
THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1962

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 28th August, 1962.

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 12 o'clock (noon) 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.; Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, (*Minister of Communications, Works, Housing and Tourism*); Mr. W. R. COWARD; Mr. W. R. LOWE; Mr. G. V. BATSON, (*Chairman of Committees*); Mr. J. B. YEARWOOD and Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, (*Minister of Social Services*).

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that the Minutes of the meetings held on the 29th May, 5th June, 12th June, 20th June, 26th June, 28th June and 29th June, as well as those of 3rd July of this year, have been printed and circulated amongst hon. members. Unless any hon. member objects, those Minutes will be taken as read and confirmed. (*After a pause*). No objection having been made, those Minutes are now taken as read and confirmed.

Mr. MOTTLEY and Mr. WALCOTT entered the House and took their seats.

DOCUMENT

Mr. SPEAKER: I also have the honour to inform the House that I have received a copy of the Town and Country Planning Development Rules, 1962, made by the Judicial Advisory Council for laying on the Table of this House.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Premier, I am commanded to lay the Local Government (Pensions) (Amendment) (No. 2) Regulations, 1962.

On my own behalf, I beg to lay the Customs Duties (Vehicles imported for the Brace Experiment Station of Mc.Gill University) Order, 1962.

On behalf of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries, I beg to lay the Twenty-fourth Annual Report and Statement of Accounts of the Peasants' Loan Bank for the year 1st June, 1960 - 31st May, 1961.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the following:-

The Third Annual Report of the Tourist Board for period 1st April, 1960 to 31st March, 1961.

The Barbados Tourist Board - Statement of Accounts for the year ended on the 31st March, 1961.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the following:-

The Annual Report of the Director of Medical Services for the year 1959-60.

The Annual Report of the Public Assistance Board for the period April, 1961 - March, 1962.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Government Notices were given as follows:-

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: (for the Hon. Premier and Minister of Finance.)

Resolution to place the sum of \$650 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1962-63, Part I - Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimate, 1962-63, No. 18 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, on my own behalf, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to approve, under the provisions of subsection (1) section 18 of the Natural Gas Corporation Act, 1950, the borrowing by the Natural Gas Corporation from the Government of a sum of \$250,000, the loan to be redeemable between 1975 and 1990 and to bear interest at a rate equivalent to that payable by the Government on its own long term borrowings.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR and Mr. CARMICHAEL entered the House and took their seats.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to place the sum of \$8,193 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1962-63, Part I - Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimate, 1962-63, No. 19 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Premier and Minister of Finance, I beg to give notice of a Bill to amend the Magistrates' Jurisdiction and Procedure Act, 1956.

On my own behalf, I beg to give notice of a Bill to amend the Customs Act, 1962.

LEAVE TO DEAL WITH RESOLUTIONS

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to deal with the Resolution for \$650,00, of which notice was given today, in all of its stages later in the day.

Mr. SPEAKER: I take it that that was the Resolution, copies of which were circulated with my permission to hon. members.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Definitely, Sir.

There being no objection leave was granted the Hon. Minister to deal with the Resolution in all its stages today.

12.25 p.m.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 35/1962 asked by the hon. senior member for St. Thomas on 10th April, 1962 is ready.

Also, Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 56/1962, asked by the same hon. member on 26th June, 1962, is ready.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 44/1962, asked by the hon. senior member for St. Thomas on 29th May, 1962, is ready.

Also, Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 47/1962, asked by the hon. junior member for St. Peter on 29th May, 1962, is ready.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I want to ask leave to deal with the Resolution for \$8,193 of which I gave notice earlier today in all its stages. I propose with Your Honour's permission to have copies cyclostyled and circulated at the very earliest possible opportunity during the morning session.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will grant that permission for circulation. Will the hon. member say briefly what is this Resolution for?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: This sum of \$8,193 is to meet the expenses of the Commission of Enquiry into the Sugar Industry of this Island.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has asked leave to deal with, in all its stages today, a Resolution, copies of which will be circulated before he attempts to deal with it, for \$8,193 to meet the expenses in connection with the Sugar Industry Investigation, and if there is no objection, the hon. member shall be granted leave.

Apparently there is no objection.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Resolution.

WHEREAS this House views with approval the declared intention of Her Majesty's Government to grant Independence and self-determination to British Colonies and dependencies, and,

WHEREAS this House sees with great joy and appreciation that the peoples of Trinidad and Tobago, bound to us by ancient ties of friendship and rivalry in games, have been granted their independence by Her Majesty's Government,

BE IT RESOLVED that this House on behalf of the people of Barbados express its sincere congratulations to the people of Trinidad and Tobago on obtaining their independence and wish them success and continued development and progress;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this House commission the Honourable Minister of Education to convey this Resolution passed by this House and signed by Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of External Affairs of the Government of Trinidad and Tobago for transmission to His Excellency the Governor-General.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will give permission for copies of this Resolution to be made available as early as possible

to hon. members. I take it that the first sentence refers to Her Majesty's Government of the United Kingdom.

The Hon. Leader of the House is asking for leave to deal with that Resolution in all its stages today, in view of the imminence of the Independence celebrations and ceremonies in Trinidad within a few days' time, and if there is no objection, leave will be granted.

There is no objection; leave is granted.

QUESTIONS

Mr. COWARD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Question:-

To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:

Is Government aware of the condition of the road known as 'Surinam Road', in the parish of St. Joseph?

2. If the answer is in the affirmative, will Government seek to have this road repaired as soon as may be conveniently possible?

Mr. BATSON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Question:-

To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:

Will Government explore the possibility of having Rediffusion Service Sets installed at specially reduced rates in all Government Schools throughout the Island in an effort to broadcast topical programmes in the form of Lectures on selected subjects especially on such subjects as 'Road Safety', in view of the constantly increasing number of fatal accidents involving children?

2. If the answer to the above is 'yes', will the Minister set about negotiating with the Manager of Barbados Rediffusion in connection with the installation of the said services and the periods most suitable to accommodate pupils during school hours?

REPORT OF SELECT COMMITTEE

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present the Report of the Select Committee appointed to consider the Bill relating to the Seventh-Day Adventists.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to amend the Magistrates' Jurisdiction and Procedure Act, 1956, be now read a first time.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: I beg to second that.

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

12.35 p.m.

On motion of Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, the Bill to amend the Customs Act, 1962, was read a first time.

Mr. M. E. S. HEWITT APPOINTED TO ACT AS DEPUTY CLERK

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Mr. M. E. S. Hewitt be appointed to act as Deputy Clerk of the House for today's sitting.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: I beg to second that.

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

STATEMENT BY HON. G. G. FERGUSON WITH REFERENCE TO REPORT FROM OTHER PLACE ON PRINTING COMMITTEE

"In the Barbados Daily News on Thursday, 24th August, 1962, there appeared a report of proceedings in the Other

Place under the caption "Bayne Hits Out at Printing House Debates".

2. The inference which the public must draw from the statements reported in the Press is that the staff of the Government Printing Office is inefficient and therefore responsible for the non-publication of the debates of this Honourable House or the delay in publication.

3. I should like to make it abundantly clear that the Government Printing Office is not responsible for the delay in the printing of the Hansard, and I am satisfied from an investigation which I have had carried out into this matter that the Government Printing Office can produce the proof copy of Debates of the Honourable House within a period of four (4) working days from the date the original debate is received at that office, and that printed copies can be available within a period of three (3) working days after final proof copies have been returned to that office.

4. The Government Printing Office cannot, however, print Debates which have not been submitted to it nor can it finalise printing until final proofs have been returned."

STATEMENT BY MR. SPEAKER ON REPORT
IN ADVOCATE NEWSPAPER ON 22ND
AUGUST, 1962

Mr. SPEAKER: Before the business of the House is further proceeded with, I have the following Statement to make:-

"My attention has been formally drawn by an hon. member of this House to a caption and the article thereunder which was published in "The Advocate" newspaper of Wednesday, 22nd August, 1962 on its front page with headlines:-

BARROW: I WOULD ACCEPT
RUSSIAN AID.

BUT THERE MUST
BE NO STRINGS.

and which purported to be a report of the debate in this House taking place on the previous day.

The hon. member in question, the honourable and learned member for St. John, the Premier of this Island, has contended that "this is neither a fair nor accurate nor complete report of the said proceedings and is maliciously calculated to bring a member of the House into disrepute".

It is elementary that at the opening of the General Assembly, Mr. Speaker lays claim, in the name and on behalf of the General Assembly, to their ancient and undoubted rights and privileges, and in accordance with ancient custom, such were granted by His Excellency the Governor on the 19th day of December, 1962.

Manifestly it is the duty of the Speaker to be satisfied that a report of the proceedings of this Chamber is accurate and not misleading, even if not complete. On careful consideration of the caption and article which I have mentioned, and of the official manuscript of the debate in question as will appear printed in Hansard, I am of the view that the former is not accurate nor complete, as a report of the proceedings in Parliament.

Inasmuch as the Hansard for 21st August, 1962 has not yet been published, and for the benefit and information of hon. members, I now request Mr. Clerk to read the relevant portion as it appeared in the closing stages of the Hon. Premier's Speech and as contained in the official manuscript.

Mr. Clerk, will you please read the relevant portion of the Hon. Premier's speech?

Mr. CLERK read as follows:-

"We are at the present moment discussing with other Governments the possibility of getting assistance from

them. We do not turn up our noses and say we do not need milk like the last Government which was offered milk and declined to accept it. If we get milk for children, we will take it. We are not too proud to take milk to save the taxpayers some money. If we can get machinery and equipment, we intend to take it. I am in business with whoever is giving away. This is the part where we have no pride at all in this matter. I dare say if Russia decided to give away something, we would have to think twice before we declined. We would have to think very seriously if the Russians came in here tomorrow and said they are going to give us \$15 million, as long as they do not want to do like some industrialists and tell the Government how to run the country; but we know from experience that they usually want to have strings attached. If they would give money away without any strings, I would take it from Russia too, and I would not apologise for that; but when you have to pay for something, it is a different matter."

12,45 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: In view of the fact that I consider the report of the proceedings in question as it appeared in the newspaper in question unfair, I hereby direct the Clerk of this House to communicate formally with the Editor of this newspaper to that effect, with a clear intimation to the latter that I expect an accurate and complete report of that part of the Hon. Premier's Speech about which complaint has been made to be published on the front page of the said newspaper with equal prominence to that which was given their publication complained of on the front page of its issue of 22nd August, 1962. To facilitate and ensure this, the Clerk is instructed to enclose a copy of the official manuscript as has been read by him on my instructions this afternoon in this House.

Failure fully to comply without delay with the terms of this communication by the newspaper in question will make it imperative and inevitable that I consider and determine the action I will take in the furtherance of my duty as Custodian of the rights and privileges of this House and each and every member thereof. (Cheers).

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Education:- To move the House into Committee of Supply to consider the grant of sums of money for the service of the island.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that you do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply, and that it be an instruction to the Committee to deal with two Resolutions of which notice has been given today, namely, the Resolution for the sum of \$650 and the Resolution for the sum of \$8,193.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: I beg to second that.

The question that His Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply, 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.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE, 1962-63, No. 17

THE WEST INDIES GAZETTE

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution is a Resolution asking for the sum of \$1,876. This is a very simple matter. It involves the payment for the *West Indies Gazette* which was supplied to us by the Federal Government for the year 1961, and during the period from January to May, 1962. What has happened, Sir, is that the amount provided in the current Estimates in respect of this item was only \$1,000 and supplementary provision of the amount asked for in this Resolution, namely, the sum of \$1,876, is now being sought to settle two outstanding accounts in connection with this matter. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I beg to second that.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE, 1962-63, No. 18

MEETING OF COMMONWEALTH PARLIAMENTARY ASSOCIATION

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, the next Resolution is one of those for which I sought and obtained permission to deal with in all its stages today. This is a Resolution for \$650 and again this is also a very simple matter. It is as a result of the decision of the Local Branch of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association to send a Barbados delegate to attend the Conference and General Meeting of the Association to be held in Lagos, Nigeria, from October to November this year. As explained in the Addendum to the Resolution, the greater portion of the expenses involved in the attendance of the Barbados representative will be borne by the General Council of the Association and by the Nigeria Branch. The Barbados Government, as is normally the practice, will continue to undertake the granting of a subsistence allowance to the delegate.

This Resolution for \$650 seeks to provide the necessary funds to pay the subsistence allowance at the rate of \$20 a day with a small amount of \$30 in order to meet contingencies for the delegate which was selected by the Local Branch of the Parliamentary Association at its meeting on Tuesday last week. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I beg to second that.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE 1962-63, No. 19

EXPENSES OF COMMISSION OF ENQUIRY

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, the next Resolution is one for the sum of \$8,193 to meet the expenses of a Commission of Enquiry which the Government proposes to appoint under the Commission of Enquiry (Amendment) Act, 1962-33. I sincerely hope that hon. members have received their copies of this Resolution which has just come down. I must apologise for soliciting the support of hon. members in dealing with an important Resolution like this at relatively short notice. The fact is that in consequence of the pending adjournment of the House for a holiday, I should like very much to have all the machinery in motion for the setting up of this Commission of Enquiry into the Sugar Industry of this Island, and that is why we have asked leave to deal with this Resolution today in all its stages.

Mr. Chairman, the Resolution seeks to provide the sum of \$8,193 to meet the expenses of this Commission of Enquiry which the Government proposes to appoint under Section 2(c) of the Commission of Enquiry Act, 1908-3 as amended by the Act 1962-33 to enquire into the sugar industry in the island. The breakdown of the expenses is enumerated in the Addendum to the Resolution as follows:-

Passages	\$ 318
Living expenses in the Island ...	1,200
Fees to Chairman at rate of \$100.80 per day and to members at rate of \$75.60 a day	6,300
Travelling expenses	375
Total	\$8,193

It will be noted that the Ministry of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries will supply the secretarial assistance, stationery and printing for the Commission.
12.55 p.m.

I think hon. members would probably like to have in addition to that, the specific terms of reference of the Commission. The terms of reference are as follows:-

"To enquire into all aspects of the Sugar Industry in Barbados, with special reference to its financial and general economics, including the arrangements for marketing of canes and of sugar and molasses, and for the provision of a guaranteed minimum weekly wage for all agricultural workers in the Sugar Industry."

This matter had been debated, Sir, at considerable length in this Chamber on a previous occasion, and it will be recalled that during the last session, the Government resisted a motion of this sort calling for this enquiry. The Opposition then pledged itself after the election, if they were elected into power, to proceed with all possible dispatch to set up this Commission for the purposes already outlined. From January we began taking the necessary steps to have this Committee appointed. It involved considerable correspondence, negotiation and discussion with several people whom we wanted to serve on the Commission. Some of the members whom we had in mind were not available, and the financial expense involved in having one or two others who were suggested was not in our opinion warranted for the simple reason that we thought we could do just as well by substituting other personnel.

I should like to say that so far as I am aware — because you know, Mr. Chairman, this matter does not really come under my portfolio; I am merely dealing with it today in the absence of the Minister of Agriculture who is in Trinidad attending a meeting of the West Indian Cane-farmers Association — the personnel of the Commission had to be ratified by the Executive Council of the Barbados Workers' Union. My information is that they are quite satisfied with the personnel as appointed by the Government, and the Union, Sir, therefore, endorses the conviction of the Government that the position of sugar workers in this country would be adequately protected, and that they would be given appropriate representation at the hands of this Committee.

I beg to move without much more delay that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I beg to second that.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, there should never be anything hon. members of this House should attempt to hide or prevent from being disclosed relative to the main industry of this Island. I want the hon. introducer of this Resolution to bear with me in some criticisms which I have to make here about the Resolution and answer some questions which he should answer and which I thought he would have given us before he sat down. He has, for instance, mentioned the terms of reference which are not here in this Resolution. We accept his apology for having brought the Resolution today and asking leave to deal with it, because these things can happen and as long as we are in here, we must allow for that. The terms of reference are, I regret, not here in this Resolution so that we could very well follow them carefully, but judging from my memory, if it is not playing tricks with me, I understood him to say that the terms of reference of this Commission of Enquiry will among other things and besides dealing with the Sugar Industry, deal with the question of recommending a minimum weekly wage for such persons in the Sugar Industry.

I have got a few things to say on it and I am going to read the Addendum first. First of all, we in the House like the Union or anybody else or more than anybody else are entitled to know if you come here with a Resolution setting up a Commission and giving passage, whence these people are coming, and I hope the hon. member will give us that because we see \$318 for passages, and we do not know where these people are coming from, and not only the Union should know. The Union represents the agricultural workers.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: If the hon. member would give way.....

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am always prepared to give way, but the House is in Committee and the Minister has a right to reply to me after making notes and give a full answer for the benefit of this House to the questions which

I am asking. Let it be understood that I am not opposing the motion, but I am here to know and should be able to know the facts concerning this Resolution from the Government for \$8,193.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order, I merely want to disclose for the information of the Committee at this stage — I should have done it before — the Commission's personnel. The Chairman of the Commission will be Dr. Rawle Farley and the other two members are Mr. Max B. Ifill, M.A. (Oxon), Diploma Agricultural Economics, Economic and Business Research Consultant and Mr. J. C. Brown, Chartered Accountant of the Colonial Development Corporation. The basis on which these funds are submitted is for an enquiry estimated to last 25 days.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I must thank the hon. member who has been stated to be a very good debater in presenting his case, but that information must have slipped him. I have nothing against the Chairman of the Commission whom I think most of us know well, and I think the hon. member has selected men of great calibre, learning and experience in agriculture for doing this job. However, I still have some criticisms to make, and I would like the hon. member to bear with me and note them. I accept what the hon. member has told me about the 25 days; I do not question the passage or anything like that, because these are men of learning and great experience, and I presume that this has been agreed upon as to what price they should be paid. Who am I to say they should not be paid this price if they are to do this job, which is a tremendous one?

Mr. Chairman, if you read this Resolution, it seeks to provide this sum to meet the expenses of a Commission of Enquiry which the Government proposes to appoint under Section 2 (c) of the Commission of Enquiry Act, 1908-3 as amended by Act 1962-33 to enquire into the sugar industry in the Island.
1.05 p.m.

There are other things which the Hon. Minister must tell us because from his explanation he has said many other things besides enquiring into the sugar industry. According to the terms of reference which he has read, the Commission is to carry out an enquiry into the minimum weekly wage of sugar workers.

I hope the Hon. Minister is not saying that the sugar industry is confined to those persons who fork the ground, who reap the canes and cut the canes. I am wondering myself if he has taken into consideration that there are a number of agricultural workers in this country who do not work in the sugar industry. Is the Government confining its activities and enquiries to (a) the terms of reference to carry out an enquiry into the minimum weekly wage only of those persons engaged in the sugar industry, or does he mean also those engaged in agricultural pursuits of the Island? If you are confining it to those who plant the canes, reap the canes and work in the factories, then that is not good enough.

Sir, I presume that you are talking of the sugar industry as a whole. For instance, there are still a number of people who cannot get work in the sugar industry and hon. members of this House can tell the hon. member that that is so. There is a number of people who cannot get work at Bulkeley's Factory and at other factories in this Island, but they work in agriculture and they mean a tremendous lot to this country. Are those people to be denied the results of this enquiry relative to a proper weekly wage? They work purely in the sugar industry.

Sir, I hope the Hon. Minister will not take this as a sort of criticism against him but will take it as a criticism which you are bound to face. The people who are planting yams and planting the other provisions are not in the sugar industry. This Government has said that they are going to throw out certain plantations from planting canes; therefore, there must be some means of guaranteeing the people who work at those plantations in the planting of something else the same terms of a proper weekly wage.

Let us say that there are 25,000 people working in agriculture and of that number 20,000 are working in the sugar industry. Surely you are not going to tell the 5,000 who do not work in the sugar industry but who are still the backbone of the industry that they are not working in agriculture. If that be the case, should not this Addendum read:

"To enquire into the agricultural industry of this country?"

I say that because we are not merely confined with people who work only in the sugar industry. The Hon. Minister of Trade has just come back from West Germany. What about those persons whom you want to work in the cassava industry? Are you not guaranteeing them a proper weekly wage?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. Certainly the hon. member is now splitting hairs. The people who work in the sugar industry are general workers in agriculture. You plant canes in October and November. You start reaping in January, February, March, April, May. The people who plant yams and canes are the same people who cut canes in January. They are not different. The people who plant cassava, potatoes, yams, runcevals are the same people employed by the estates to harvest canes during the crop. Let us try to make this clear. The Government.....

Mr. MOTTLEY: With the greatest respect, Mr. Chairman the hon. member is making a speech.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I am still on a point of order.

Mr. MOTTLEY: That is not really a point of order. How can it be a point of order? That is replying to a speech.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I am on a point of order.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am willing to give way any time, but surely I am not going to allow Your Honour to sit there and let the hon. member make a speech. It is an easy thing for an hon. member to get up on a point of order and cut a member off his speech by making a point of order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Minister is on a point of order. Let me hear him.

Mr. MOTTLEY: He is not on a point of order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: He has not completed his point of order.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Surely the hon. member cannot do that.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I apologise to Your Honour. If the hon. member is making a speech, can you not see that the hon. member is making a speech? That is not a point of order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am yet awaiting the hon. senior member for the City to sit and listen to the point of order.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Sir, I seldom lose my temper. I go very quietly, but that is really not a point of order. However if you rule, I am going to sit down. Nevertheless, it does not make me feel, if you so rule, that your ruling is correct. I repeat, it is not a point of order.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, all that I am trying to do is to correct the misstatement made by the hon. member. He is trying to point out that the people who plant yams and plant cassava are not workers in the sugar industry.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I have never said any such thing. I told the Committee that I am supporting the Resolution, but it was unfortunate that your terms of reference for the setting up of the Commission of Enquiry were not put before us but were terms of reference which you explained to us. The Addendum states that this Resolution is to meet the

expenses of a Commission of Enquiry to enquire into the sugar industry in the Island.

