want to do that, then he should adjourn until 12 o'clock noon next Tuesday. I am registering my protest in the early.

Mr. SPEAKER: I should like to remind the hon. member that it is, of course, within his province to move the adjournment of the House until 12 o'clock noon next Tuesday.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I formally beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next at 12 o'clock noon.

Mr. SMITH: I beg to second that.

Mr. MOTTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I am looking at the Hon. Minister of Communications, Works and Housing. On the last occasion I took the opportunity to draw to his attention a matter which existed, and I thought he would have been able to give me some information about it today. I observe that a certain section of the Press was very critical in accusing me of doing what I did for ulterior reasons or with some ulterior motive, but, of course, I pay no attention to that because the writer of that article will remain where he is for a long time yet, and the cognizance he possesses will deteriorate as time goes on. 7.50 p.m.

My question was in respect of the playing field at Y.M.P.C., and I think that by now the Hon. Minister ought to be able to tell us something on the matter.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. senior member for the City has reminded the Hon. Minister about his query into the Y.M.P.C. playing field. Perhaps the Hon. Minister may lay a Statement at the next meeting of the House. No debate may be initiated at this stage, but the Hon. Minister may say a word or two if he is ready.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On the motion for the adjournment, Sir?

Mr. SPEAKER: The new Standing Orders differ from the old Rules so that on the motion for adjournment, a member may not speak *ad infinitum* or sometimes *ad nauseam*.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I know that, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the Hon. Minister prepared to say anything now, or does he prefer to lay a Statement at the next meeting of the House?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, I would like to tell the hon. senior member for the City that I have investigated the matter and it is still under investigation. I have not received any direct file from the officer in charge of Town and Country Planning, as it would take twenty-eight days before the matter is referred to me under the Regulations of the Town and Country Planning Act, and that time will be up in another two days.

Mr. SPEAKER: The motion is that this House now stand adjourned until this day week at 2.30 p.m. To that motion an amendment has been moved that it now stand adjourned until 12 o'clock noon. I shall put the amendment first.

The question that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 14th August, 1962, at 12 noon, was put and resolved in the negative, the House dividing as follows:–

AYES: Mr. COWARD; Mr. HOLDER; Mr. SMITH; Mr. MILLER – 4.

NOES: Mr. BATSON; Hon. J. C. TUDOR; Hon. E. W. BARROW; Hon. C. E. TALMA; Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON; Mr. CORBIN; Mr. LOWE; Mr. YEARWOOD; Mr. CARMICHAEL; Mr. BOXILL; Mr. SEALEY; Mr. LYNCH and Mr. MOTTLEY – 13.

The question that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 14th August, 1962, at 2.30 p.m., was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

7.58 p.m.