I am saying, speaking from experience, that there are people who work in agriculture who have never got a chance to work in the sugar industry. The hon. member who belongs to the Trade Union will be able to tell you if that is true or not. There are many people in this Island who have not been able to be absorbed in the sugar industry.

What I mentioned about the question of cassava was this. There are a lot of people who work in the agricultural industry, namely those who work in the planting of yams, potatoes, cassava, and so on, and I asked what was he thinking about as regards those people. I said that a lot of these people may never work in the sugar industry, but are agricultural workers. There are hon. members of this House who represent country constituencies who would say that I am correct.

Sir, while I agree with the terms of reference, I am only suggesting that rather than it be an enquiry into the sugar industry, it would be more appropriate to put it as an enquiry into the agricultural industry of the Island. 1.15 p.m.

The hon. member smiles because he thinks that is a joke. This is a serious matter. I will name a number of factories which have closed down over the last five or six years. Let us take Sandy Lane Factory. You are enquiring and deciding that the number of persons employed in the sugar industry should be guaranteed a weekly wage. Let us say that Sandy Lane Factory has been employing 200 people. I challenge the hon. member, who is a Trade Union Leader, to say that one half of them have been looked after. Only this morning I saw a man whom I had not seen working for a long time; he is a mason. You take Warren Factory or Bulkeley Factory — this is a question of the sugar industry. When I think of the sugar industry, I do not think merely of people who plant canes, those who load canes and those who drive tractors and so on. Persons in the sugar industry must mean those who handle sugar produced in Barbados. From the Manifesto of this Government, it means not only the people who are in the sugar industry, but agricultural workers as well.

The terms of reference will leave outside the pale those who work in the sugar industry, those who might have been in the sugar industry for some time and who will no longer be in the sugar industry. They have no guarantee under these terms of reference of their being included in the sugar industry. There is no more tending of cattle and mules; there are a number of people who cannot get a job at Hanson or any where else cutting canes. I am contending that these people worked in the sugar industry. You have the average farmer and the woman who may not work in the sugar industry as such. The sugar industry means the sugar industry, the agricultural labourer means the agricultural labourer and the agriculture of this country is the agriculture of the country. There is as much difference between persons who work in the agricultural industry and those who work in the sugar industry as there is between those who work as clerks and those who work in industry. The hon. member's backbenchers can tell him if I am right or wrong in this matter. In St. Thomas, Mr. Chairman, you know about this.

(Mr. SMITH: He does not know anything about that).

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Is the hon. junior member for St. Joseph addressing the Chair?

Mr. MOTTLEY: It is your duty to have a Commission of Enquiry into the sugar industry. If you want an enquiry into the sugar industry alone, that is all well and good, but there are a number of workers who have never planted canes but they have also been working in the sugar industry. The hon. member may not pontificate on this matter today, but on another occasion he will postulate as regards a constituency like St. Andrew, I feel that the hon. member should tell us straight that these people who are cane-cutters and those who weed and fork the land all work in the

interest of the sugar industry. The Minister of Agriculture himself has said that in his school feeding programme he will throw out a tremendous amount of land. These are not people in the sugar industry but they are agricultural workers. Some agricultural workers do not work in the sugar industry; and if you are only guaranteeing a weekly wage for those people who are in the sugar industry, the Resolution is wrongly worded and should be amended. Nobody would oppose the question of the appointment of the Commission; but are you asking us to guarantee a weekly wage to agricultural workers or only to workers in the sugar industry? You will find that there are a lot of people in the sugar industry for whom there will be no provision made.

Mr. YEARWOOD: Mr. Chairman, I take it that the hon. senior member for the City thinks that the sugar industry only comprises cane-cutters, factory workers and all those who work directly in the reaping of the sugar industry.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I do not know why the hon. member should think so. I made it abundantly clear that it is not only the people who reap and plant the canes and who work in the factory, but it is also those persons who work the land for the purpose of the sugar industry and those who drive the lorries. I will go so far as to say that the term "sugar workers" applies to those who handle the sugar in Bridgetown. I am sorry that the hon. member did not understand me.

Mr. YEARWOOD: I understand the hon. member to say that the people who farm the land are not in the sugar industry.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order, I never said that. I was not born in Bridgetown. Let the hon. member understand that. I said that people are used on lands which are not used for the sugar industry at all. I am dealing with the question of agricultural labourers and sugar industry workers. If there is any difference, then let the hon. member tell the Committee what is the difference. There are those people who have nothing to do with sugar but they are employed by people. 1.25 p.m.

Mr. YEARWOOD: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry if I misunderstood the hon. senior member for the City, but I have never seen an estate which only plants cassava, peas and things like that. Wherever there is a plantation in Barbados, it plants cassava, peas and other crops, and as long as people are working on that plantation, whether or not they work in the reaping season, they are in the sugar industry.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of recorection, I hate to do this. The hon. member is quite new. (Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: But he is quite right.) He is absolutely wrong and you represent St. Philip and should know it. I can show you a place where a person plants okras and nothing else and employs agricultural workers. I know what I am talking about. I can carry you to a place where a person does not plant anything beside okras, and carries labourers all the time. Are they working in the sugar industry? You are not talking to a novice. I appreciate the hon. member's taking part in the debate, but on a point of correction he is absolutely wrong in what he is saying. In Christ Church there are people who would not plant cane on their land, because they are afraid that when the sun comes in, they would have to cut them; but they continue to plant okras and irrigate the land and employ labourers. They are therefore not in the sugar industry and would be outside the terms of reference of this Commission. You seem to think that I do not know what I am talking about, but I was not born in town.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Chairman, the Resolution before us seeks to provide the sum of \$8,193 to meet the expenses of a Commission of Enquiry which the Government proposes to appoint under Section 2 (c) of the Commission of Enquiry Act, 1908-3 as amended by Act 1962-33 to enquire into the Sugar Industry in the Island. The first thing we have to realise is that agricultural labourers are based on the same wages as those who work in the sugar industry. When a labourer applies for a job, he is asked where he last worked and what wage he was receiving, and if he was get-

ting \$3.00 a day he will be paid \$3.00 or a little more, but nothing lower than that paid in the sugar industry. I am saying, Mr. Chairman, that if a Commission is set up to enquire into the sugar industry, it should enquire into all categories of workers so long as they are labourers in this Island, so that the working class people can be protected whether they work on an okra farm or a tomato farm. Whatever an agricultural labourer is getting in St. Lucy should be paid to an agricultural labourer in the St. Michael area or any other part of the Island.

Mr. Chairman, I am not speaking against this Resolution because it is long overdue. We should have a Commission of Enquiry into the sugar industry to see what conditions exist. I am certain that there are many sugar workers who are suffering today, and this has been occasioned through the closing down of factories. I think of Joes River Factory, Haggatts, Bruce Vale, Swans and Sandy Lane. The workers at these factories have been contributing to the welfare of this Island; yet they have not received one cent, though some of them are ready to die after all the years they have been working. An amount of \$4.80 is taken out for the Labour Welfare Fund, \$4.80 for the Price Stabilization Fund, and I think \$3.20 for the Rehabilitation Fund, and it is very hard after these people have retired and the factories have closed that they have to stand by the wayside and beg their bread; some of them scarcely have a pair of pants to wear.

I am very glad to see that this Government has brought this Resolution today to set up a Commission of Enquiry into the sugar industry, Mr. Chairman, but I feel it should be an enquiry into the whole Agricultural Department in this Island. I trust when the Commission is set up that it will do its best to protect the poor inhabitants who have been suffering for these many years after the factories have been abandoned. Sandy Lane was the last factory that was closed, and the labourers are scattered abroad without receiving a penny. The ones who received money were the managers, the bookkeepers and the cane weighers. Sandy Lane has now been turned into a luxury hotel. The land has been divided up and people from abroad have come to Barbados and bought that land and are making thousands of dollars selling it at the highest price and living sumptuously in this Island. I believe that the land there is sold at \$14,000 or \$15,000 per acre, but the poor labourers who worked to the upkeep of Sandy Lane have not received one penny. I know it is not the fault of this Government, because it has just come into power, and it is seeking now into the welfare of these people. When a man tries to do something against his fellow creature, he is for himself; but God is for us all; and I tell you that the eyes of God will never be closed against the poor who have been oppressed in this Island. 1.35 p.m.

People from all over the world have come here and are eating the good of the land. They eat our eddoes, our cassava and they live in luxury houses. How much money this Government is getting out of that? I am sure if Sandy Lane made 4,000 or 5,000 tons of sugar, you would know how much Government would be getting out of that. Are we looking after the interest of those people who have been laid off? They are depending on our assistance. I am sure that this present Government which is in power is putting forward their best effort to try to eradicate the evil which was in existence before their coming into power and is trying to help those people who are suffering. Bruce Vale and Joes River have not given a penny to those poor people. That can also be said about Sandy Lane and Swans. Why should you allow those poor people to suffer like that? All of those plantations have gone out of existence and Haggatts is the only one existing in St. Andrew today.

Sir, I trust when this Commission gets down to working that it will go into this matter carefully and seek out every means to help the poor people of this country. I remember a poor old man who came to my home and said to me "Honey, I am old enough for your father: I can call you Honey. I left Bruce Vale Plantation for many years now and cannot get a cent to help me. I hear that the Government has said that it is going to give us some money. I hope that we will soon get it." I told him that I expected

a Commission is coming down to see what can be done and he told me that he hoped he would get a little piece of money because he is suffering. All of that could have been prevented if the last Government had taken care of the poor as they should have done. These people would never have been suffering as they are suffering today.

This Resolution is for the sum of \$8,193 and I believe this money would be spent in the right way so as to relieve the poor people of this country.

I see the argument of the hon. senior member for the City. His argument is not a bad one. He is trying to include all the agricultural workers in the Island of Barbados and to protect that. We must protect Harry, Dick and Tom as long as they are agricultural workers, and the only person to protect them is the Government and God because they have no protection otherwise. The only means of their future existence is that this Government take into consideration their plight and seek into their welfare and their right so as to prevent them from putting their faces down to the earth to graze the grass. Mr. Chairman, I think I will have to agree to this Resolution wholeheartedly.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman —

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, —

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman, —

Mr. CHAIRMAN: My eyes caught the hon. junior member for Christ Church first.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman, I would like to take first of all the remarks of the last hon. member who spoke because, as I know it, he is not aware of the true facts of the case. I am not an agriculturist, but I do know in the matter of Sandy Lane that the Sandy Lane Hotel has nothing to do with that statement at all. The former owners of Sandy Lane Plantation, Messrs. DaCosta and Company, so far as I know have set aside a sum of money which is there for the purpose of paying those who were employed at the Sandy Lane Factory and Plantation. If all the money has not been paid out, it is not the fault of DaCosta and Company; it is a matter between the Inland Revenue Department and DaCosta and Company to be resolved before that money can be paid out. In other words, some relief from taxation must be meted out to Messrs. DaCosta and Company in the paying out of this money. That is how I know it to be.

I know of a case of someone who was eligible for severance pay who was about to go to England and he went in to DaCosta and Company and put the case to them and although this matter has not been resolved yet, he was paid an amount of money — what they thought was his share of severance pay. He went off to England with his money.

As I have said, it is no fault of Messrs. DaCosta and Company, who were the past owners of Sandy Lane, that this money has not been paid out. This is a matter which must be resolved between the Inland Revenue Department, the Government, the Workers Trade Union and Messrs. DaCosta and Company. I think the hon. senior member for St. Peter when he gets up would substantiate what I have said about it or say what he knows about it, but I think for the record as regards what the hon. senior member for St. Andrew has said that it would be put right.

Sandy Lane Hotels Limited bought from Messrs. DaCosta and Company the sugar factory. They are employing today 150 persons. It is true to say that they are not the same sugar workers but they are Barbadians. They are the sons and daughters and nephews of people from St. James. Therefore, that plantation is still employing and at better wages 150 people at Sandy Lane Hotel. When we hear all these statements about the owners of these plantations, I say that hon. members should know the entire facts before they come to the public because it is a wrong and an injustice to the people who are trying to do something.

Sir, this question of severance pay was not on the Statute Book of the Island; but because Messrs DaCosta

and Company got a good price for Sandy Lane, they decided that they would set aside a sum for this purpose. The hon. senior member for St. Peter knows more about it. That is putting the record straight.

Now, Sir, when it comes to the sugar industry, according to this Resolution, a Commission of Enquiry would be set up to go into it. I did not hear the terms of reference. What I did hear was that it would be set up to give a guaranteed weekly wage to the workers. It is going to take economic brains to work out a formula to satisfy everyone in this Island. I do know that they have made a good selection in the Chairman; I do not know the other two members. I do believe the people in the sugar industry will have confidence in the Chairman. He has worked in Barbados and around the West Indies. He is a West Indian and I think he has the interest of the economy of these Islands at heart. I feel confident that under his chairmanship they are on the right track, but it is going to take some working out; and I hope as a result of this enquiry when the report is made that it will be one to satisfy everyone and not for a year only, but for all times.

I am told of plantations in Christ Church and St. Philip which have not made money for the last three years but they are still called upon to pay a gainful wage to the workers. You can stand losses for so long, but not for all time. The planter is the same businessman as those around Bridgetown. I know the argument is that they are buying plantations at exorbitant prices and by so doing they have a lot of interest to pay. However, I hope when the report of this Commission of Enquiry is accepted that it will be satisfactory not only to the planters, but to the Union and the workers as well because at this stage of our history we need co-operation from everyone if we are to go forward.
1.45 p.m.

There are many people who are doing business in this island and they are on the border line. They cannot afford to be on that border line for too much longer; otherwise somebody else will own the plantation and it may not be a Barbadian. Barbados is owned by Barbadians and that is one of the successes of this island. People come from all over the world to see how we can survive on sugar and on sugar alone. We get the maximum out of the island; we are a model to people all over the world and we must give the Barbadian planter great credit for the economy with which he has worked the land for all of these years.

There are a number of peasant proprietors who will be affected as well as the big plantations. When you set the price for the big plantation, the peasant proprietor has to follow and pay even more. There are peasants who have to pay more for cutting their canes than the big plantations because people say: "I will get an extra bonus at the end of the year; you have no means of putting that aside. If I am to work for \$4.25 from the plantation owner I am asking you to pay \$4.50". When the worker comes on, he has to get his breakfast and when he goes home he will want a little grog as well. There is a large section of the community which is growing canes. In the parish which I have the honour to represent, the parish of Christ Church, there is a large section of peasant proprietors and these people will have to be protected. The peasant proprietors have to borrow money at high interest rates and they have to repay this money. Let the hon. senior member for St. Andrew realise that, if he did not know of it before, what he said about Sandy Lane was an injustice to the last owners and the present owners have absolutely nothing to do with it. I am not sure how much of the fund has been paid out, but I know that in respect of every worker from Sandy Lane for a period of years prior to the sale, there was a sum set aside for severance pay. It is only the question of a difference between the Inland Revenue Department, the Government and DaCosta & Co. over taxation relief on that sum of money that they are paying out.

Mr. MILLER and Mr. CORBIN rose to speak.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. junior member for St. George caught my eye first.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, in relation to this Resolution we are placed in a rather awkward position and at a disadvantage. I am holding in my hands a Resolution asking us to vote for supplies for the Government. Actually, the Addendum to the Resolution says nothing. I am wondering if the Minister in charge does not see fit to release to us the terms of reference of this Commission. He did not give the names of the Commission and again that is rather unusual. It is true that the Minister did read out the terms of reference because they were asked for by the Parliamentary Secretary. The Hon. Minister would not ask us to remember all of this.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: May I ask the hon. member who is the Parliamentary Secretary?

Mr. MILLER: The senior member for St. Andrew. We are told that there should be severance pay because the workers were sent away from the factory. Certainly the Minister in charge did not refer to that. This is the type of thing that you would not expect in a modern Parliament. We are asked to vote the sum of \$8,193 to pay for this Commission. Somehow or other this is a piece of expediency. The hon. member is still thinking in terms of a minimum wage. The sugar industry today is unionised and I think that every worker is in agreement with the Barbados Workers' Union. You talk about a Wages Act and a Minimum Wage Bill; it is difficult to understand that, when you have these people organized in the Barbados Workers' Union. I am not so sure about the additional terms as set out by the hon. senior member for St. Andrew and I am wondering if the Hon. Minister would be kind enough to postpone this discussion for an hour or two and have copies of these things supplied to this House for the benefit of hon. members.

The hon. senior member for St. Andrew was in trouble with the microphone. It may be that he was using the wrong microphone, which is like the pen I have here which never spells. I am asking whether the Hon. Leader of the House will read out these terms slowly and at dictation speed so that we can write them down. You are paying a tremendous sum for 25 days to the Chairman of this Commission. I am not saying that he is not worth it or even more, but I am not at all satisfied with the information which has been given in respect of this expenditure. I would be happy if the Hon. Minister would be willing to read it out, as I say, at dictation speed rather than lose time which is so important, knowing that we want to go for a summer recess. We do not want to be at any disadvantage in voting this money when we do not know what we are voting it for. You do not want to appoint a Commission of Enquiry without giving us the terms of reference. I would be more than obliged if the hon. member would call out this information at dictation speed because I want to facilitate him. We do not want to be asked to vote this \$8,000 when we have all of these discrepancies.
1.55 p.m.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, there is going to be the 2 o'clock suspension soon, but I hope we will be able to deal with this matter. I am a democrat and I believe in all the tenets of democracy, even those that are not sound. I have grown weary and tired of Commissions of Enquiry. All Governments have been tinkering with agricultural workers in Barbados for a long time, and therefore I have to make my position quite clear. The Government says it wants to have an enquiry into the sugar industry. It was one of the planks of the Government's platform in the election, and they have won the election; so they have to go into the industry. That is what they want to do; so let them do it. When the Commission is appointed and we have to prepare a memorandum, we will tell the community then what we have to say.

What I will say, however, Mr. Chairman, is that cleverness in politics can never take the place of basic commonsense. You have to be commonsensical about these things. I do not take everybody's argument and the statements you hear in here seriously, because there are a lot of agricultural workers who are voters, and some of the members here have not yet passed through the sound barrier of being able to represent people soundly, but have to

pick up every little cheap argument on which they think they can succeed. You have to pass the sound barrier of ignorance and mediocrity if you want to be a true representative within the context of present day circumstances in Barbados. I would not approach the matter like the hon. senior member for St. Andrew, because he is one of those kind-hearted afflictions which we must accept in politics since we have adult suffrage. He does not realise what he was talking about, but the Party of which he is a member will have to suffer the embarrassment, not me. The Premier and the Leader of the House said one thing and he was undermining what they were saying, because last week the Premier said we were producing sugar, all of which we could not sell and would have to utilise other things. Today the hon. member comes along and talks about the closing down of factories, which is a different thing.

Mr. Chairman, a factory in Barbados would not close down for the love of closing down, because when a factory closes, the people who run the factory cease to make money from it, and nobody has reached the stage where he does not want to make money. The reasons why they have to close down are simple, economic facts.

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

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. SPEAKER: It now being 2 o'clock p.m., automatically this Sitting is suspended until 2.30 o'clock p.m. of this day.
2.00 p.m.

On Resumption:

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I observe that there is no Quorum present and ask Your Honour to direct that the Bell be rung.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the Bell be rung.

The Bell was rung and a quorum was obtained.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, with Your Honour's permission, I should like to ask for leave to suspend Standing Orders Nos. 5, 14, 16 and 18 for the remainder of today's sitting. I have given the Opposition the understanding that at the expiration of Government Business, we will revert to Private Members' Business for a short while.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the House has asked leave to suspend Standing Orders Nos. 5, 14, 16 and 18 for the remainder of today's Sitting, and if there is no objection, leave will be granted.

Apparently, there is no objection, and leave is granted.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House revert to Committee of Supply.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House resumed Committee of Supply, Mr. BATSON in the Chair.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Before the sitting was suspended, the hon. senior member for St. Peter was addressing the Chair.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, as I said at the beginning, I am a democrat and I believe in democratic decisions even when some of them are not in accordance with my own thinking. The Government placed this matter as one of their election pledges, and won the election on it, and I have no quarrel with them...

Mr. Chairman, these microphones are not working and I take a serious view of it. What is the use of having these and someone ostensibly to repair and work them, and yet they do not work? Are you manufacturing money to throw away? This is a waste of time. With all these enquiries that are going on, we need an enquiry within the House itself to see if these things can work. It is a positive lack of efficiency.
2.40 p.m.

It is an example of positive waste of public funds. I am not going to aid a bit anybody in throwing away public funds. I am not satisfied to work for money hard and then to pay money out by way of taxation for somebody to sit down and then these things do not work. This is an example of dealing with this Commission.

Sir, I have no need to dwell too much on what has been said today. In this Island, commissions have become very popular; people have become an easy prey, not to what should be done but to pass the buck. The hon. senior member for St. Andrew got up and spoke and look at what he said as to what this has to do with these workers. The very thought that he can talk of Government getting compensation for these workers shows that he does not know that that is a creation of the Barbados Workers Union. Prior to that, the workers had to work without having any severance pay.

Now, Sir, you are going to set up a Commission of Enquiry into the sugar industry and I am going to give evidence. The only difference is that I have to work very hard on these things. I have to work harder on these things than any other member in this House because for 52 weeks in a year I have to deal with it every week and I have been doing so for the last seventeen years. It is because of that I believe I have more knowledge of the sugar industry than any other member of this House — and not only of the sugar industry in this Island but of the sugar industry in other parts of the world. What I have noticed is that the sugar industry is used as a political football. When I entered the Trade Union there were people who were making the sugar industry a political football. The Government now says that they want an investigation into it. I have no grouse about it. Investigate it and find out what there is in it.

I would say this to the hon. junior member for St. George. His Party when they were in power set up a Commission of Enquiry into the sugar industry and brought Mr. McKenzie here as the Chairman. We did not agree with the Commissioner that the enquiry should be held in private and we objected to it. I will say to this Government now. Before I give evidence in a private capacity, you can send me to gaol; I will go to prison first; I have nothing private to give them. If they call for a Commission to be held privately, I have nothing to give out. You can send me to prison; I am not going to give you anything. Other officers of the Union may give evidence in private but I have nothing to give in private.

On the last occasion, the negotiations broke down because the Barbados Workers Union refused to give evidence. We prepared a memorandum. The Commission reported and in their report they made certain statements for paying wages for which we gave no evidence and we never agreed with their report.

Presumably this Commission of Enquiry will go into that report also, and all it means is that they will be travelling over the ground which some of us did not agree with and which some agreed with.

I agree with the hon. senior member for the City. I think the Addendum should have stated what are the terms of reference of this Commission so that hon. members could see what they are. It is not unusual for Addenda to carry the terms of reference, because if you look back at the note, you will see to what you are giving approval. Members will know what the situation is.

If the hon. senior member for St. Andrew has the idea that the Government as such will give relief to workers, he

is mistaken. The workers have to take the bull by the horn, if they want relief, and organise themselves. This is the age of institutions. Workers in the sugar industry in a general way do not depend on the Government to give them increase in wages. The Government of Barbados did not give the workers in the sugar industry production bonus. This year, the Government did not give the sugar workers a 10% increase. I remember quite well that some members of the last Government said that factory workers were paid too much money as compared with cane cutters.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. I do not want to interrupt the hon. member, but he said that some Ministers of the last Government said that factory workers were paid too much money. Will he name them?

Mr. WALCOTT: No, No: I am not going in for naming anybody today; I am going in for broad statements. Some of the politicians wanted to go about and tell the workers what they should get, forgetting that to every man in the factory there were so many others in the field. What is my objections for all time is that you cannot negotiate in Parliament for workers; you can only negotiate in Parliament salaries for yourself. Surely you cannot negotiate in Parliament the wages for the thousands of people in the sugar industry. You cannot decide how much you must pay out for planting canes, for cutting canes, for picking up trash and all the other aspects of jobs which you have in the sugar industry, and I will go as far as to say that not even the Commission of Enquiry can do it. Today, when we negotiate wages in the sugar industry, we negotiate on the basis of the particular work which is now done in the industry. There is no point negotiating for an item which does not now exist; therefore, when we come to such an item we shift from that and deal with something which is current.

There was no dispute so far as the Union was concerned, and I would say that whenever there is a dispute in the sugar industry, the Union is not afraid to call a strike. I am amazed. I have been engaged in a strike longer than anybody. It was a strike of nearly 100 days. To be precise, it was 98 days. It was no joke in the whole strike; it was one which cost the Trade Union a lot of money, but we were striking on fundamental issues. Of course, when we are going on a strike, we give you notice. We tell you that if you do not do so-and-so by such a time we will be forced to withdraw the labourers of the Island from that work.

I say again that this is to investigate all aspects of the sugar industry. We have no objection. If we say that we object to your investigating all aspects of the sugar industry, somebody will say that the Trade Union does not want an investigation into the sugar industry. What the hon. senior member for St. Andrew has forgotten is this. Before there was Swans Factory, there used to be windmills at Swans. Those windmills went out. We cannot go back and put down windmills because such a mode of operating the sugar industry could not work in this age.
2.50 p.m.

Somebody is asking for a bus service, not a jack-ass cart service. If you had a jack-ass service instead of a bus service, there would be more people to work; but can we work our economy like that in the context of a community service? Technological changes are inevitable in every industrial age, and as long as we are part of the Western civilisation, we cannot escape the technological changes which take place. We have to learn to live with changes. The last Government and this Government have both things before them. You see technological changes taking place, and therefore you have to set up *ad hoc* committees in order to make a study of these changes — and not only to make a study of these changes, but also to make recommendations within the context of these changes. Do not let us expect an overall plan to take care of these economies. You do not need any Professor Arthur Lewis to tell you that if in two sectors something has taken place you will have to make a specific study of them.

In 1961 the last Government was asked to carry out a study of these things, but in their objection, they turned it

down. What has happened is that the Barbadian mentality is allowing a situation to take care of itself, when you should have a study made of it. I said that here some two or three years ago — the hon. senior member for St. Andrew might not have been in here then, Applewhaites Factory is going to be closed down; more factories are going to be closed down in Barbados and you do not need any economist to tell you what I am saying. I have to bring the notice of the hon. member to some of these facts. One particular factory has produced 13,000 tons of sugar this year. Some factories produced ten thousand tons. Porters can produce 10,000 tons, Andrews can produce 13,000 tons and Bulkeley 10,000 tons. With the technological changes taking place and with the knowledge of men going up, the factory position in Barbados will be improved and not decreased. Factories which are producing 6,000 tons, 7,000 tons or 8,000 tons of sugar will be memories. And why is that? The normal replacement charges, if you think of those in a small factory, are going to be comparatively higher than the same replacement charges in a larger factory, and the criterion for determining sugar is how much per ton or unit the cost will be. These are the determining factors Barbados has to face; we are not going to have more factories producing sugar; we will have less factories producing sugar. I might say that as far back as 1955 at a Conference in British Guiana we, the Barbados Workers Union, passed a Resolution drawing to the attention of the Government that the sugar production in the area is going to employ less people per unit in view of the technological changes which are facing the world. Dr. Williams was there. One factory in Cuba can manufacture more sugar than what is manufactured in Barbados with our 19 factories and it can be manufactured more quickly too. Cuba is capable of making or producing an amount of sugar more than the total production of the British West Indies islands put together. We have a guaranteed price for 90,000 tons of sugar and as to that quantity you know about the price. Our quota is 130,000 tons of sugar of which the known price is concluded, the N.P.Q.

The Hon. Premier made a speech in here and it might have been in answer to the hon. junior member for St. John, his colleague, who raised the question of paying the cane farmer more for his sugar in 1962 as a result of the increased negotiated price. The Premier explained that the negotiated price for 1962 was higher than that for 1961 as a result of the market price for sugar being above the average price now. That is to say, that if Barbados produced 160,000 tons of sugar you can sell 130,000 tons at a negotiated price, another 10,000 locally and if the Canadian preference would give another 10,000 tons, you would have 150,000 tons; but above that, you have to scratch the surface for what you want. If you have 175,000 tons instead of 150,000, you will find yourself against a brick wall getting a price for it.

Those are inescapable facts which you cannot begin to talk around and talk about other matters. When the hon. senior member for St. Andrew talked about Sandy Lane, he did not ask about the Sandy Lane Factory. The Union said that these workers have to be paid by the factory, but what was the delay? The hon. junior member for St. George does not like mention to be made of the last Government. We reached agreement as to how to settle this question about the payment of people. We passed a Resolution at our Conference two years ago and we got nothing out of the Government. We have to come to this House in order to get legislative approval for this reason; you are sending canes to a factory and if you do not have legislative approval the Sugar Producers' Federation and the Barbados Workers Union cannot agree to pay a Provident Fund out of these funds because you, the cane grower, would object because you should not participate in payment out of an agreement to which you are not a party. In order to settle that, it must come through Parliament so that it becomes law; it has legislative approval and nobody can go back.
3.00 p.m.

The Union took objection to the delay by passing Resolutions; but the Union has no guns. We cannot get a revolution by shooting down people and saying we will take over, because we have no army; we only have an army of

civilians, without bullets, guns or ammunition; so we try to persuade Government to implement this. On May Day this year the Union called for this but it is what the Union has negotiated and initiated and not what the hon. senior member for St. Andrew has talked about, because he does not know the formula. It was the Union that said that you could not displace people unless you made some provision for them; so the Union was the forerunner for this sort of legislation. This House of Assembly existed for many years and no Resolution was passed in this House which gives any workers by law any Provident Fund or provision after he has been employed for many years and is leaving. What law is there on the Statute Book to protect any worker in Barbados today? People are dismissed up and down this country, people are laid off and go out of employment, yet no law was passed in this House of Assembly. Had it not been for the Union pressing for it, some of the workers would not get a penny, because no bunch of politicians has passed any law to that effect. I said in the House of Assembly already that every worker anywhere.....

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I did not refer to the Provident Fund in my speech; I was speaking of the factories which were closed down turning the workers adrift; they should be compensated as if they had worked for the Government. If at the Cassava Factory a section of men worked for any period of time and the factory closed down, these workers would be compensated because the factories could no longer employ them.

Mr. WALCOTT: I do not believe the hon. member was aware of all the debates that took place in here. If he were, he should know by now that that is an accepted principle where a factory closes down like that — a factory which was sold out completely as a factory and plantation, which meant that that unit went out of total sugar production in Barbados, and therefore the factory itself must pay the workers. The hon. member should remember that in the last Session the last Minister of Labour made a great play of this matter, and you will very well understand that I have been the butt of a lot of criticism in all this. I have been the football between the politicians every time a sugar argument comes up. Sometimes the politicians will say I am on the workers' side, and at another time they say I am not doing enough and I am on the employers' side.

On this occasion when the Government sought to have an enquiry, I objected to the way in which the enquiry was done. The hon. senior member for St. Philip who brought this Resolution and his colleague, the then Minister, had a long argument about honesty and dishonesty outside of this. They had weeks of it on a Resolution on this basis about an enquiry into the sugar industry. Since this Government has come into power, they have said that they want to have an enquiry into the sugar industry, because the last one was not good enough. Let them have it. What we objected to in the Trade Union was the terms of reference. We were not going to subject ourselves to terms of reference that were meaningless.

Mr. Chairman, I do not agree with the hon. senior member for the City in his wide sweep of agricultural workers and then what the hon. senior member for St. Andrew caught up with, because if they realise the facts of life, they would know that the number of people in agriculture in a general way in Barbados is infinitesimal. The plantation economy is the one which involves large numbers of people. People who grow okras or plant yams only can be forgotten in the context of this, because there are not as many people in that category that would harm anybody, and compared with the sugar industry, it is like the proverbial mosquito on the rump of the rhinoceros. What are we going to do therefore in a situation like this? The people who grow okras or plant lettuce or something like that which are cash crops do not engage large sectors, but the main purpose of the Government bringing this is to investigate the sugar industry, to do something for cane farmers, or as they say, to give a minimum wage to everybody. I think that everybody is entitled to a minimum wage; but for how long are you going to give it? Are you going to give a minimum wage for ten weeks or fifty-two weeks? I know that the number of people in the sugar

industry reaches 20,000 in crop. If the Commission of Enquiry goes into the sugar industry, do you mean that these 20,000 people are going to be offered a minimum wage? Or do you mean the out of crop people, who are about 8,000, on the average of so many days per week?

Mr. Chairman, there is only one unfortunate thing about it, and it is that the Commission has come at a peculiar time, if I may say so, in that Britain proposes to enter into the Common Market, and we have to study what effect the United Kingdom's entry into the European Common Market is going to have on the primary producing products of this area, and what is going to happen with the sugar negotiations which have a price guarantee up to 1969, and to what extent this is going to affect the situation here. Now I heard the Premier say, and I know from a practical point of view, that it has been said that Barbados has to cut down its production. I think it was in the papers this morning in speaking to the hotel people. I do not know if the hon. senior member for St. Andrew read what the Premier said, or knows what is the policy of the Government on this broad, economic problem, because you got the Premier yesterday making a statement to one effect while the hon. member says something different. Everybody talks about economists, but we have a lot of economists here. When people talk about \$16 million in the tourist industry, nobody tells you what is the net return from the tourist industry. The hon. junior member for Christ Church spoke on the tourist industry, but I can tell anybody that not less than 30%, and it may be more like 40%, of the total income they put against the tourist industry, goes back outside without touching anybody's hands in Barbados. Do you realise that many of these hotels have, by agreement, to pay 20% to these ASTA people? That is why sometimes when I argue with them and they tell me that they have to pay 20% to the agents in the United States or the United Kingdom, I ask them to let me see what the wage bill is, because if they can pay this money and cannot pay higher wages, then something has to be wrong.
3.10 p.m.

Just do not talk glibly in this flabby chat which you hear people talking. Politicians will give you flabby chat, and the man in the street does not know until he gets something which he cannot realise. You hear a man say that the tourist industry is worth \$16 million, not realising that \$33 million which the sugar industry is valued at means \$33 million in Barbados and \$33 million circulating in the Barbados economy. The \$16 million which the tourist industry is valued at does not mean the same thing. I do not mean to say that you do not have to encourage the tourist industry or industrial development, but do not let us think that \$16 million in the tourist industry means the same thing as \$16 million in the sugar industry.

When the hon. member says that Sandy Lane employs 150 people, I am not saying that the Sandy Lane project may not prove to be a worthwhile project; but it is not the project which is worrying me; what is worrying all of us is what steps are you taking to examine the net result. The hon. senior member for St. Andrew does not know that setting up a Commission of Enquiry is not the problem. I met a man who contended that he got \$4,000 as a result of displacement, but he would have never got any \$4,000 if he did not have the Trade Union to negotiate for him. But what is the problem? It does not matter if you give him \$4,000 or \$10,000; what matters is that there is a day coming when that same man is going to ask you for a job. Between July last and February you paid out \$1 1/2 million to displaced personnel which meant more than what the total wages would have been. What is worrying me is what is going to happen after. These persons are unemployed and they are going to ask you for a job. What is needed is a Committee to study the question of unemployment resulting from these changes which you have to face.

I may tell the hon. senior member for St. Andrew that if you did not have the Deep Water Harbour, you would have to keep all the sugar made in St. Andrew and make sling and sell it at one cent a pint — and at that, you will not be able to get it sold. The hon. member must bear in mind that the economy of Barbados is part of the world economy. The economy of Barbados is sugar. Another of our indus-

tries which is part of the world economy is the tourist industry. Our population is not big enough for us to do something on our own. You cannot start growing potatoes and yams as an economic crop because you cannot eat potatoes and yams and go to sleep. As soon as you have to buy clothes and so on, you have to go in for something which you can sell to somebody so as to get something else for yourself. If you are in a wage economy, you have to be in a position to be going in for something which is tied up with something in the world economy. You are dealing with sugar, which is one of the most fragile economies in the world because it is not coffee or tea. You can only grow coffee on a coffee tree and you can only get tea from a tea plant; but you can get sugar from growing other things than cane. The people are getting sugar from beet, they are getting sugar from the sucrose content of other things; therefore, they are not going in for any subsidising of anything which you have because they do not know when a war is going to tumble down on them and place them in a position where they do not have any sugar and they cannot get it from you. They are getting it out of beet and they are going to extract the sucrose content from out of these things. There are four million people in China who do not worry with sugar at all. They have no sugar taste. Therefore, you have to get it quite clear that we are dealing with an economy which is very fragile.

I say that so that the hon. member can understand that there are people whose job it is to pay close attention to these things. We, of the Barbados Workers' Union, have just prepared a memorandum to place before the sugar people, and that memorandum which is forty pages thick deals with out-of-crop wages for sugar workers of every level and a new formula for relating these things. You cannot do these things in the House of Assembly.

May I also tell you that one of the problems with which we are faced in the sugar industry is that at the moment with the amount of sugar manufactured in Barbados some of the manufacturers are getting uneasy; they do not want the amount to be over the amount which they can get a guaranteed price for because they say that the price for that over the amount is lower than the price which they have to pay for making the sugar. Some of them say that it would not pay them to make more than a certain amount of sugar because the additional amount cost them more to manufacture than what they are getting for it. In other words, if it costs them ten cents to manufacture, they only get eight cents for it.

Sir, your enquiry may come at a time when things are not booming; but far from things not booming, you may have to utilise more land for planting other crops, which may be quite a sensible thing to do. For example, instead of Barbados importing so much potatoes and other foodstuffs, you may grow more of the local things used in the community. That may be all right; but one of the problems which you have in the community is that Barbadians like rice; and rice is not grown here. You cannot transform the eating habits of a community overnight. You cannot tell the people that they must eat potatoes and do not worry with rice. At present you are subsidising rice to the tune of \$400,000 because Bajans like their rice. The economist, if he is working on the theory, would say that it would be wiser for Barbados to subsidise the growing of more potatoes than to subsidise rice. All the countries which subsidise foodstuffs, subsidise their own local crops. The United States of America subsidise wheat, but not the wheat coming from Canada; they subsidise the wheat grown in the U.S.A. Barbadians are forced to subsidise a crop which is grown outside of the country which means that you are propping up somebody else who is producing rice.

3.20 p.m.

It is difficult for you to tell a Barbadian that your economic section must eat yams, lettuce and all the crops which grow here, and save the money. That will not be so easy. In the United States of America and in the United Kingdom — well, nobody grows tea in the United Kingdom; it comes from Ceylon. I think it is necessary for hon. members to understand the full implications of this matter.

The Hon. Minister, in introducing this Resolution, said that the Union agrees with the terms of reference and some

of the members of the Executive Council of the Union know the officials who form this enquiry. I must say that the Union knew of the enquiry. The Government said that they were going to set up an enquiry, and in so far as the Union is concerned, I say that it did not matter to us whom you named to put on this Commission of Enquiry. Mr. Michael Manley at one stage was named for the Chairmanship of the Commission. We were not worried in any way. I do not like the idea of substituting cleverness for commonsense because it catches up with you. I am quite satisfied that an investigation into the Sugar Industry of this island cannot do anybody any harm. As far as the Union is concerned, we would like to see an investigation into the industry because we have nothing to lose by it. We have no dispute. If you want to investigate anything we say: "Go ahead, we do not mind". If you want to have an investigation into the Trade Union tomorrow I would say: "Go ahead and have your investigation; see what funds are being collected and how the money is being spent; you should have this investigation because it will be something good for the public".

I say that it is the Government's business to say to the members of this House what are the terms of reference, in relation to this Commission of Enquiry. If it is a question of giving a man a guaranteed minimum wage, that does not mean anything unless you say what kind of wage you mean. It may be a guaranteed annual wage or a weekly wage amounting to what? You should set out in your terms of reference what you have in view. We know what are the wages in the Sugar Industry. You may mean giving a man work for three or four days a week but at what rate? The rate stipulates what the cost is going to be. If you are giving a man work for three or four days a week, you must guarantee a minimum of 200 days, provided that the man is willing to come out to work, and at so much. I would counsel the Minister not to start anything unless you know what the implications are going to be. If you start something and you do not know the implications of it, when the rebound takes place then you want to look for another scapegoat. For instance; the last Government started the Deep Water Harbour; they had five years to study the implications of the loss of work which would come as a consequence of the construction of the Harbour, but they did not make any study of it; however, when the Deep Water Harbour was to be opened, they wanted to take all the credit for it. They called in the yard fowls and you saw people with beer in their hands and sandwiches in their mouths; but when, in July, the workers were displaced, the Harbour was Walcott's Harbour. They did not study what Walcott was telling them when the Deep Water Harbour was being built, but after it was finished it was Walcott's Harbour. I did not want it to be said when the rebound took place: "Well, you know, the Union agreed". Mr. Chairman, I have been used as a scapegoat often in this island; when the money is missing, I have it; nowadays you hear that I send back money into the Treasury.

As I was saying, Sir, if the hon. member said that the enquiry is with a view to having a minimum wage, I think that he should explain to the Committee what is in his mind. This Government Party went to the country and won an Election on this basis. I think it is incumbent on the Hon. Minister to tell the Committee what is meant by the terms of reference; when he talks about this minimum wage which was put in the Government's Manifesto, hon. members must know what is in his mind. There is a minimum wage which you can give a man based on a weekly wage where a man gets so much money. In the United States of America, you have a minimum wage of \$1.00 or \$1.25 and nobody can be employed for less than that amount; but they do not say that a man must be guaranteed fourteen hours per week. It does not guarantee that every man who is given a minimum wage per hour will get that wage for every week in the year. If you get agricultural workers believing that they are going to get a guaranteed weekly wage by your setting up a Commission of Enquiry, you should not inject or project that point of view into people's minds if it is not forthcoming. I can say without the Commission coming here you cannot have a casual look at 22,000 people with 22,000 weekly wages; that is why I say that you have this vague generalisation. What the hon. senior member for St. Andrew says would give us the impression that by passing this Resolution to set up this Commission of Enquiry, we are giving the seal to this matter.

3.30 p.m.

There are some workers today who get a guaranteed week. I do not believe it should be difficult to give all the factory workers a guaranteed rate because their economy is one.....

Mr. Chairman, you will have to ask the hon. senior member for the City to go out of the House.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. senior member for the City is interrupting the hon. member who is addressing the Chair.

Mr. WALCOTT: We are interrupting him; so we will ask him to leave. All I am asking the hon. member and the Clerk to do is to go into the Speaker's Lobby and discuss their matters.

I think, Sir, that the factories would be able to offer an easy solution in some aspects, but as I said, it is for the Minister to tell the House what they have in mind as far as the minimum wage they want is concerned, so that at least not only the members, but the Commission would know. This is a public Commission you are having, and there is no point in having a Commission and no debate has taken place on what is expected from the public Commission, apart from the strict terms of reference, because these are what the Commission would work on; but the debate would give us some lead as to what it is. Let there be no mistake about what hon. members would say for the sugar workers, and when I say sugar workers, you know what I mean, because sugar represents the basic economy, and if these workers form part of the core of your industrial society, there is nothing wrong in having the best terms for them.

I do not know, Sir, if the Hon. Minister gave notice today of a Resolution, but the point which the hon. senior member for St. Andrew raised is about the payment of the people at the Sandy Lane Factory, and I should like to say to the hon. member, if he does not know, that an agreement has already been passed in this House in which you can levy \$1.00 per ton out of the sugar industry for the purpose of instituting a Provident Fund to take care of the points raised by the hon. member, and we in the Union have called upon this Government too to see that this matter be implemented before the Commission of Enquiry is set up, because this is something in which negotiations have been going on for the last three years, and we feel it is something that should be implemented. When the hon. member talks about Sandy Lane, he does not know the number of workers that is involved. There are workers at Carringtons Factory, sugar curers at Bulkeley, people at Searles and people up and down the country who for the last three years have been calling upon the last Government to implement the scheme, but in matters that need political approval, somebody always wants the credit for doing something.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want any credit or any kudos for doing anything. I want to be able to have an idea; and if I have an idea that projects something before me, it does not matter whether you say the idea was yours or that you were thinking of it too. All I want to know is that I can project an idea that is worth something. That idea was projected years ago to be implemented, but somebody seems to be afraid that I have projected the idea and does not want to do something that is not his idea. I could not care less. I would like to see the workers get the benefit of a Provident Fund, and the workers in the sugar industry are entitled to it. There is an amount of nearly \$1 million that can be implemented right now, but the last Government went out of power eight months ago and they did nothing about it. They knew about the Sandy Lane affair, but they dilly-dallied. This Government has been in power for eight months, and we have asked them to implement it; so when you hear these statements being made, you must know the background of them to know the delay.

As I said, Mr. Chairman, I am a democrat. The Government won the election on the basis that they were going to have a further enquiry into the sugar industry. It is Government's business to do it, and in doing it, to say what they mean by the terms of reference. I agree that the terms

of reference should be in the Addendum, and I am of the opinion that whether or not the Minister is in Port-of-Spain, it is incumbent on the Government, because it is Government's policy, to state to the House the terms of reference. On the question of a minimum wage in the sugar industry, the Government should give some insight as to what they mean by a minimum wage and in what context, so as to give some lead to people, because you do not want to make the minimum wage a maximum wage. You want the minimum wage within this context to be something higher and better than what it is, because if a man is now getting \$500 or \$800 a year as an income out of the sugar industry, you do not want to have an enquiry that gives him a minimum weekly wage so that when the year ends he only gets \$750, which is \$50 a year short, or give him weekly employment of three days when the money earned does not come up to the same thing.

So far as the Union is concerned, Mr. Chairman, we have no objection whatsoever to the enquiry, because we have to negotiate wages anyhow. Whatever enquiry you have, it will leave the situation where you have to investigate wages, and if you are going to guarantee a minimum wage week by week for workers in the sugar industry, all you have to do is to try and see the highest wage you can get for those who are guaranteed, and we will be extremely happy. What the hon. senior member for St. Andrew has said in the relation to the generalisation is all right if he is speaking without specific reference to this; but I would say that the question of the Sandy Lane workers is a grievous one, and if the hon. member reads, he would see that up to last Saturday the Barbados Workers' Union at its Annual Convention again passed a Resolution condemning this delay, and calling upon the Government to implement the scheme. I will say to the hon. member that any delay in implementing any scheme for Sandy Lane Factory or any factory in Barbados must reside with the Government. The Minister of Labour who introduced this Resolution received a letter from the Union within six weeks after the Minister took over office, and we have not received a reply as to what the Minister's intention is about that. I would like to ask the Minister what is his reply about the Union's proposition on the Sandy Lane affair and its implementation. I do not know if a Resolution was introduced today, because I was not here at the beginning, implementing that scheme; but six weeks after the Minister took over from the last Government, the Barbados Workers' Union requested the Government to implement this scheme, because money is there or should have been there, and we would like to see the workers have a scheme from which they can be compensated. As I said, this loose, flabby chat is all right in a general way; but when you are dealing in a specific manner with a matter, you should know the full facts about it.

3.40 p.m.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Chairman, I have listened for some length of time to the remarks of the hon. senior member for St. Peter and, of course, it has occasioned no surprise that on a matter of this nature the hon. member spoke at length and with much interest because the subject of a Commission of Enquiry into the sugar industry would hold great interest for the General Secretary of the only Trade Union in the Island.

What I have been amazed about and partly every hon. member who spoke before me is that the terms of this Commission of Enquiry are not precisely yet known to us and it does appear as if we are going to pass this Resolution without the Hon. Minister giving the House the precise terms of reference of this Commission.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. I do not think that that is a clear or accurate statement. The hon. junior member for St. Peter may not have been in his place, but I most decisively read out the specific terms of reference of the Commission.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Sir, in spite of that, I still speak at great disadvantage and the hon. member is very well aware of that. The Hon. Minister was in his place when the hon. senior member for St. Peter was addressing the Chair

and he said as much as I have said, I use the word "precisely". Mark you, Sir, I did hear that the Hon. Minister proposed to set up a Commission of Enquiry and that one of the terms of reference was the matter of going into the provision of a minimum wage for agricultural workers.

Now, Sir, I cannot conceive, when I have heard that, that I have heard precisely the terms of reference of the Commission of Enquiry. Is it going in for this one phase as far as it affects the agricultural workers? I ask that because I have not heard the hon. senior member for St. Peter mention other references which can be called a term. If I am wrong, I am willing to sit; if I am not wrong, I remain on my feet.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: If I may repeat the terms of reference of the Commission of Enquiry, they are:-

"To enquire into all aspects of the sugar industry with special reference to its finances and general economics including the arrangements for marketing of canes and all sugar and molasses and the provision of a guaranteed minimum weekly wage for all agricultural workers in the sugar industry."

Mr. HUSBANDS: I am very grateful to the Hon. Minister because he said that the terms of reference of this Commission of Enquiry include all aspects of the sugar industry. They are very many indeed. The reason why I was interested in getting to know the terms of reference of this Commission-to-be is that I know that there must have been some reasons prompting the Government to set up this Commission of Enquiry and, of course, I should like to know them. I would not like to have somebody to say that it was set up for political reasons because in the absence of precise terms of reference, there would be no way of shifting such an accusation. However, I will still observe that although the terms of reference seem rather full - it begins that way by mentioning all aspects of the sugar industry - yet that itself is rather hazy.

There are certain things mentioned such as marketing of canes and the handling of sugar and molasses and the general finances of the industry and I do hope that this Commission which we are about to set up would be able to cover very, very thoroughly these terms that have been given.

However, Sir, there is one phase of the sugar industry affecting the workers that I am interested in. I do wish that there can be embodied in the terms of reference the provision for sugar workers in their old age. I quite remember during the last political campaign that many workers in St. Peter came to me asking what the Government would do, or would be doing, as far as making some provision for sugar workers in the time of their old age. That is one of the things which is always coming up, always popping up, and those of us who witness the conditions of sugar workers during their old age, I do not think can afford to let it leave our minds.

It is appalling to see what are the conditions of the agricultural workers who always get lip service from politicians, but year after year I do not even see any move in that direction. I remember bringing up that suggestion to the former Minister of Agriculture in the past Government and I do not think I got from him much of a promise; but I hope the present Minister of Agriculture will interest himself even now before this Commission is appointed and would suggest to the Commission that since the general finances of the sugar industry come well within the terms of reference of the Commission, consequently some provision may be granted to agricultural workers during their old age.

On the question of severance pay, I have heard, and this House has heard, from the hon. senior member for St. Peter on more than one occasion of several delays affecting workers from Sandy Lane and he has given the House notice of his intention to bring to the notice of the Government how those workers were suffering as a result of such delay.

3.50 p.m.

Even more recently than Sandy Lane, there is a development scheme which has not yet got on the way. That development scheme is in the parish which I have the honour to represent. Everybody knows that Heywoods Plantation has been sold to a foreign company and that plantation will soon be going out of sugar production. It is continuing only for a short while; as a matter of fact, it was the decision of the proprietors to stop cultivation. Just a few weeks ago, cultivation has begun again for a time. The day is not very far off when Heywoods' sugar workers will be out for good and some provision should be sought for them too.

I do not think that my colleague has conducted any negotiations for severance pay between the Union and the former employers, but that is something which, whenever I hear the Sandy Lane premises mentioned, I wonder if any severance is coming to the workers at Heywoods plantation in the parish which my colleague and I have the honour to represent. There are many matters which I think this Commission will be able to make enquiries into, because the matter is put in the role of Trade Unionism. I would like the Hon. Minister to answer the question about a minimum wage; the mention of a minimum wage would require a little clarification. Everyone knows that sugar cane production has its in and out season. There is a season for cultivation, there is one for harvesting, there is a short rest and then there is cultivation again. I think it is a tedious matter to draw up a minimum wage. For my part, I would be more interested in the plight of the sugar worker during his old age and I do believe that the Government will grant these workers some assistance.

While co-operating with the Trade Union in promoting some scheme, I say that this Resolution for the sum of \$8,193 is not really controversial, unless the Government could not give this Committee sufficient reasons for the setting up of this Commission. The hon. senior member is interested in the agricultural workers. I think there was a time when he sounded a somewhat discordant note on this matter, but he will give the Resolution its blessing and hope for its passing. I think I should end on the note that a minimum wage, or the mention of it, does not mean very much; I think of the provision which should be made for these old people when they have given their best in the agricultural industry. I hope that the Minister will be very promptly on his feet; but when it is said that we do not know what the terms of reference were, it seems to me that that hinges around the question of making provision for a minimum wage. I hope the Minister of Agriculture or the Minister of Labour, who presented this Resolution, will see fit to stress the necessity for including in the terms of reference of this Commission some sort of security and provision for the worn-out and tired agricultural worker.

Mr. WALCOTT: My colleague knows something about this matter. I want to make it clear that the Barbados Workers' Union and the Barbados Sugar Producers' Association have already agreed that all workers in the sugar industry should have a Provident Fund and they have agreed on a certain amount of money. In that connection, the Government has already passed a Resolution for one dollar per ton to take care of these people. You therefore do not need any Commission of Enquiry to go into that matter. In addition to that, the Sugar Producers' Association and the Barbados Workers Union have agreed that if a plantation or factory goes out of production like Sandy Lane or Heywoods Plantation, the plantation would pay money out of its own pockets to the workers. In a similar way as others were going out for other reasons, the Union said that nobody would close down a factory for the sake of giving severance pay. In these border-line cases, the plantation remains and the amount out of production goes into the Provident Fund and still you will get more money.

Sandy Lane does not pay any more money into the Provident Fund because they have sold out the Plantation. The sugar people agreed that the Sandy Lane Factory will pay to their factory workers out of what they have; similarly, in the case of the sugar workers at Heywoods that plantation would have to pay. Mr. Chairman, I have been very decent with the Government; they have come to an agreement to which people would not have come if they were not working

in the sugar crop. Agreement has been reached on what can be regarded as social security measures between Government and employers. That was the subject of an enquiry too. We objected; and our reason for that is that we did not think we should wait for a Commission of Enquiry to go into that matter. We say that you should start something and let the enquiry say whether it is enough or not. 4.00 p.m.

I say for that reason that the Union did not agree that that should be the subject for an enquiry, because an agreement had already been reached on that.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: Mr. Chairman, it was during this debate that I think much doubt has been removed. Dealing with the money for these sugar workers, I am very thankful to the hon. junior member for Christ Church; and when he mentioned — and I have every reason to believe what he said is true — that a particular worker because of certain circumstances has been granted some money, one must wonder what has become of the rest of money or about the other workers. Today it has been made clear. The hon. junior member for Christ Church has put his side, that there is a willingness to pay out this money; the hon. senior member for St. Peter, the Trade Unionist, has made it clear that the Union has done its part; so it remains for some other side to make a uniform rate. But the particular point now is that there is a willingness to pay out the money, and it is a question of some uniformity and last but not least, the delay. It is not enough for the one who has the money to say he is willing to pay it while nothing is being paid.

Some time ago, Sir, it was said that the people who owned Sandy Lane Factory did not want to pay the money, and others who did not understand it said that the Trade Union Leader was responsible. When you went to one side, they said that they were willing to pay, but it was the Union, and therefore the blame fell on the Trade Union leader. That was not fair, but I think from today it has been made clear that it is only a question that no side is unwilling for the people to get this money, but it is a question of getting together, having some uniformity and satisfying the people. It is not enough for a man to know that the money is there; he wants to know that everybody is willing to pay and the machinery is set in gear. I think this is a warning, because what is said today within these walls will be known throughout the Island, and in the end someone will have to bear the burden.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman, I will speak again because in the lunch hour I checked my statement with the firm of DaCosta and Company, and I never realised I was so correct. All I said I can repeat, and I have figures here to prove what I am saying. DaCosta and Company three years ago set aside a sum of money to be paid to 67 displaced factory workers at Sandy Lane. I saw the list of names, and I will repeat when it was put to the Inland Revenue Department, they said that the Company would have to pay 40% of the sum they had put aside to pay these workers. As a matter of fact, DaCosta's has had to pay that 40%, and the result is that they can only pay out 60% to the workers, and they are waiting for a refund of the 40% from the Income Tax Commissioner to pay out to the workers. As a matter of fact, it is in such an abeyance that they have not been able to pay out the 60%, since they are waiting for a decision from the Income Tax Office. That is all it is. They are glad to get rid of it because they are annoyed daily in this office over this very matter. It is now for the Government to come down with some form of a Bill to make it legal for the Income Tax Department office to refund that money so that the workers can get it. It is as simple as that. The money is there for them; I have the figures and have seen the names and the amounts that have been paid out; and I will say that in one case where a young man was going to England, he told them for God's sake to give him what was his, they paid him the whole thing and he has gone with it. But DaCosta's has had to pay income tax on that money.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Before the Hon. Minister replies, I think my colleague has made it abundantly clear that it remains only for the present Government to have this legal

tangle set right, because when one says the Government, one really means the Income Tax Commissioner, and the question of paying the 40% must have been backed up by the legal advisers of the Government. If DaCosta and Company who are the owners of Sandy Lane give \$X to be divided among all these workers and the Income Tax Commissioner advised that they must pay 40% to the Income Tax Department, then it means that DaCosta's will only pay the remainder to the workers. It seems to me that in this case DaCosta is saying they do not think that is what the workers should get. If it were \$100 and they said the Government must get 40%, it means that the workers would get 60%, and if it were \$200, the Government would get 40% and the workers 60%. If DaCosta and Company sold Sandy Lane Factory and so many acres of land and are going to give so much money to the displaced workers, and the advisers to the Income Tax Commissioner said that they must pay 40% of that to the Government, then it remains for you to say whether the people should get 100% or whether the Government should get 40%. It is a matter for you to untangle that with the Income Tax Department. The Union has done its part and the Sugar Producers have done their part. In actual fact DaCosta's is willing to pay this money, but the Income Tax Department has said that the Government must get 40%.

I would like to hear the Minister on that part because during his lunch hour the hon. junior member for Christ Church went into DaCosta's to confirm his facts, and what the Trade Unionist has said is correct.

Mr. WALCOTT: I will go further..... Mr. Speaker, I do not want any gesticulations from the Gallery about how we are to speak. I want the people in the Gallery to understand that they are not part of the House of Assembly; otherwise they would have to run. I faced the electorate and was elected here; therefore I do not want any advice from the Gallery. Let the Gallery get it clear that elected members have to be unfettered in here. I am not one of the members who are afraid of the Gallery. 4.10 p.m.

Let the Gallery get it clear that elected members have to be unfettered in here.

I go further. I am nothing to do even if DaCosta has to pay 40%, 50% or 99,999%. The position is that an amount of money is to be paid to the workers. I want to say that it is the fault of both Governments. The last Government did not do it and the present Government has not done it either. The next thing we heard was that they were going to set up a Commission of Enquiry. Do you think that I am a country bookie now? Do you think that I am going to sit down like an idiot? The Government which preceded this took three years and now this Government says that it is going to set up a Commission. Must I agree to that?

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. I want to enquire from the hon. member what is a country bookie.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I rise on a point of order. I did not connect the interruptions of the hon. senior member for St. Peter to the Commission of Enquiry in this context. It has absolutely nothing to do with the question of severance pay or compensation for displaced workers of Sandy Lane or any other factory. They are separate and distinct things.

Mr. WALCOTT: The hon. junior member for St. Peter spoke on this matter and made specific reference to this question and I answered the hon. member by telling him that I was informed that a Resolution would come down today dealing with this question and settling issues about this matter. I was not in the House at the beginning, and I do not know if the Resolution was introduced to that effect; but I informed him that in so far as this matter being a subject for this Enquiry, the Union had objected to this matter being dealt with by the Commission. I told him that the Union objected to this question being included.

The original note which came to the Barbados Workers Union came with these terms of reference — not that the name of Sandy Lane Factory was mentioned — before I left

in June, and the Union sent back to say that we do not agree that those things should be a matter of a Commission of Enquiry and that we regarded those things as a matter which should be settled alone. If the hon. member looked back at his file, he would see that we did not accept the terms of reference because of the Provident Fund. They talked of social security and we pointed out that the question of social security was already covered in that context.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I did not want to say anything on this matter, but I would have to say this now because after hearing the hon. senior member for St. Peter — and he knows his stuff when it comes to Trade Union work — he has not left one thing for me to say on that particular matter; but I now feel very unhappy to know that money is there for these displaced workers and still they cannot get it. This is just like the old lady. They are in double trouble. They lost their work and are out of work. Money is there for them and they cannot get the money. I do not think this present Government can get out of it.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Sir, I rise on a point of order. The position is this. The question of severance pay for displaced workers is entirely separate and distinct from the matter before the Committee now. In so far as this is concerned, it deals specifically with the Resolution for the setting up of a Commission of Enquiry, but the legislation to deal with compensation for displaced sugar workers will come before the Legislature shortly; and when it comes, we are in a position to explain to the satisfaction of even the hon. junior member for St. Joseph any reasons for the delay.

May I suggest merely for the sake of getting this and other matters on the Order Paper concluded before midnight that we stick to the Resolution before us and get the debate through? I am prepared that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph and his colleague, and whoever wants to, have a field day and discuss as long as they like all the ramifications and documentations of the matters of severance pay for displaced sugar workers. When the time comes, our position can be explained with ease and I would be quite capable of doing so. We have this Bill dealing with the Boundaries Commission and a number of other matters on the Order Paper to be dealt with. As hon. members know, we are hoping to bring the session to an end for six weeks as from today, but if we go on like this we will not be able to do so. Hon. members should be allowed all the latitude they want to discuss this and any matter which they want; but they must also bear in mind that we have a lot of other matters to conclude before we adjourn.

Mr. SMITH: The hon. member sat there in his seat and allowed one of his backbenchers, the hon. senior member for St. Andrew, to open the question of Sandy Lane.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. Oh no; it was the hon. junior member for Christ Church who raised that question.

Mr. GODDARD: Oh no, the hon. senior member for St. Andrew raised the question and I answered him.

Mr. CORBIN: I will never forget what Samson said. He said that if you had not ploughed with my heifer, you would not have expounded my riddle. If I had not touched on that question, we would not have known that money was there for the people.

Mr. SMITH: I want the Hon. Minister to bear in mind that all of us have equal rights in here and I do not think that I was pushed inside here on a stretcher. I have been elected by the people. The Hon. Minister allowed his own Party member, referred to by my colleague the hon. junior member for St. George as the Parliamentary Secretary-to-be, to open this question on Sandy Lane and now he is appealing to the Committee and to me, drawing our attention to other important matters to be dealt with tonight.

Why did he not appeal to his Party member, the very one whom he can control? He would not do that, but I must sit in my seat and say nothing. It is not fair to us.

Look at the way the Hon. Minister introduced this Resolution! He started out with a certain amount of smartness

because he omitted to let us know in the first instance the personnel of the Commission of Enquiry. It was only when the hon. senior member for the City drew it to his attention that he got up and said that he forgot to mention it.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. I object to his smug insinuation that I got up on my feet with no intention to give the personnel of the Commission. This file was pushed in my hands five minutes after I sat here today.
4.20 p.m.

When somebody asked for the personnel I also gave him that. It was merely an omission that it was not mentioned earlier. That is all there is to it.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I am advising the Minister that when things are put into his hands at a moment's notice he should not accept them. Do not let him look at such things.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: When I said that the matter was pushed into my hands, I meant that the Hon. Minister of Agriculture was not in the island.

Mr. SMITH: If the appropriate Minister was out of the island and the Minister who is taking charge of the Resolution is not *au fait* with the facts, then he has no right dealing with this Resolution to make me believe that he is misleading the Committee.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I object to this nonsense. Nothing I said here would indicate that I wish to be misleading the Committee or to be smart.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. junior member for St. Joseph confine himself to the subject matter of this Resolution?

Mr. SMITH: I am talking about this latitude and the way in which the hon. member began to introduce the Resolution. I am saying that at the same time that the Resolution was pushed at him, the terms of reference of the Commission of Enquiry should have been pushed at him too.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: The hon. member is completely misinformed. The first thing I did was to read the terms of reference.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I think that the hon. member is very unkind to the Minister.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I think that things were going very good today, and now you are starting up something.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I asked the hon. member to stick to the Resolution.

Mr. SMITH: Are the terms of reference not any part of the Resolution? But what do you think it is? It does not appear to me as if you know whether you are right or wrong. I repeat that, as to the terms of reference, the Hon. Minister never mentioned them in his opening remarks. It was only after.....

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order. That is not true. The first thing I did in dealing with this Resolution was to read the terms of reference. If the hon. member wants to say that the terms of reference should have been printed in the Addendum to the Resolution, well, let him say so. I do not prepare Addenda; therefore do not let the hon. member say that I did not read the terms of reference as soon as I began to speak on the Resolution.

Mr. SMITH: The hon. member read the Resolution and it was only after the hon. senior member for the City asked for the personnel of the Committee — as a matter of fact, even up to then, the Hon. Minister did not read the terms of reference. I think that it was the same hon. senior member for the City who referred to the terms of reference and then the Minister read them out. Whether he read the terms of reference or not, it is not sufficient for me and for other

members of this Committee for the hon. member to have something in front of him and to read it out to us as if we are little children. The terms of reference should have been given to us at the same time as the Resolution was circulated. I had expected to hear, when the Hon. Minister read out the terms of reference, that they would be the terms of reference in relation to these workers, rather than the terms of reference of the Commission to recommend a minimum wage. I was listening to hear that the recommendations would be in relation to these people who, if they work for two or three days a week, they would be paid for a whole week as was promised during the General Election. That is why I wanted to see the terms of reference in this Resolution, because if the Government members are carrying out their promises to the Electorate then they will have to carry them out fully.

Mr. Chairman, I am asking the Hon. Minister not to do things in this way any more. I feel that although the Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries who is the appropriate Minister to deal with this matter is out of the island, I do not think it is good enough for one Minister to put another Minister in charge of a matter and that latter Minister did not have any opportunity to study it. That is not good enough for a Government. I still feel, though, that the Hon. Minister, who is dealing with the Resolution, should know something about this matter before it was pushed at him at the last moment. There is something which is not good enough in this Resolution because the hon. senior member for the City had to pull the personnel of the Commission and the terms of reference out of the Hon. Minister. If nobody had said anything about the matter, we would not have had the terms of reference and the personnel of the Commission.

MEMBERS: Question! Question!

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, before you put the question, there are just two points which I want to make as regards the money which we are spending on this Commission of Enquiry. One of the Opposition speakers criticised an amount in the Resolution and said that it was too high. (Mr. MOTTLEY: Who did that?) It was the hon. junior member for St. George. I should like to inform this Committee that previously we wanted to have the services of Mr. Carl Goldenberg who directed a similar enquiry in Jamaica in 1959 and in 1960 in Trinidad. He demanded the same fees, he wanted his transportation, his travelling and living expenses here and he wanted a fee of \$300 a day (Canadian Dollars), and \$250 a day for the work which he did on the Commission in Montreal. When we arranged to pay Dr. Rawle Farley a fee of one hundred dollars a day, you can see what economy has been effected.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I could not allow that to pass unnoticed. I said that the fees were high. The Trade Union representative is not satisfied. We have long passed the age when we should have a Commission of Enquiry to recommend wage rates. To tell me that anyone would come to Barbados to do something of this nature with fees at the rate of \$100 a day and that is not high, I would like to know what you are saying. You know that it is not true that this matter was just pushed in your hands at the last minute and, in fact, the Minister would have to read the terms of reference at the Cabinet before he came down to this House with this Resolution.

4.30 p.m.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order, I said absolutely nothing about seeing this for the first time, and if the hon. member cannot understand English, it is not my fault. What I said was that the file was given to me when I came here today. The point is this, Mr. Chairman. If the hon. member feels as his Government felt last time that there should be no enquiry into the sugar industry, let him say so; but we are paying far less than Jamaica or Trinidad paid for a similar enquiry. It is more than passing strange that in Jamaica, the Government should have seen fit to have brought in an enquiry under the Chairmanship of Goldenberg on this matter. Trinidad did the same thing when faced with a similar situation, but here in Barbados no enquiry is needed. All I am saying is that by not getting

Mr. Goldenberg and by getting Dr. Farley, we are paying one-fifth of what Trinidad and Jamaica paid to their Chairman for having a similar enquiry.

Mr. MILLER: What are we to do with Jamaica? He is talking about Jamaica and Trinidad; but we have not got any money in the Treasury, and he is telling me that they are paying \$100 a day and criticising me for saying it is too high. You were talking about this for two years, but now want to persuade this House that the file was pressed into your hands at the last hour. You had to read this at Cabinet and you are familiar with it.

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

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that you do now report the passing of three Resolutions in Committee.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, seconded in each case by Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, the Resolutions were read a first and second time and agreed to.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Order No. 4 be the next order of the Day.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: I beg to second that.

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

HOUSE RESUMES DEBATE ON PUBLIC HEALTH BILL

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Social Services: to resume debate on the Second Reading of a Bill to repeal the Public Health Act, 1908, and the Public Health (Amendment) Act, 1945 (Act 1945-29).

On the last occasion when this Bill was under discussion, the hon. senior member for St. Michael had completed his speech, and the hon. senior member for the City seconded by the hon. junior member for St. George moved the postponement of further consideration. The hon. member for the City may now resume if he thinks fit. It is not compulsory.

Mr. MOTTLEY: It is not compulsory; it is my turn to speak.

Mr. SPEAKER: I trust the hon. member is not addressing the Chair.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I was really looking in the direction of the hon. junior member for St. George to remind him that it is my turn to speak.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to have had the opportunity of moving the postponement of this Bill so that the Government should get an opportunity to give the matter further consideration. This is actually to repeal the Public Health Act, 1908 and the Public Health (Amendment) Act, 1945-29, and I took the opportunity since the adjournment of the House to refresh myself with the various sections of the Bill and to observe the difference between the repeal of portions of the Act against the amendments of the Bill.

Now without making any accusation against any Civil Servant whom I believe myself is in any way dishonest — and I have not been a hypocrite since I have been in here — whether or not a Civil Servant can defend himself and I feel he is dishonest, I will say so on the floor of the House, and you either encourage it by cursing me or you do not defend them.

The object of the Bill, Sir, is to give more power, as I said on the last occasion, to the Town and Country Plan-

ning Officer. Let me begin by saying this on this occasion: I have never opposed the idea of having a Town and Country Planning Office in this country, because sitting on my immediate left are my colleagues who deal week after week with applications, and we have on several occasions supported the Town and Country Planning Officer in respect of people who wanted to come along and put their houses on the street without leaving a single foot of pathway or sidewalk for people to walk on.
4.40 p.m.

We have already agreed as to the setting up of the Town and Country Planning Office because the hotel people in the Hastings area wanted to erect their hotels right out to the end of the road. We have agreed with the Town and Country Planning Officer on several occasions, but we have however on other occasions disagreed with him. I have made it very clear to the Hon. Minister present under whose portfolio this comes that I do not feel this amendment is coming at the appropriate time. Rather, I have said, I feel there is necessity for a Town and Country Planning Officer because you must plan for the future: you must plan for as much as two hundred years ahead.

I do not like the way this Bill is worded. If you take the Objects and Reasons, I do not think it is the right one because there is no provision made for mention of what takes the place of the other sections in the Act.

In this Bill you are repealing the Public Health (Amendment) Act of 1908 and the Public Health (Amendment) Act, 1945, (1945-29), and the Local Government still has to be guided by provisions under the 1908 Act because the new Public Health Act cannot be operated in full yet. There are many sections under the new Act to be proclaimed; therefore when you repeal these two Acts, you are putting those persons whose authority it is to operate this Act in a very difficult position.

It is not necessary to repeal all of these two Acts. What you need is an amendment. May be, I have the temerity to make the suggestion to Government which is advised by its legal officers. However, it leaves us in each of the various Local Government areas without any power at all for the purpose of constituting or bringing up to date the sections which deal with drink, including food. When I say that, I am dealing with milk and the like. In any case, in my opinion, the transfer of such control to the Town and Country Planning Officer would be unwise until the administration of planning is thoroughly overhauled.

I drew this to the attention of the Hon. Minister concerned because I think it is absolutely necessary. What some hon. members on the other side must realise is the necessity of overhauling as soon as possible the Town and Country Planning Act. I am among those who feel that there should be an appeal to the Judiciary in a matter of this sort. I am going to show you what I consider to be partiality in the operation of this Act. I will say it may be, when the Town and Country Planning Officer did this thing, that he did it in good faith but to us it was strong partiality.

We are saying that the control and sub-division of land is still a Public Health matter and no one would say that the Board of Health caused such great dissatisfaction. I do not like the idea of one man having too much power and, as I have said on the last occasion, there were some applications resting on the desk of the Town and Country Planning Officer thus keeping a tremendous number of workers out of employment and nothing was done to expedite them at all.

I am going to give you the instance of one. As I have said, I must know about them because every month these applications must come before the City Council. Listen to this, if I must give you a concrete instance. An applicant, Mr. J. Emtage of Cave Hill was given permission to sub-divide for housing four acres of land still under cane cultivation at Grazettes and a further 5/8 acres from a 2 1/2 acre plot under vegetable cultivation, while another applicant, Mr. J. Duguid, was refused permission to sub-divide for housing a barren 5/8 acre lot of land along the

frontage of Rendezvous Road on the ground that it could be used for agriculture when the Rendezvous Road is a recognised area.

I am putting it straight to you. A five-eighths acre of land at Grazettes was sent down signed by the officer stating: "Oh, yes, you can divide it". Then you walked up to Rendezvous Road, a place of rock, and you say to Mr. Duguid who came to you with a plan and everything right: "Oh no, you cannot do this because the land is good for agricultural purposes".

Now, when we visited that site, and as a matter of fact, whenever we disagree with him, we say: "Let us see what is wrong; let us see if there is any partiality". I believe every hon. member knows Rendezvous Road and knows that the land there is barren. The officer says: "Oh no, we cannot let you put a house there," but with land at Grazettes still under cane cultivation, he says: "Yes, we are going to let you divide it".

I want to make mention that the hon. junior member for Christ Church is a member of my Party, and at one of these meetings I made it clear that I was not prepared to stand for the sort of partiality of your allowing the Goddards to raise Harrison's store four storeys and then to go next door and say to the owner of the Model Store that he could not raise his. I asked the Town and Country Planning Officer: "How can you do that?"

These things are in black and white. You allow Messrs. Goddard & Sons permission to raise their store to four storeys. My colleague, the hon. junior member for Christ Church, is a member of the Board and my Party, and I told them that I am standing for nothing like that. He had to agree with me. You cannot make flesh of one and bone of the other.

I will give you another instance. An applicant, Broome Bros., was given permission to sub-divide five acres of land at the Pine adjacent to Philip and Sunrise Drive with a stipulation that the road reserved be fifteen feet instead of thirteen feet as specified by the law; and that the development be isolated from the adjacent area by keeping a road previously approved by the Board of Health in a state of disrepair and restricting it to pedestrian traffic when the Board of Health made no such restriction on it.

Both of these conditions can be ignored as *ultra vires*, but it can be seen what to expect should those powers be transferred to the Planning Office even though the Repeal Bill says all decisions of the Board of Health will be honoured by the Planning Officer.

Let me make this clear. One day we got a telephone call saying that they did not want any lights in the Pine Hill.
4.50 p.m.

The Board of Health passed the laying out of land in Pine Hill and some people preferred it to remain in that way because they did not want any traffic over it. The Board of Health dealt with this land saying that you must divide it and therefore you must have a road. These people, however, do not want any traffic on it. What manner of man is this? You are giving this man more power by bringing forward this Bill; this is a serious matter. It can be seen what to expect when the power of the General Board of Health is transferred to the Town and Country Development Planning Officer. This is what the Bill says:-

"The decision of the Board shall be deemed for the purposes of Section 6 of the Town and Country Development Planning (Interim Control) Act, 1959, to be a decision of the Town and Country Planning Officer for planning permission."

Mr. Stevens is the substantive holder of the office and he honoured the decision of the Board of Health; but, unfortunately, within the last few months the acting gentleman felt that he was a law unto himself and therefore there was no honouring of the decision of the Board of Health. I do not know what happens in the North or what happens in the

South, but this is what happened in the municipal area: An applicant, Mrs. Garvey, of Cummins Road, Brittons Hill was refused permission in April last to erect a wooden porch on to her house on a fifteen foot building line, on the grounds that it should be a nineteen foot line. Somebody has a house 15 feet from the centre of the road. You want to make a porch, I am not against Town and Country Development Planning in this Island; I agree that there should be some form of planning, but I do not agree that a Town and Country Development Planning Officer can tell the Esso people that they can open a road on the Northern approach to the Harbour and look at another person on the same road and say "You cannot have that". We know Barbados and we will not stand for that. The Esso people are a big company with a lot of money and they are told: "Yes, you can open this road"; but when it comes to a poor fellow up the street he is told that he cannot open this road. I am a suspicious man. Now you are going to amend this Act. I do not mind who feels that I should not make these accusations. I have brought these facts in here because I do not want the Reporters to be misrepresenting anything in here. If Mr. West feels that I am misrepresenting him, then he can get the facts from me. This woman was refused permission to put on this little porch. I want the Minister to know this: I am not accusing anybody of any rank, stark dishonesty. Let me show you how dishonest this thing is. Mrs. Garvey appealed and the appeal had a right to reach the Minister's desk; that is since April; the appeal does not reach the Minister's desk, but listen to what has happened. Instead of the appeal reaching the Minister's desk, after forwarding a copy of the grounds of her appeal to the Planning Officer — before the appeal is heard, and within two months after lodging such an appeal, the section under which the appeal was made has been repealed and the building line is now made 19 feet. The Act said 15 feet.....

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: On a point of order. In case the appeal came before the Governor-in-Executive Committee, it was filed in the month of April and then the Act was repealed, extending the width of the road from 15 feet to 19 feet. At the date when the appeal was made, prior to the date of change, that law would have held good. I am perfectly sure that that matter would not have escaped the eyes of any Minister of the Cabinet. We did not have any knowledge of the appeal; if the appeal was in April and the law was changed in September, in the month of April the appeal would have to be in accordance with the law in April and not in September. That would not have escaped our notice.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am happy to hear the Hon. Minister say that; but now that the matter has been brought to his notice, he will look out for it. There was a ding-dong fight over this matter. There was the assurance that this Act would be repealed and I say now that that appeal was specifically held up on the grounds that they knew that the law would be repealed. Mr. Speaker, if that is not dishonesty, then I do not know what is dishonesty. You will notice that this Act is to be made retrospective. Is that not the case of a man who is using his power? I say that I am not against Town and Country Development Planning in this Island. We have fought and we have told people that Mr. Stevens was right. We have told people that we will not allow them to put any houses on the street like that. I have always said that this Island of Barbados must be properly planned but, at the same time, you must take into consideration the amount of land which you have.

5.00 p.m.

If you repeal this, and make it retrospective, what is going to happen to the woman's application which was kept up there? Do not ask me how I know that because I am a Barbadian, and after so many years in politics, I would say what the ex-Prime Minister of the West Indies used to say to me when I bring something in here. He used to say he would make somebody lose his job. If you kept this from the time the law allowed fifteen feet, and you amend the Act and make it nineteen feet, and the law is retrospective, what do you put a poor woman like that to do? I feel that the Hon. Minister of Communications has the guts and courage to stand up and tell this man what he has to do. If the law allowed 15 feet and Mr. West said he feels it should be so-and-so, he was not elected here. If an appeal was

there and you amend this Act and make it retrospective, then the grounds of the appeal would be invalidated.

During the last session, Sir, the hon. senior member for St. Peter requested an investigation into the administration of the Town and Country Planning Office because there were so many complaints. I do not object to the complaints because you have to tell people when they are doing wrong; but what I cannot get over is that when I have to tell somebody that the Town and Country Planning Officer is right, and then he asks me what about John who is in a similar position, what am I to tell him? What can the members of the Board and the Minister tell him? If a man applied for entrance on the Northern approach road and is refused, and you take a walk near to the Minister's place and see that an entrance has been given to Esso on the same road, what are you going to tell the man? Are you going to tell him that that is Esso, that they have a lot of money, they come from abroad, but that he is a nincompoop Bajan? You cannot say so and neither can I. Let Mr. West know that we will have none of this stupidity here, that the law must be respected, and if he wants it to be respected, he must be as impartial as ever.

Mr. Speaker, you must not let people feel that you are taking sides in any way at all. That is how we feel on this matter, and as I said on the last occasion, there has been so much boasting by people saying what is going to happen and what is not going to happen; but I feel that the Minister has enough courage to stop this. I have always told people to appeal to the Minister, but I myself believe that you are not enacting legislation for this Government. As I told the last Government at the time, we were not enacting legislation for that Government, but for people in Barbados for generations, and I have always felt that there should be the Judiciary to decide whether or not something is right or wrong. Barbados was the only place in the West Indies which has a Court of Appeal. In those days there were magistrates who were planters, no-goods and so on to whom a person could bring a bundle of canes or a bag of yams, and a person could get locked up before he got to the Court. This was just after the abolition of slavery and people feared having to go before "Kit Massiah" and "Brer Lion". The people in St. Lucy felt that if they went before "Brer Lion" and he did not like them, he would send them up for fourteen days; but there were two judges in the Court of Appeal and if they went there and were given fourteen days, they were satisfied in having appealed, because they had that confidence in what we consider British justice.

It is my considered opinion, Sir, that I have to deal with more of these people and applications than any other member of this House, even though they are members of the other Council, because more applications come in from the Municipality than from the other areas, and at times I have to say that the Town and Country Planning Officer is right by law. I have seen great hardship effected upon people. My colleague has just reminded me that when he was on our Board there was an application from somebody at the corner of Broad Street, and we questioned it. I was very angry that day. I do not treat people badly normally, but when people try to make me out to be a fool, I treat them like a hog. I asked the man to give me the reasons why they had given the Goddards permission and had refused to give Rollock, and he said that the reason was that he did not believe that one building could carry the storeys. There are Englishmen and Englishmen. I remember when I was on the Harrison College Board, one of the things Mr. Hammond used to say to anybody who was coming out here was that the students were predominantly coloured, and if he could not get on with coloured teachers and coloured people, do not worry to come. I think you should tell people that if they do not like taking orders from coloured people, do not worry to come. If you believe that Harrison's has some divine right, as the hon. senior member for St. Peter would say, to have four storeys and Rollock does not have enough money and that is your reason for refusing, that is so stupid.

Mr. Speaker, very often we have found the Town and Country Planning Officer to be right by law, and there are several cases in which we agree with him. In St. Michael

where you have the water-borne system of sewerage within a certain area, and there are wells for pumping drinking water to the reservoir, I would be the biggest lunatic in the world to play to the Gallery that I did not agree to zoning that area with the present building system that is going on now where people sink wells, when some day there would be pollution of the water and the spread of typhoid. If the man were my greatest enemy, I would have to agree that this must be done for the coming generation. (A VOICE: Suppose he was Cox?) He would not have sense enough to understand this.

What I want the Minister to know, Mr. Speaker, is this: let us take My Lords Hill, for instance, as the crow flies and then within a certain radius of the pumping station at the Belle. We must agree that there must be some power in somebody's hands to prevent everybody from turning this into an area of a water-borne system of sewerage for houses and so on, because it has been known that bacteria can penetrate through the crevices and cracks of stone and even the soil, and would create trouble in Barbados when it reaches the water system. What I want the Minister to know is that it is very difficult for people to go into an area like this and buy land for building, not knowing that it is an area which is zoned. The gentleman had the courage and guts to tell me when I suggested to him that he should read Dr. Senn's Report, which I consider to be a wonderful report, that Dr. Senn is just a mediocre. When a man can refer to Dr. Senn with the ability and necessary qualifications as a geologist as a mediocre, I consider him to be a lunatic outside the Mental Hospital and wants looking after. 5.10 p.m.

That is my view because that is how I feel about Dr. Senn's report and how my colleague Mr. Lewis felt about it. We got the benefit of Dr. Senn's report because he was working for the Oil Company then. I am asking the Minister now to say that not only should people know all about this but you should have the matter posted up all around. You cannot let people dig a well for the disposal of faeces right next door to people who have a well for water to drink. What you have to do is to protect people from this. When you divide up in zones, see to it that you have some maps to show so that when somebody comes to buy land they will see that if it is in such a zone, they will have to put down proper sewerage.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Sir, I rise on a point of order. I would like to explain to the hon. senior member for the City that less than a week ago we received the plans of the water situation of the entire Island in several zones — Zone 1, Zone 2, Zone 3, Zone 5. We have decided that we will have maps provided for the general knowledge of the public of Barbados so that they will know where are the ground areas. They would know that in Zone 1 is a place where no building can go on because we must have control to prevent the pollution of drinking water in that area. In spite of that, I feel that the people should know exactly what is the position.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, whenever the Hon. Minister rises on a point of order, he always gives me food for thought. It shows me that the Hon. Minister is really taking this job seriously. As he is a young member of this House, I just want to say to him that this is a very serious matter. You can ask any solicitor in Bridgetown and he can tell you how difficult it is when people go to buy land. Do you know what it is when you have to pay £15 or £25 for a plan and then to be told that you cannot put a house there? You must control the pollution of water in those areas: but let the people know beforehand that on land one mile away from this area, a house cannot be built unless you put down a septic tank. You are changing the whole set-up, and as people have improved their standard of living there are no more earthen pits, I think it is necessary for you to let people know that within these areas you have changed the system of disposal of faeces; therefore, they should have a type of septic tank for the disposal of faeces. Because of that there should be some department to guide people so as to tell them that when they are building a house in those areas they should have a septic tank. Nobody today wants to live in a house in which when they get up in the night

they have to walk across the yard. You must have a septic tank; but they know nothing of septic tanks. The purpose of this Town and Country Planning Office should be one to enlighten and guide people and let them know; therefore I suggest to the Hon. Minister that such plans should be put out in every area and in every solicitor's office. Do not let people waste money because, as you know, you still have some money sharks who would take money from people knowing full well that the people who go and buy land cannot build there.

Now, Sir, the Act says that you cannot divide that land for sale unless you first get permission from the Town and Country Planning Officer. When you have got that permission, you then send to the Board of Health your plans and to the Waterworks. That is why I am at a loss to understand how any man coming to this country where we are asking for good roads and because that man has certain friends, he says to Mr. Duguid: "Yes, you can go ahead and develop that land but you must not do this road". Who is he? Are you looking for heads to cut off? I say, do not give one man too much power. If you have one man in power and he refuses to grant your application, we say: let us have a law where you can appeal to the Judiciary. That is how it stands today.

According to the Objects and Reasons of this Bill, it is stated:

"It has for some time been considered desirable to transfer to the Town and Country Development Office the functions now performed by the General Board of Health under the Public Health Act, 1908, and the Public Health (Amendment) Act, 1945, (Act 1945-29) in relation to the subdivision and sale of land.

"This Bill therefore seeks to repeal the above mentioned Acts while an Order made under section 3 of the Town and Country Development Planning (Interim Control) Order will provide for the transfer of functions."

I see the reason why you want to do that; but why repeal the Act to do that? I want the Hon. Minister to explain this to me. When you repeal an Act, it means that the Act is wiped out. I submit that when you have repealed that, there is no opportunity for any officer to deal with food and drinks. The Hon. Minister has his legal advisers.

The Objects and Reasons go on to say:-

"Provision has however been made in clauses 3 and 4 of the Bill for the continued enforcement of the Board's decisions and for the determination of any applications to the Board and of any appeals from the decisions of the Board which are still pending when the Bill is enacted and brought into operation."

If you go through the Bill, you will see what I mean about it being retrospective and I hope the Hon. Minister would be able to look at it. 5.20 p.m.

I feel this way; it is my opinion that, in the circumstances, this Bill should be sent to a Select Committee. That is my personal feeling. This is a very big thing; you are making a tremendous change here. There are solicitors in this country who deal with this Bill day after day. Mr. Speaker, I say that, in the circumstances, having regard to this particular Bill, it can effect no hardship with the delay of this Bill until after the recess which this House proposes to take. I therefore beg formally to move that this Bill be referred to a Select Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER: At this stage, I should like to inform the hon. member that the Bill will have to be given its second reading before it is sent to a Select Committee.

Mr. MOTTLEY: That is so, Sir. I am not a lawyer; I am speaking only from my experience, having been a Commissioner of Health for many years and also a member of the General Board of Health. If you are amending something, that is different from repealing it or doing away with it.

I do not believe in giving more power to this man. If this Bill is sent to Select Committee we will be able to get the assistance of persons who are acquainted with this House, along with the Crown Law Officer, to tell us what we are passing. Members of the Government cannot tell us what part of the Public Health Act we are repealing and how it will apply to the other parts of the Public Health Act.

Mr. MILLER rose to speak.

Mr. SPEAKER: On the previous occasion when this Bill was under discussion, the hon. senior member for the City moved that the further consideration of the debate on the Bill be postponed. That motion was seconded by the hon. junior member for St. George who is now entitled to speak.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, we have listened to a very long debate from the Hon. Leader of the Opposition on this matter. Judging from the number of things which the hon. member said in connection with this Town and Country Development Planning Officer, one would expect that he would be dismissed tomorrow. As to this Bill which is now before the House, the Hon. Minister will realise that I had quite a lot to do with it. We do not want anything to be irksome and to be operating against the best interests of the island. We are spending millions in tidying up corners. Look at what is taking place at Eagle Hall.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has said that the Government is spending millions in tidying up corners. I should just like to let him know that we do not have that kind of money to spend on tidying up corners.

Mr. SPEAKER: Well, the hon. junior member for St. George did not say whether the millions were dollars, cents or what.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, for what reason has the Premier entered this debate? Is it not right to say that we spend millions of dollars in tidying up corners?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order. This Government has been in power for exactly eight months and I may say that we have nothing in the Development Plan to spend millions of dollars in tidying up corners. The hon. junior member for St. George will remember the protest made by the hon. senior member for the City and myself in connection with a vote for straightening roads when money was expended on the Spa Road; therefore do not let us have this debate about the Government spending millions in tidying up corners.

Mr. MILLER: That is the sort of thing which comes from the cesspool.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: The only cesspool I know was in Reed Street.

Mr. MILLER: And it was the same thing which kept the hon. member in shoes when he lived with his uncle Dr. O'Neale and my father sent things to him. If you want to be vulgar, let us be vulgar now. Do not let us talk about it. You cannot do justice at any time.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I will not listen to the diatribe of the hon. member, and I think, Mr. Speaker, that you have the dignity of this House to maintain. I was referring to the sum of \$80,000 which was voted in the Estimates to be expended on straightening certain curbs and bends on highways and which was spent on the Spa Plantation. That was a debate in this Chamber. I do not know what the hon. member is talking about his father sending things to my uncle.

Mr. MILLER: I object to your descending to such depths in this debate.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member must address the Chair.

Mr. MILLER: I am addressing the Chair.

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes, but if I intervene, the hon. member has to listen to me.

Mr. MILLER: I have an unswerving respect for the Chair.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let there be no talk about somebody's uncles or aunts.

Mr. MILLER: The hon. member talked about cesspools and uncles and aunts. What I said was nothing to provoke that attitude which we see adopted in here every Tuesday. You have that sort of bombast. The hon. member thinks that he is in Court and I cannot reply.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I want to ask the hon. member to withdraw those remarks. I am prepared to go outside and talk to him where there will be no privilege whatsoever and I will give him chapter and verse.

Mr. MILLER: I will speak to him anywhere.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the Hon. Premier asking that certain words be withdrawn?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I was asking Your Honour to request the hon. member to comport himself on this matter.

Mr. SPEAKER: I shall request the hon. member to keep to this debate and refrain from making remarks of that kind.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Otherwise, I will ask the hon. member to come outside and let me get before a microphone and tell the public what I want to say.
5.30 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the hon. junior member for St. George deal with the second reading of the Bill to amend the Public Health Act inside here? I have no control outside.

Mr. MILLER: But, Mr. Speaker, you want to be sure that anything you say from the Chair does not discriminate against one member. You heard one member talk about something other than the Bill, but no exception was taken to that.

Mr. SPEAKER: An exception did not arise.

Mr. MILLER: It was from that that we listened to this base argument and debate from time to time.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the hon. junior member for St. George raise the tone.

Mr. MILLER: That has been my business to save whatever is left in this country. We see it in the doldrums and we are supposed to come to the rescue. I have no doubt you will agree with me that the march of time demands these changes. I had a lot to do with this Bill and am very familiar with it. I cannot agree with the hon. senior member for the City in all the strictures he has made in connection with the Department, or, for that matter, against the officer in charge. I have been up against no end of problems in the Department. You have a Board called the Public Health Board, and you appoint somebody in an area to see after the dividing up of land, and it is sent to the Minister of Health and Social Services. If you send in the valuation of land as being worth \$1.50 a square foot and the Ministry sends it back asking for a new panel to be appointed, every time it happened the valuation was the same. I can think of one area at least where the land was valued at 40 cents, and the first set of values took it to \$1.20. I sent it back asking for a new panel to be appointed and the value came back as \$1.80. Only last week I saw one of the houses being removed. If a person has raised an entire family on a spot and the time comes when he cannot buy the land or cannot continue to rent, the shambles would have to be removed. We think it is unfortunate that Town and Country Planning Development has come to Barbados probably twenty years too late.

Mr. Speaker, the moment you change conditions to which people have been accustomed and bring some form of supervision, you will come up against this difficulty, and I believe the Town and Country Planning Officer will come up against it. We have a changing of building after nearly three hundred years of practice, and we must conform to a road of fifteen feet and the widening of corners like at Eagle Hall and Welches, and we will have to spend millions and millions if we are to maintain and support the growing population. We will have to take in agricultural land to provide houses, schools and what have you.

Mr. Speaker, Town and Country Planning is essential and the Planning Department has been suffering for a long time. It can do with some more staff, and probably you are asking too much of the Officer with such a small staff. I must say that people have enjoyed freedom of cutting up land, and changing the access through their backyard to the beach which they have allowed their friends to use for ten or fifteen years. Something has happened and you want to expand, and the moment you close your gate and no longer give that access, you create a barrier; and that is the position with the Town and Country Planning Department. You must like the Good Samaritan always think of the best. You have brought the best and put him in this new Department; but the moment you bring supervision from a Department, it would appear as though this particular Officer has become the irritant; but when you examine it, he is right. There must be some responsibility to the Minister and no Government can allow these things to go on. Look at what happened in Broad Street, Swan Street and in the City generally.

I was in Parliament ten years ago when we had Estimates for a new Post Office across the street, but today with modern thinking you would probably have to take it down, because the Income Tax Office must go and you must develop a square. You cannot get all the things you want from a small Department, but you must have it. I do not agree with the hon. senior member for the City, and he knows it, and all he has said about Goddard's has nothing to do with this. We have a Board of Health comprised of people who know nothing about the valuation of land. Occasionally you get an individual who is in the business of buying and selling land, but the majority of them have no knowledge of valuation. Now you have a Town and Country Planning Office which ought to have been here several years ago. You also have a Board of Health with men who are not concerned about the selling of tenantry land, and they are expected to appoint valuers, and the Board of Health is powerless to do anything about it and the Minister has to sign. Is it not farcical? You have made a decision to repeal this Act. The Minister will have to say that he found all this work on the files, and we spent nearly two years getting it together.

When the Town and Country Planning Office was being built near the Government Printery, I did request additional floor space because I could envisage the number of metal cabinets that would be required to carry all the records from the various Departments. In the Ministry of Social Services, we had piles of stuff that did not concern the Ministry of Public Health, but concerned Town and Country Planning. This is a step forward and the type of progress to which a country must look forward. You may get a little noise from people who want to expand because their daughter is getting married, and they call in at the office; so everybody will get on his back because it entails supervision. You want to get on; and unless something happens immediately, I want to say that this will enjoy not only the satisfaction of my Party, but I would say of the country, because it is a step forward.

5.40 p.m.

If I felt that this was not in the best interest of this country, I would have said it and anybody in Parliament would know that I would say it. I would say it anywhere; I have no fear in my heart. I know the danger of being fearful. In the development of a country, you have to take care of your transport and you know what you are up against. The future holds less than promises; but that is the position. If progress must come to this country which we have some love for, I appeal to some of the hon. members.

You must become suspicious of this. If you feel that the Department is not being run right, dismiss the man whom you are unhappy about. It is not the Act that is wrong. Speaking for myself, I would say that the officer has been doing a wonderful job. Of course, he has brought a lot of dissatisfaction, but nevertheless if the world must go forward, then planning is very necessary.

Mr. COWARD: Mr. Speaker, looking at the Objects and Reasons I see here that it has for some time been considered desirable to transfer to the Town and Country Planning Development Office the functions now performed by the General Board of Health under the Public Health Act, 1908, and the Public Health Act (Amendment) Act, 1945, (Act 1945-29) in relation to the subdivision and sale of land.

Now, Sir, I am opposing this Bill which seeks to transfer that authority into the hands of one individual. While I agree that proper planning of an area is important, yet it must be borne in mind that the interest of the small man must be protected. I think that if too much power is given to one man it very often flies to his head and that is what I see would happen where the Town and Country Planning Officer is concerned.

Mr. Speaker, I happen to be a member of the Town and Country Planning Committee of the Northern District Council for the past four years, and from time to time I have had to go the rescue of the small people in St. James. I can mention a case in Fitts Village where the Town and Country Planning Officer turned down a man from building his house after the land was given to him by his mother-in-law. I was a member of the Committee which went on the spot and argued with the Town and Country Planning Officer. As a result, today, if you go to St. James in Fitts Village, you will see that the particular house has been built there.

If you transfer this power to one individual member, I am sure that he would misuse that power and it will be reflected not only on the Government who has given it, but even on hon. members who failed to object against it. I do know that in dividing land you must have proper roads and water. I agree with that. Whenever land must be sold, that must be done. But what is the position? There may be a poor man who has a spot of land who would like it to be divided between his children as soon as he dies, but by giving all of this power to one individual, he may be able to deny these children the rights of building something on their part of the land. It is quite all right if Sir John So-and-so may want to build a house on a spot and have an entrance on a certain man's road. I have no doubt that the Town and Country Planning Officer will give that man the go-ahead to go and erect something on that land. But what would happen to the poor fellow? It is true that the poor fellow is allowed the right to appeal to the Governor-in-Executive after he has been turned down by the Town and Country Planning Officer; but, as you know, Sir, most people are ignorant of what are the steps which should be taken to get this appeal. Therefore I am appealing to hon. members not to be misguided or to be mistaken in any way. To put such power in the hands of any individual would be a dangerous thing to do. I will agree if this power is transferred to a Committee instead.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, it is quite clear that the hon. members on the opposite side do not really know the purpose and contention of the Bill which we are now debating. The Public Health legislation of this Island is not primarily concerned with Town or Country Planning. Chapter eight of the Act of 1908 is the first Public Health Act which we have and that is an Act of no less than 59 sections. It is only when we get somewhere in the early fifties — Section 52 — that the Public Health Act begins to deal with the division and sale of land at all; and if I may speculate at this distance of time as to the intention of the Legislature, that came shortly after a period during which we had several visitations of pestilence and disease such as cholera — chiefly cholera. There are lots of provisions inserted into the Act to make sure that insanitary conditions, overcrowding and so on could be offset.

The General Board of Health as it was then called was appointed by the Governor-in-Executive

Committee and it was to consist of a President, three of the Commissioners of Health for the several parishes of the Island who were appointed at the same time, and also members of the Legislature, to perform these functions which in the first part of the nineteenth century in the United Kingdom were similarly performed by the Local Authorities of Health. But following also the reform which took place after the similar experiences of the mal-functioning of United Kingdom authorities in 52 counties in the United Kingdom and probably in a few hundred local authorities, the General Board of Health was formed to supervise throughout the Island as a whole the control of health and the control of sanitation in the Island.

What I find strange today is that when the Central Government intends to relieve the General Board of Health of a duty which it was performing very imperfectly — without any reflection on the people who comprise the General Board of Health or the Board of Health Advisory Committee members should confuse this with the alleged inefficiency and discriminatory practices which they claim to exist in the Town and Planning Ordinance as it stands. 5.50 p.m.

In 1945 the Public Health Act was amended. The 1945 Act at chapter 29 and in Section 3 says this:

"(a) no owner of land to which this Act applies may directly or indirectly sell any such land unless he shall first have obtained a certificate from the Board and a licence from the Governor-in-Executive Committee in accordance with the provisions of this Act;

(b) no person may directly or indirectly purchase any land to which this Act applies in respect of which a certificate from the Board and a licence from the Governor-in-Executive Committee have not been obtained in accordance with the provisions of this Act."

What is interesting in the 1945 Act is this. Whereas the 1908 Act created powers for the subdivision and sale of land and tenancies making it obligatory for persons subdividing their land to submit plans to the General Board of Health, it also imposed certain duties on the General Board of Health. I want to say this: if the General Board of Health had been aware of their powers under the Act of 1908, the development of this country would not have been carried out in the ramshackled way in which we have seen it done in the past 50 years. They had the power to visit sites and appoint inspectors to see that the law is carried out. I do not think they made any special laws or regulations, under the authority which they had, to say that this island of Barbados was not to be discredited by the disorganised development which has spoiled the beauties of nature in the island in which we live. The Board of Health would not qualify under Town and Country Planning; they had the power to appoint inspectors to see that the plans were adhered to. I know of few cases in which they went out to study the terrain and the topography of the land over which they were appointed to exercise control. In the majority of cases — I stand to be corrected on this — the members of the Board of Health were satisfied to look at plans....

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order. The Hon. Premier says that he stands to be corrected and I am willing to correct him. The position was that applications went to the General Board of Health and that was incorporated in the 1942 Act. It was the Act of 1928 which gave permission for dividing up.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am not talking about the maximum size of a house plot; I am talking about the powers of the General Board of Health.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The Hon. Premier has referred to the Board of Health having the power to appoint inspectors. I should like to say that whenever the Board of Health received an application they sent Dr. Grannum, if I may call his name, to the spot together with the inspectors to see the land before they would consider the plot before them.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: The hon. member has confirmed what I am saying. They always relied on the report of the person to whom they delegated their authority. They delegated their authority to somebody else who also delegated his authority and it possibly ended up with the scavenger.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order. The General Board of Health sent somebody to the site, but the Medical

Officer of Health was the person who had to report on it. It was on the report of the Medical Officer of Health that the Board acted.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: And the hon. senior member for the City is seriously suggesting that this power should not be given to the Town and Country Planning Officer! I do not consider that the Ministry of Social Services is the right Ministry to deal with this matter. The General Board of Health were concerned about the cutting up and sale of land, and they used to interpret their powers so liberally that they even permitted people to sell off land, one piece at a time, year after year so that the poor man who wanted to get some money by selling out his land, unless he was able to submit his plan to the Board of Health, could not sell out his land at once. The Board of Health had control over tenancies from 1928. I will say that if they had carried out their duties the City of Bridgetown could not have sprung up as it is now. We have the Bridgetown, Speightstown and Hometown Act, 1891, under which places should not be built of wood; and if you were to go to Hometown now you will see these wooden buildings, because the Vestries and the Commissioners of Health were not interested in a certain class of persons living in anything but worm-eaten board-and-shingled houses; but the law says that no board-and-shingled houses should be there at all.

Mr. MOTTLEY: You have them at Bank Hall Cross Road too.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: And in the City of Bridgetown too.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Some provision was made in the Act to have these brick-nob houses. Furthermore, a test case brought in the Courts disclosed that certain regulations were laid in the House in connection with this Bridgetown, Speightstown and Hometown Act.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: The hon. junior member for St. Peter is probably right. The Board may have passed the regulations, but the Act certainly laid down the restrictions. 6.00 p.m.

Section 21 reads as follows:—

"No house, storehouse, kitchen, stable, or building whatsoever shall be erected in the principal streets, alleys, and lanes within the limits of Speightstown, otherwise than with such materials and in such manner as hereinafter mentioned, and any person who shall presume to build contrary to the regulations contained in this section shall be warned by the sergeant of police on duty in the said town" — that was the first Town Planning Act — "to remove or alter the same conformably with the said regulations."

That is where the hon. junior member for St. Peter is right; but it says in subsection (2) that "the outside of all buildings to be erected in the principal streets, alleys, and lanes of the town shall be made of brick or stone, or brick and stones together, or brick or stone nogged, except balconies and the frames of doors and windows; and any sergeant of police who shall connive at or suffer any house or building to be erected in the said town, contrary to the preceding provisions, without giving information thereof to the Police Magistrate, shall forfeit the sum of twenty pounds for every building so erected."

So the sergeant was the Town Planning Officer, not only the sergeant in charge of the station, but whichever sergeant was on duty at any particular time. Moreover if a building went up at Speightstown that was not built out of brick or stone despite the absence of Regulations, my contention is that the sergeant should have paid twenty pounds into the Treasury for every building that was erected. Town Planning is nothing new to Barbados, but it was honoured more in the breach than in the observance; and I am saying that the reason why we had this approach to our first attempt at getting some order and conformity into our building regulations, was because the people in the General Board of Health were interested in selling lumber.

If you study the composition of the different Boards and then you study the structure of the mercantile com-

munites in Speightstown and Bridgetown, you will see that certain members always opted to be on certain Boards because they had no intention of seeing that this was carried out, since we did not manufacture bricks in Barbados at that time, and bricks used to come down here from the United Kingdom and Canada as ballast in ships that took back sugar to the United Kingdom, and those ships came to Speightstown too. That is the early history of Town and Country Planning legislation in the Island; and it does not matter how many Committees you appoint, if these Committees do not understand their powers and attempt to carry them out, there is no point in crying about some poor old woman whose name is legion, not being able to build within fifteen or nineteen feet of the highway. That does not alter the principle that we have allowed this Island to develop in an inchy-pinchy manner although the Board of Health had ample power. Now we come to this position that in 1959 we introduced Town and Country Planning, and I would be the last person to suggest that it is a perfect bit of legislation. I criticised it at that time and I still have a large number of reservations both about the powers and the functions which are performed by certain persons under the Act. I do not want to go into details; so I do not want hon. members to press me.

Under that Act, Mr. Speaker, the Town and Country Planning Officer consults with the Town and Country Planning Committees of the Local Government Authorities which are now the three District Councils — the Bridgetown City Council, the Northern District Council and the Southern District Council. That actually is the state of affairs. Now I may also inform hon. members at this stage that for a period of time there was no such authority as the General Board of Health, but the General Board of Health continued to hold meetings and to hold up people's applications although the Act had imposed a limitation of time of 30 days in which they should have granted or refused the application. The same Board of Health which is being vigorously defended now by some of the members on the opposite side would hold up applications though the General Board of Health had been abolished. That shows you the high sense of responsibility which they were exercising. The General Board of Health, in so far as the subdivision and sale of land is concerned, is a great farce. Furthermore we found on the General Board of Health that you had people who were supposed to value land, and a lot of them were people who were land brokers and estate agents. They had no interest in Town Planning and very little in health.

Now what the General Board of Health can do, no one individual or Minister can do, and that is to say whether you should have a density of so many buildings per acre and so on. That is all the General Board of Health is for; but they regulated the price of land in Barbados by fixing what they considered to be the maximum, which eventually turned out to be the market price. In fixing the maximum, that would automatically become the market price of land which was being developed in various parts of the Island. They had other functions; but those functions have been largely transferred to the Director of Medical Services and are partly carried out by the various Committees of the Local Government Authorities.

Now, Mr. Speaker, bearing all that in mind and bearing in mind that the 1959 Town and Country Planning Act authorises the Town and Country Planning Officer to consult with the Committees of the three Councils, depending upon which area the proposed development is, he would send and consult with these people, so that you would get the exercise of a kind of authority on paper by persons like the hon. senior member for St. Joseph who would say that he has decided that this person or that person should build, no matter what the Town and Country Planning Officer says. Where is the exercise of Ministerial authority going to be vested therefore? Is it going to be vested in a member of the Committee?

Mr. COWARD: On a point of order, I do not think what the Hon. Premier has said is quite correct. I happen to be a member of a Town and Country Planning Committee, and I know of cases where the Town and Country Planning Officer ignored the Committee altogether and carried out his

wishes, and I think the hon. senior member for St. Andrew can bear me out on that.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I thought the hon. member had said that you could go and see the house that he was speaking of actually constructed, when the Town and Country Planning Officer said it should not be done. I may be deficient in understanding, but now the hon. member is telling me that the opposite is the case and that we can go and see a place that is not there that the Town and Country Planning Officer said should not be there. It is a bit confusing, but I accept what the hon. member says. Anyhow, Sir, if I may pass on, I am sure the hon. member is really acting with what he considers his responsibility as an elected member of the people to see that justice is done. This kind of business is an extremely technical matter, and we do not consider that it is within the province of a politician to decide on planning issues. Now at the same time let me make my position clear.

6.10 p.m.

I agree with the Hon. Minister of Communications who rose on a point of order and gave expression to the viewpoint of the Cabinet on this whole matter of Town and Country Planning legislation.

We do not feel that in an Island like Barbados — or anywhere else for that matter — any wide discretion, if any discretion at all, should reside in the hands of any Town and Country Planning Officer. I will go so far right now as to say that I do not consider that the Executive Committee at all or the Cabinet should necessarily have the authority to say whether a person should not build. What I feel a Government should do is to give study to the needs of the island's development and give particular study to the population growth in order to find out what the future demands are likely to be, what the other regulations of health, sanitation and water requirements are likely to be; and after you have done all of that, you draw up your town planning saying that you can build here, you cannot build here, and you cannot build there. We feel that any citizen, no matter how thick his skull might happen to be, should be in a position, as long as he can read, to pick up a Town Planning Ordinance and say: "I want to build or construct a building for a factory, whether it is a bicycle repair shop or whether it is for any kind of benefit or whether it is even the building of a church and say that according to the Town and Country Planning Act I cannot do so and so." He should be able to do so or get whatever kind of advice he wants without going cap in hand to the Town and Country Planning Officer and asking that officer or any member of the Board of Health to give him a break to do so-and-so. I feel that everyone should know where he stands.

The difficulty with which we are faced is that today we have 31 appeals from the Town and Country Planning Officer. We have instituted what is an innovation. We feel that the people who are appealing should have the right to sit through the case and be represented. This is what we did up to last week when we heard nine appeals. We have had to disagree with the Town and Country Planning Officer in about 65% of the cases and we agreed with him in about the other 35%. We disagreed with him because it was a question of discretion and it was not allowing anybody to break the law.

Let me now allude to the type of cases to which the hon. senior member for the City referred, where the law said that you cannot build within 19 feet and somebody came to build within the 19 feet of the centre of the road — we have now four classes of roads and the nearest distance from the centre line of the road is supposed to be 19 feet — therefore any time we had a case where somebody made application to build within that distance, of course, that is the law and we would tell them "no". We had that kind of decision to make and we simply told them that the law is that you are not supposed to build within 19 feet. We did not care what the person's political support was. I did not want to say too much on that, but it does not matter what is your political support. We tell you that you will be breaking the law, and if we give you a licence, somebody else will come along and break the law.

In some other case, the Town and Country Planning Officer thinks that they ought to be a green belt in certain parts of Barbados and we asked him what part of the law that is. If the answer is "no" and if there is any other special reason, either because we have something in mind which this development should approach, we then ask why should we not grant permission to do so-and-so and we decided on those grounds. One of the applicants was actually one of the Opposition candidates and in that case we said that the Town and Country Planning Officer was wrong. In the second case, the applicant was within my knowledge an active supporter of the Party to which I belong, and we said that that person was wrong. In the case of a member of the opposite Party, we felt that the Town and Country Planning Officer was exceeding his authority and we said that the applicant was right. We are not concerned with which Party you belong to at all.

What I am worried and disturbed about is that there is a lot of truth in the restrictions which were made by the hon. senior member for the City, although I do not necessarily share his point of view, and his approach to the problem. There is a lot in what he said in that the law at present is worded in such a way that it gives a wide amount of discretion to the particular Government officer and I intend to divest the Cabinet of that authority too because I do not feel that Town and Country Planning has anything to do with politics. If you think it should be 50 feet or 1,000 feet, come and get that put into the Act. I am not breaking or allowing somebody else to break the law.

The difficulty is that a Minister has to overrule a Civil Servant or uphold a Civil Servant, and in these matters the Minister is put in the invidious position of overruling the Civil Servant's ruling or opposing the Civil Servant's ruling. The whole system of Ministerial Government is that a Minister should be responsible for matters coming under his portfolio; but in the present state of the law I would be the last person to say that the Minister should be responsible for some of the decisions made by the Town and Country Planning Officer. I am not saying that the Officer is acting corruptly, but it is because the law has never made it clear whether Parliament is supreme or the Town and Country Planning Officer is supreme.

As long as we have the authority to hear an appeal, we allow both sides to come in and give evidence, and at the end of the evidence, the Town and Country Planning Officer has to withdraw too. This is the first time where the other side has had to withdraw. The last Government used to go on the advice of what was written by the Town and Country Planning Officer, except with the one case in which an excuse was made for the erection of the Fish Market at Bay Street.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: I notice the Hon. Premier has sat down. Has the hon. junior member for St. George got up on a point of order? I did not hear him say that he had risen on a point of order.

Mr. MILLER: Yes, Sir, I rise on a point of order. The statement made by the Hon. Premier is not accurate. He referred to the market at Bay Street and said that that was the one exception. We from time to time had a number of appeals in which we had to vary the decision or recommendation of that officer.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Is the hon. member informing the House that he used to hear both sides? It is not a question of whether they varied or persuaded the Town and Country Planning Officer to permit them to vary it. 6.20 p.m.

I do not want to say too much on this matter; I know a lot about it. The point is that they had submissions before them by the Town and Country Development Planning Officer and they did not allow John Citizen to be represented to argue his case.

Mr. MILLER: On a point of order. We went further; we would investigate every single case, we would visit the site on every single occasion where there was an appeal.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I do not know if the hon. member understands the question I have asked.

Mr. MILLER: I understand it; you put forward an appeal and the whole Cabinet would go to the site and decide whether or not the appeal should be allowed. The decision was seldom based on that of the Town and Country Development Planning Officer; it was only on Ministerial level. You have a Cabinet comprised of eight members, and therefore a Cabinet of eight judges and nobody could address the Cabinet. The matter must go through the Ministry.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Then they were breaking the law. What I am dealing with is whether the hon. member is prepared to say that the person who made an appeal was allowed to go before the Governor-in-Executive Committee with or without a legal representative and state his case, because I think I understand a little about the law. He said that they visited the site. They must have reasons for visiting the site; there must be tamarind tree decisions. I am asking the hon. member whether John Citizen was allowed to argue his appeal. I am submitting that that did not happen until we assumed office; it did not happen until recently.

Mr. MILLER: On a point of order. You have a number of days in which to discourse with the Town and Country Development Planning Officer and the appeal must go before the Cabinet. That matter could be settled and the correspondence must be handled at the Ministry. Nobody could address any letter to the Governor-in-Executive Committee but to the Ministry. You can bring witnesses. I am thinking of a case where a decision has been taken against an appellant in connection with the erection of a gasoline station. I can think of a visit where the Ministry discussed the matter with the owner of the land. The party erected a gasoline station at Welchman Hall, but it is a waste of time to go into this matter.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am asking if the hon. junior member for St. George is stating that at any time since we had Town and Country Development Planning legislation in Barbados any appeal at all against the decision made by the Town and Country Planning Development Officer went before the Governor-in-Executive Committee or the Cabinet, and the appellant was allowed to be heard or was allowed to be represented by a legal representative. If the hon. member is saying that, then he is telling a deliberate falsehood. It is entirely a different matter where the Minister has power under the Act to ask the Town and Country Development Planning Officer that the matter be referred to him. You are canvassing at this stage by a person telling a Minister that he has something before the Town and Country Development Planning Officer and the Minister has power to send for it. That is different from the Town and Country Development Planning Officer making a decision and sending in the appeal. It gets to the Governor-in-Executive Committee and the hon. member is telling this House that the Cabinet, which is the Executive Committee, because the functions of the Executive Committee have been delegated to the Cabinet - if he says that they have heard any appellant, I say that that is a deliberate falsehood calculated to misrepresent the true state of affairs before this House.

Mr. MILLER: The Hon. Premier has adopted an ugly attitude and has become personal.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I said what I said at dictation speed so that it could be taken down. I say that if the hon. member says that an appellant was allowed to be heard or to be represented by a legal representative before the Governor-in-Executive Committee or the Cabinet, that is a deliberate falsehood which he is telling. There has never been an appeal to the Cabinet in which they have heard one single case. I can go through the files where the Attorney General has pointed out to them that that was asked and they did not do it.

Mr. MILLER: When the hon. member opens himself to attack then he applies to Your Honour for protection. I am thinking of a case in White Hall. The lady appealed against the decision of the Town and Country Development

Planning Officer. This matter would be dealt with at Ministerial level and that is where it should be dealt with.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I am not giving way on this occasion at all. I am not giving way to the hon. member. He is like the Pope and he must sit on this occasion. He always wants to use his sledge-hammer, but I will bite him up and wipe up all the red carpet in here. He opens himself to attack, he says things and then appeals to Your Honour for withdrawal.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am appealing to the Hon. member. Let the hon. member make his point of order concisely.

Mr. MILLER: There is no point in saying that if you have a Cabinet you should waste the time of the Cabinet with an appeal. The Minister can invite anybody to the site. The Minister brings the appeal to the Cabinet and that is the case of White Hall where we said that we would disagree with the Town and Country Development Planning Officer and allow the lady to continue with her property.
6.30 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is it the lady or her solicitor?

Mr. MILLER: I do not remember, Sir, and it would not be proper, Sir, to call her name; so do not inveigle me, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: I just wanted to get the point clear in my mind. The point of order has been made.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am saying seriously that if any member of the public can bring a single case to me in which a Minister has heard an appeal, I will invite that person to put my Government in Court and offset that appeal, because the Minister has no authority under the Act to hear any kind of appeal. I would advise anybody to sue this Government, not the last Government, in the Courts, and I will not defend any such case, because I am satisfied — and so is the Hon. Attorney General — that such a procedure would be completely wrong. An appeal is to the Executive Committee and not to a Minister getting behind any tamarind tree. I resent this tamarind tree justice. For him to say it is nonsense to talk about the Cabinet, I will disclose that we did not even hear the appeals by the Cabinet alone, but summoned a full meeting of the Executive Committee with the Attorney General present to hear these appeals; we insisted that the other side should be heard and we disposed, I think, of nine or ten of these appeals. They left 31 appeals for building development from all over the Island, and I did not want to touch them, because I was trying to get the machinery produced where the appeals could be heard by a non-political tribunal; but the House is going into recess and we did not want building development to be held up anymore, and decided to proceed on the backlog. We wrote to people informing them to bring along their legal advisers and witnesses and we would hear the appeal. That is the difference between our approach to law and order and theirs, but now he is telling me a lot of baloney. That is quite a polite term, Sir; it is a species of sausage.

Mr. Speaker, you could not expect the Cabinet to go and visit a site, but there was not one word about whether they wrote to the people and told them to attend with their legal representatives. The point I am trying to make is — and I am making no apology for it — that I feel that a Minister has to defend a Civil Servant where he has been consulted, and if the Minister does not take the chance to read a file and there is a mistake in the decision, then the Minister must stand or fall by it. Where the Town and Country Planning Officer feels he is above Government and does not have to consult the Minister, then I am going to let the attacks from the other side go over my head, because it has got nothing to do with me. What we are seeking to do is to alter and amend the Town and Country Planning Ordinance in such a way that every person without even going to the Planning Office, the Bridgetown City Council, the Northern or Southern District Councils or the Board of Health, would know exactly where he stands before he orders his materials. It would not be dependent on the whims and caprices of the Minister or the Town and Country Planning Officer.

I feel in a small Island like Barbados that it is not too difficult for us to decide what our planning policy is. I do not want to be personal, but I have had the greatest difficulty in getting a proper explanation from certain officers as to how Barclays Bank could be allowed to build practically in the gutter, and another man in St. Lawrence Gap can be told that he cannot build at all, and I am told that the reason they were allowed to build in the gutter in Palmetto Street is because it is a corner site. The provisions as passed by the last Government to the Town and Country Planning Ordinance are so flexible and susceptible to so many interpretations, that it is the breeding ground — and I am not making any apologies for this — for graft and corruption, and if anybody wanted me to prove it in Court, I can. The whole method of recruitment into that Department leaves a lot to be desired. I propose not to go too far into that, because I still have a certain amount of responsibility, but I have already indicated my views strongly to the Minister and to the people there. The whole organisation of the Department is something which Government is giving very active and careful consideration to. I want to make it clear that we are not satisfied, and people should know where they stand or sit and whether they should build or not build. That should not be left to anybody's discretion at all. You should decide before you have your regulations what policy you want carried out, whether you want Bridgetown replanned or do not want it replanned, because if you want Bridgetown replanned, how can you allow the kind of development you have by Barclays, Frank B. Armstrong, and C. F. Harrison? We do not understand it at all. We have tried to follow the provisions of the Act where these provisions occur. We feel that all the provisions in the Act ought to be clear, and a certain amount of reshuffling of portfolios is going to be done by the time the House resumes, and members will see a much more strict kind of control over this business.

We have had this kind of situation by people who sign their names with the letters "A. C. I." or "A. I. C." or "A. I. A.", but all it means is an inspector telling people they may go ahead and build, but come in and let him draw the plans. We have such a plethora of evidence on this matter that it is regrettable that we had to take over this kind of confusion as a Government, and we are doing our best to straighten it out, because not only the whole physical aspect of the country can be radically altered by this sort of unplanned planning, but the very confidence of the people in the country can be shaken if they feel that a policy is so flexible that it makes flesh of one and fowl of the other. Members who had the privilege of being in this House when the legislation was introduced three years ago, will appreciate that what I am saying now is no different from what I was saying then, and I have told the public that because I have become Premier of the Island, my views have not changed on a single thing. Where my views have not changed and the legislation was inconsistent with my views, we now have to make that legislation conform with the views of myself and the other members of the Cabinet, because that is the system of Parliamentary Government.

If members accuse me of not changing from the time I was in the Opposition, what do they expect me to do? Do they want me to sing tweedle-de-dum on this side when I sang tweedle-de-dee on that side, and because we are in Government everybody is right no matter how corrupt he may be, we must defend the incorruptible, and the very things we attacked before we must now defend? I always say to all those Civil Servants who are dissatisfied with the lack of good manners and observance of the laws of propriety by the present Government that they can go and get a job where people pay more money for the vast talents they possess, and not grumble and be dissatisfied with the Government, because this Government has been put here by the people, and those Civil Servants who are not satisfied either with their salaries or the terms under which they should work and the rules which we expect them to observe must go and work for Wilkinson and Haynes, for the same Barclays Bank, for the Barbados Shipping and Trading and all the Companies that they think are so anxious to employ them. We want those people who are willing to co-operate in carrying out the wishes of the people. Do not think it is a duty cast on me being Premier to defend the Civil Servants at all costs when we get the greatest amount

of trouble sometimes in getting them to understand what the Ministerial system of Government is. I want hon. members to understand that I do not agree with the approach necessarily of the hon. senior member for the City, but there is a lot in what he says; I know the public is not satisfied and we are working on it. At the same time I do not consider that the General Board of Health is the appropriate authority, and the mere fact that Town and Country Planning leaves a lot to be desired is not a recommendation for the retention of the Board of Health.

6.40 p.m.

That is all that I disagree with the hon. member who has spoken against this Bill, other than that in itself, there is no recommendation for the retention of these powers in the General Board of Health to the dereliction of the Town and Country Planning Officer.

What we have got to do is to straighten up that Department. The whole approach to having this kind of discretion and the Minister running off behind somebody's piling, all that is wrong. The law should be reviewed and should be clear so that any man who is living in a 16' x 9' can understand by looking at the law if he can put on a shed roof.

I serve notice on the Town and Country Planning Officer that I will not feel myself constrained to agree with him if he thinks his policy overrides the principle of separation of powers and the discretion of the Cabinet. I made that position clear and I will be contracting out of defending that particular Department.

Sir, I only pointed out that there was a hiatus between two bits of legislation at which time the General Board of Health was so unaware of their powers and functions that they really had no powers at all. They were still considering plans for the division and sale of land. Otherwise, this was an oversight which was corrected. There was a time when the Board was abolished and it continued to function.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Speaker, there is something which I want to point out. I am supposed to be Chairman of the Town and Country Planning Committee of the Northern District Council. The point is that some time ago a plan came to this Committee for a Hospital at Ashton Hall, St. Peter, and when I looked at it, I did not see any such thing on the plan: So I asked that the plan be referred back for the consideration of the Committee. When I said that, the Clerk of the Northern District Council said that it is only an act of courtesy that the Town and Country Planning Officer sent the plan to us; so I want to know if they can do without us why are they using the Committee. We would like to know where we stand. If they can do without us, well then, they are not supposed to have these Committees. At the next meeting the plan came up for consideration and I saw that it had provision for a septic tank. They told me that that area was a sheet water area and therefore I could not erect any buildings in that area.

I want to know what is the position of the Town and Country Planning Committee of the Northern District Council if they send a plan to us. I am sure that this Department is doing a good job; but I am telling this House that I, 'Homey' Corbin, have seen partiality working in that Department. If a thing is law for one, it should be law for all. The same thing that is done for Bob should be done for Johnny. I hope that they will stick to their guns and do their best.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, after listening to the remarks of the Hon. Premier, I hardly think that the hon. senior member for the City would want any further explanation from me. As a matter of fact, as the Hon. Premier has pointed out, the only functions of the Public Health Act 1908-8 that remain are Sections dealing with the division and sale of land which was in the hands of the Board of Health, and I would just like to point out to hon. members what these clauses deal with. After the introduction of the 1954 Public Health Act, it is to be noted that the sections remaining of the 1908 Act were Sections 52 and 53 and another amendment of 1945 to take care of the division and sale of land.

It is to be noted that those were the remaining provisions of the 1908 Act and the hon. senior member for the City asked why abolish or repeal the Act.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I asked why repeal the Act when the Section which we read here is, so to speak, not repealed but amended in such a way according to the Act that any person so dividing in lots any land at all in this country, before he can do so, has to go to the Town and Country Planning Officer. In other words, the Board of Health does not consider your application unless the Town and Country Planning Officer gives permission.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Sir, this is the point which I would like to make and I am sure the hon. senior member for the City would agree that it is a waste of time.

Sometimes people wait for two months longer than they should wait to get their appraisals put through because they have to leave the Town and Country Development Planning Officer and go to the Board of Health.

Mr. MOTTLEY: You only go to the Board of Health if you are dividing a tenantry. I have had the experience where a man who owns a quarter-acre of land applied to the Town and Country Development Planning Officer in order to get money so as to live out his old days. That Officer says "Yes" or "No". We asked you if you are going foolish or not. Must the man eat the land? Unfortunately, the Town and Country Development Planning Officer does not go to see any land; he just looks at plans.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Therefore the hon. member is trying to contradict himself; we are dealing with the repeal of the Public Health Act; we are repealing all of the remaining sections of the 1908 Act which would repeal the General Board of Health. If a man wants to sell off a quarter acre of land he does not go to the Board of Health; but why bring in that argument? The hon. senior member for the City has been saying that we are putting more power into the hands of the Town and Country Development Planning Officer; but I am saying that he is not being given any more power because the Town and Country Development Planning Office must deal with the matter before it reaches the General Board of Health, if the Board of Health must come in at all.

Mr. MOTTLEY: If you say that five people should divide your land and now you say that one man should do it, are you not giving that one man more power? You have given the Board of Health power to say that you should do so-and-so but you should not put this power into the hands of one man.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I was saying, Mr. Speaker, that with this Board of Health, a proposal for the division and sale of land must first come before the Town and Country Development Planning Officer. If that Officer has to deal with the proposals before it reaches the Board of Health, you are abolishing the Board of Health by means of an Order giving the Town and Country Development Planning Officer authority to deal with the matter solely without having to go before the Board of Health. When the Town and Country Development Planning Officer is dealing with these proposals he has got to consult the Health Authorities and the heads of the Technical Department of Government. The hon. senior member for the City said that the Act should be amended and not repealed. The only remaining sections of the 1908 Act, having been amended in 1928 and in 1945, deal with the General Board of Health and therefore why should we not repeal the Act?

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker,.....

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I was on the floor before the hon. member.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. senior member for the City has intimated that he wants to make a motion for referring this Bill to a Select Committee.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I am always willing to be respectful to hon. members. I beg to move that this Bill

be referred to a Select Committee. My reason for doing that, I have already given. While I am not against amending the Bill as such, I feel that the actual repealing of the Act would be a dangerous precedent. An amendment to the Act would serve the purpose which the Government members want to be served. To repeal the Act which would allow actual right of appraisal to go into the hands of one man, I do not agree with that. I therefore beg to move that this Bill be referred to a Select Committee where we can go through it with various persons and discuss it. I like to know what I am passing. I have been working with this matter for several years and I feel that an amendment to the Act would serve the purpose which the Hon. Minister is pointing out. The repeal of the Act would go against the right person. If you say that the Town and Country Development Planning Officer should deal with the applications — when you take the power from the General Board of Health and transfer it to this Officer — when you think of people who have worked for their property and you put this power into the hands of one man in relation to the valuation, well, if the Executive Committee feels like giving this power to one man, let them do it. I do not think that this power should be put into the hands of one man. Let the Public Health Act be amended and not repealed. 7.00 p.m.

If you want to amend the Bill so that the power should be in the hands of the Executive as of now so that they cannot amend or send back as the Minister has explained, amend the Bill and say so, and after it has been valued and your Cabinet thinks it is too exorbitant, they can control it and after valuing a second time the Cabinet can fix a price and that shall be the price. I would rather the Cabinet which was elected by the people fix a price after the second valuation than to repeal the whole of this Act and say you should appoint one man whether he is from Timbuctu or Johannesburg.

It is universally known that the Town and Country Planning Officer has come to Barbados and has openly said that the best land in Barbados is only worth a certain amount per foot, and I can bring witness after witness to prove that. Would I be doing justice to the people of this Island to agree to giving this man the power to say what the price should be? You should amend the Bill as to give the power to the Executive Committee, so that the Minister can decide what the price should be after the land has been appraised for a second time. Every living being in Barbados would feel better and more satisfied if a person bought a piece of land in Haggatt Hall for \$400, and if in his last days he wanted to sell a piece of it to prevent him from spending his last days in the almshouse, the Cabinet decided what the price should be rather than have a man come from Scotland or London to tell him what the price should be. I would not vote for that in this House. I feel, Sir, that this Bill should go to Select Committee so that one can get not only the opinion of people who deal with land but the legal luminaries.

I beg to move that this Bill be sent to Select Committee.

Mr. SEALEY: Mr. Speaker, I beg to second that. I have been dealing with the Town and Country Planning Officer for the last four years and I feel that members of the Government have not had sufficient experience in working alongside this gentleman. I feel that the power which is vested in this Officer is too much for one man, and it is only one set of the community which is suffering, and that is the poor man. There are several cases where people in small homes have raised families and as soon as they make an addition to separate the boys from the girls, somebody goes around and wants to pull it down. I definitely feel that the power as it stands today is too much in the hands of the Town and Country Planning Officer, and if you give him more power, somebody is going to be sorry. I heard the hon. junior member for St. George say he wants it to be so.....

Mr. MILLER: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, it would save a lot of time if the Hon. Premier would get up and say there is the right of appeal from any decision by any Head of Department, including the Town and Country Planning Officer, and if he says that, he would save all this argument.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order, I would like to say that I am happy to see that this Bill has been in operation for four years, and I will testify and say on oath that the first time an opportunity was given for carrying an appeal was since this Government came into power. I do not want to call names; otherwise I can do so. I feel very strongly that it should not be in the hands of one man.

Mr. SPEAKER: The point of order has been made. Let the hon. senior member for St. Michael continue his address.

Mr. SEALEY: Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure in seconding the motion for sending this Bill to Select Committee.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I never entered this debate, but what the Hon. Premier said has got me very worried. He has made some very strong statements about the Town and Country Planning Office, and if I were not a member of the House of Assembly, I would say that there is no point in making statements like that unless you are going to have an investigation. He made strong statements to the effect that he has reservations about this Department, and he went further and said that even the method of recruitment into that Department leaves much to be desired.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I did not want to say it, but I am having an investigation made over the whole method in which the Department was transferred to the Establishment *en bloc* without any proper screening; so we have a Department which was virtually appointed by a former Government Minister.

Mr. WALCOTT: I feel, Mr. Speaker, that I am not as strong in this matter as the hon. senior member for the City. I do not have any names to call, because I do not have much experience with the Town and Country Planning Office. The little experience I have had is that we were told we could not sell a building for which we could get a good price. Maybe we will get a better price in time to come.....

Mr. Speaker, what kind of behaviour are we having? Are we going to have members whenever they finished speaking, interrupting other hon. members?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. junior member for St. George is more audible than the hon. senior member for St. Peter whose voice is by no means soft normally.

Mr. WALCOTT: I would say, Sir, that the point made by the hon. senior member for the City about sending this Bill to Select Committee could not be ignored lightly, and it is only to be regretted that he did not indicate that earlier so that members would know that he wanted the postponement of the debate.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would say that the hon. member did indicate and made a motion.

Mr. WALCOTT: Then I am sorry and will withdraw that. I am very glad to hear that in view of what has been said in here about the Town and Country Planning Officer, though I am not at all worried about placing power into one man's hands as such, because sometimes these things are inevitable. 7.10 p.m.

The Town and Country Planning Officer has been under fire for many, many months and a debate has not taken place. The peculiar thing is that you have heard a member of the Hon. Premier's Party get up and criticise this Department and this Bill, and it looks to me that it would not be a bad thing if you have the public express their views because the purpose of sending a Bill to Select Committee is to give other people who know something about the matter an opportunity to come before the Select Committee and express their views.

The Hon. Premier spoke about the stultifying of the Development Programme of this Island. I say this: if you have a situation of development in the Government's Devel-

opment Programme, but the development of private people can be stifled — not only of people of limited means but planters too undergo certain restrictions — and you have also heard the Premier saying how is it that Barclays Bank can build in Roebuck Street without stepping back, and when somebody wanted to buy the Beacon building you told them that they would have to go back; they will have to knock down the front part; and Barclays Bank which is now being erected at the corner of Roebuck Street did not have to go back, well then, with all of these things, I will say to the Hon. Premier that there is no point in proceeding further. I am suggesting if it is asked that a Select Committee be appointed to consider this Bill, it is not going to do anybody damage if you appoint a Select Committee to go in the matter. From all sides of the House you have got this pressure on the Town and Country Planning Office and you are hearing that the Town and Country Planning Act is militating against the interest of the people. I remember that the Party in power indicated during the election campaign that the Town and Country Planning Officer went and knocked down a man's house at Maxwell and I think eventually the Government had to pay or that the man had won the case.

The Town and Country Planning Office has been under political fire from many sides of this House and I would be in favour of wholly supporting the idea of sending this Bill to Select Committee in order that the public can get an opportunity to express their views and so that the Government would know how the people feel about Town and Country Planning. I have some strong views on it. You can live as long as Methuselah. This is like San Juan in Puerto Rico. In San Juan, you have some narrow streets and you cannot do anything with them. So too, you cannot do anything with Bridgetown unless you do it in the sea. What I am saying to the Town and Country Planning Officer is that as a result of all of this, you are maintaining a lot of old and dilapidated houses because the people are not going to repair them.

This is not urgent legislation. Removing this from one Board to another will not prevent you from functioning. With these criticisms which were made, it is not good government to have something like this pass without having it widely studied and giving people the opportunity to express their views on it. I understand that in rural areas we have people with an eighteen by ten house and you have the situation where a father will die and leave that property along with the land that is around it which may be something like an acre to be divided among his children, say four of them, and you are saying that property cannot be divided in four. I feel that we have to pay some attention to the community in certain things — not in all. Barbados is a property-conscious community. Everybody wants to own a property. There is no point in saying that you do not know it.

I was a bit surprised over the statement the Hon. Premier made just now. While I agreed with him as regards the administrative side, the other side is only a matter of opinion. The last Government did not share his opinion because I have found out that some Governments like to be mixed up in every thing that is going on. The last Government even went as far as administering the Labour Welfare Fund. I feel that an Executive Body should be responsible for policy; but when they have to administer money, it can lead to corruption. The functions of Government should be such that the Cabinet should not have money coming to it. Because of that, I did not agree with that system where the last Government was administering that Fund. Similarly, I do not agree with the system of the Executive Committee having power to do these things.

The point which was put by the hon. senior member for the City is a valid one in the light of this situation which you have in this matter. I will suggest that you send this Bill to a Select Committee because it gives the Government the opportunity of hearing the views of members of the public. This is not urgent legislation. If you do not pass it tonight, it will not make any difference in the operation of the Act.

(A voice was heard from the gallery.)

Mr. Speaker, this is no rum shop. The gallery must be made to understand that inside here we have to debate things with order being maintained. I am not going to speak in here when I hear all these unnecessary noises coming from the back. This is the highest Parliament.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid that such noises referred to by the hon. member did not reach my ears. However, I will ask the Marshal to exercise the utmost vigilance.

Mr. WALCOTT: I think it is very important that this should be made clear at this stage because if Parliament is subjected to this conduct — and there is nothing higher than this Parliament — then we are coming to the end of the road.

Sir, I think the Hon. Premier should consider this Bill very carefully at this time because I do not like to have mounting criticisms about a Department.
7.20 p.m.

I think the Hon. Premier will remember that the last Government ignored this sort of criticism which has been made continuously. I have read statements made by the Premier to the effect that he is not defending Civil Servants; it is the duty of the Government to defend Civil Servants. When a departmental Civil Service Head comes in for criticism and an opportunity comes along, you should utilise that opportunity for that Civil Servant to go before the Select Committee and let members of the House state what are the things they have against him and let them be dealt with. The point argued by the hon. senior member for the City is well intentioned. We are not opposing Town and Country Development Planning, but we do not want our people to be subjected to anything which is not in their interest. Many an Englishman is well meaning. I do not share all of the local people's views, that is to say, that because your grandfather had a pig pen at a certain place at the house, you should do the same; we want to have decent planning done. But I would be willing to support the motion for referring this Bill to a Select Committee and let the Town and Country Development Planning Officer know what is the general feeling of the community. This Department has had so much criticism thrown against it that we should have an opportunity to ask what hon. members of this House feel about it.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that this debate has taken the turn which it has taken within the last half an hour. The unsatisfactory nature of the Town and Country Development Planning legislation has nothing to do with the inappropriateness of the General Board of Health to make decisions about Town and Country Development Planning. Hon. members have talked about poor people being victimised and treated unfairly and that sort of thing, and the Government is not unmindful of the ways of the wounded. I have been one of the persons in the past who have been critical, and I am still severely critical, of any Government Department whose initiative overrides the policy of the Government. That has nothing to do with whether the General Board of Health is the appropriate authority for deciding whether land should be divided and whether such-and-such a price should be the price for land. Those are the two issues involved. The General Board of Health has nothing to do with the general development of the land since Town and Country Development Planning legislation has been enacted. Under the General Board of Health there was the question of building and curtilage — all of that has been transferred to the Town and Country Development Planning Office. A postponement of this Bill will not do any good because every single Bill which has gone to a Select Committee has been stifled and has never seen the light of day. We are keeping a very firm grip of the Department, but some of these Committees do not meet at all. As to the Bills which we have sent to Select Committees they have failed to see the light of day. The hon. senior member for the City knows what he is doing because the General Board of Health has only been controlling the price of land and that will cause the Government.....

Mr. SEALEY and Mr. MOTTLEY rose to speak.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I do not want to control the price of any land.

Mr. SEALEY: I have to represent these poor people who voted me here.

Mr. SPEAKER: Two hon. members are on their feet.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I rose on a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: So did the hon. senior member for St. Michael. I should like to inform hon. members and I would say for the information of this House, that only today a Select Committee which was appointed on the 10th July handed in its Report.

Mr. MOTTLEY: That was the point I was making. The Select Committee which was appointed to consider and report on the Bill to change the name of the Leeward Islands Conference of the Seventh Day Adventists to the East Caribbean Conference of Seventh Day Adventists and for matters incidental thereto, reported today. I am a man who takes my parliamentary duties very seriously. I take exception to what the hon. member has said. I do not want the power to control the price of land; and what has that got to do with the hon. senior member for St. Michael and myself? I am surprised that the Hon. Premier should have adopted that attitude. I have raised a pure and simple question; I have asked if it would not be infinitely better to refer this Bill to a Select Committee. I even went as far as to say that there should be an amendment to the Act whereby, if you have to apply to the Town and Country Development Planning Officer before you go to the General Board of Health, well, let those applications go to him; but the power to appraise must be in the hands of the Governor-in-Executive Committee.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: I also rise on a point of order for the purpose of correcting the Hon. Premier. I think that he should make a check with his Ministers in relation to Select Committees. I would like to inform him that the guilty parties in relation to these Select Committees are the members of the Government. I have a letter now from the Ministry of Trade in which they have asked me to withhold the Trade Union Amendment Bill in order that they may deal with it and they wrote a further letter on the 17th April. In this further letter, they stated that a copy of the proposed comprehensive Bill will be sent to the Barbados Workers' Union before it is introduced. That letter was signed by the Permanent Secretary, Mr. Williams. I do not think that, in the circumstances, the Premier should make the statement which he has made. That gives the impression that there are improper motives behind the appointment of a Select Committee, that is to say, that they want to kill this Bill. I am not interested in the sale of land; I would rather buy some land if I could do so.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: In relation to this Bill and sending it to a Select Committee, there is one main Clause and that is Clause 2.
7.30 p.m.

The second Clause of this Bill says that the Public Health Act, 1908 as amended by the 1945 Act is hereby repealed, and the rest of Clauses in the Bill merely deal with the transitional provisions whereby appeals which are outstanding can be dealt with and so on. I am saying that all the Board of Health did under their powers was to allow people to develop land one piece at a time without applying for permission, and when it came to building you had to go to the Town and Country Planning Department. We are saying that all this should be vested in the Town and Country Planning Department. The hon. senior member for the City well knows that they are the people who used to act on the advice in recommending what maximum price the land should be sold at.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order, that is not correct. I have been doing this for 30 years, and as soon as the Board of Health passes a Plan if they approve of it, the next procedure as the ex-Minister can say is to apply to the

Governor-in-Executive Committee, and they are the people who appoint people in any part of the Island. The Governor-in-Executive Committee appointed the appraisers, and as the ex-Minister has said, if these appraisers are appointed and send in a price and the Executive Committee is not satisfied, they send it back to the appraisers for a second valuation. I am saying that instead of repealing the Act, you should give the Executive Committee power to say that the land is not worth more than so-and-so and to fix it at a price, and I feel that people would be more satisfied with that rather than to have one man fix a price.

Mr. SPEAKER: The point of order has been made. Let the hon. member not make a third speech.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: The point I was making, Sir, is that the transitional provisions in the Bill which is now before us give the same right of appeal to the Executive Committee; so what is the hon. member worried about? Is anything more going to be said in a Select Committee than was said here today? This is not an inquisition into the exercise of its functions by the Town and Country Planning Officer; so what is the motive of sending a matter like this to a Committee?

I can promise hon. members now that a Bill completely revising the Town and Country Planning Act will be brought down. That Bill has already been drafted, and if I am not mistaken, the Bill should be coming down at the very first meeting after the recess. That Bill will be sent to a Select Committee; but to hold up this by sending it to a Committee when we are going into recess for six weeks, and then the Select Committee not being able to meet during that six weeks and then perhaps another three months after that, really is not in the interest either of the public or of the Assembly itself. I will say to the hon. member who suggested that this particular Bill should be sent to a Select Committee that I have given him the undertaking that when the amendment to the Town and Country Planning Act is introduced, we intend to have full discussion on it and send that matter to Select Committee.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order, I am prepared to be guided by the Hon. Premier as a lawyer on this, but after twenty years in which I have been on this particular Board, during the time that this Bill is repealed until you come with this new Bill, there can be no inspection of food and drugs. Tell me if I am wrong.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member cannot be asking for information or seeking advice on a point of order.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Maybe it is my ignorance that makes me do that. The hon. member has said something, and I am trying to point out to him that if this Act is repealed, the 1954 Act cannot be fully operated, because the section including food and drugs has not yet been proclaimed, and if it has not been proclaimed, how can the Sanitation Boards of the various Councils carry out their duties of inspection?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has made his point of order.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am not opposed to the Town and Country Planning Act.....

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member cannot make another speech. This is his fourth.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: The hon. member is now suggesting that the motive for sending this to Select Committee is due to the fact that it would make unworkable the guaranteed inspection of food and drugs, but in the 1954 Act, Chapter 52 of the provisions relating to these matters were repealed by the Act, and in Section 131 there are provisions for the inspection and destruction of unsound food, the onus of proof, the penalties, the liabilities of vendors, the possessor of the diseased article may request the removal of it by Council and the Section not to affect the Regulations made under the Act of 1890 Chapter 14.

Mr. SPEAKER: May I counsel the Hon. Premier not even to hear asides?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: The hon. senior member for the City really does not understand that no new Regulations from 1954 have been proclaimed, because the Regulations made under the Act of 1890 Chapter 14 are still in force according to the 1954 Act as amended; so for the hon. member to throw dust in the eyes of hon. members by suggesting that we are so besotted that by introducing this Bill we will be repealing the power of the local Commissioners of Health to exercise control over the standards of food, and drugs and drinks in the Island is pure, unadulterated nonsense. What do they want the Bill to go to Select Committee for? Is it in order to get another opportunity to say what they think about the Town and Country Planning Officer? We are sufficiently seized of all the strictures, and no useful purpose is served in sending to Select Committee a Bill which has five Clauses. Clause 1 of the Bill says that this Act may be cited as the Public Health (Repeal) Act, 1962. Are we to go into Select Committee on that? Clause 2 says that the Public Health Act, 1908, and the Public Health (Amendment) Act, 1945 are hereby repealed. Do you have to go to Select Committee on that? Clauses 3 and 4 retain the provisions hon. members want retained, that is, the power of appeal to the Executive Committee, and Clause 5 says it shall come into operation on a date proclaimed in the *Official Gazette*.

Mr. Speaker, the way hon. members are getting on over there, you would think it is a Local Government Bill with 258 Clauses with a list of involved provisions. It is a very simple Act transferring power from one place to another under the full supervision of the Minister, and plans instead of being submitted two different places will be submitted one place. Why talk about food and drugs; this has nothing to do with food and drugs. I am going to make a serious statement; it is possible if the hon. member persists in asking for this to go to Select Committee, it may very well cost the taxpayers, by the time they finish, something like \$ 1 1/2 million.
7.40 p.m.

A VOICE: Tell us how.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I do not have to say everything.

Mr. MILLER: I am going to suggest to the Hon. Premier that he can save time. All he is doing is provoking further argument. Forty-two speeches more would go on in here on this matter.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition is entitled to make the closing speech even although his points of order are peculiar to certain other hon. members.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The hon. member seems to think that I misunderstood him. I think I made the point that we would have no power to negotiate. What I actually said is that the 1954 Act is not operating fully as yet; many of the sections of that Act have not yet been proclaimed. The hon. member is saying that it is not workable because the other Act already remains. I have not been given to understand that. We have been asked to draft regulations by the Executive Committee in this respect. We have sent these regulations to the Director of Medical services and the other regulations have not been amended and this has not come into operation yet. I am saying that if you amend this, they can still go on working; but if you repeal this, we cannot go on working. From the other point of view, I think I have made myself clear. I am not against the Town and Country Planning Officer. I have not unduly criticised the other officers. I have said that Mr. Stevens has shown such interest and was able to see reasonable points which were put to him. The other man in that department was very stupid sometimes and we had to make him know where he got off at.

There are a lot of things which we do not like at all. I appreciate the Hon. Premier saying that the Government will be bringing down shortly a Bill dealing with the entire Act. However, at the moment I am thinking of what is happening now. The procedure is very simple: you must apply to him. As it stands now, you are amending some-

thing which says 'after he is finished'. You are putting the power of the Board of Health in his hands. I will grant you this. You have convinced me on this. Why go to the Town and Country Planning Officer and then go to the Board of Health? But this is what you are amending now. You are repealing the Act so that you will no longer be able to apply to the Governor-in-Executive Committee for appraisal by saying that the same man shall go and appraise the land. What I am saying is that you should amend the Act. You have to go to the Board of Health. That would wipe out the Board of Health because they have nothing to do more than give their approval. Amend it until such time that you can bring down a comprehensive Bill.

The former Minister of Social Services has pointed out — and he is correct — that after two valuations they cannot send back the third at all; they have to abide with it. I say further, amend the Public Health Act so that on the third valuation the Executive Committee should have the right to fix within their discretion. In this community nobody who works for their land wants to see any one man come along and say that it is worth so much. I have said this publicly already. Everybody knows that I have friends from top to bottom and that I am *persona grata* with everybody in this country. One of these men has said publicly in Barbados that land is worth only a certain amount of money here. If you feel that that is exorbitant, you are the person to say: "Oh no, that is too much."

They can send back and send back as many times as they like.

I am suggesting an amendment. I have had talks with him and he has asked me to meet him. We have argued and he has convinced me. He has carried me in Hastings and convinced me. I have carried him in Black Rock and I have convinced him. I am not asking for a Select Committee for the purpose —

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member will give way, just let me say this. This matter appears to be highly controversial. We have a number of things which we want to finish off this evening. This Government is willing —

Mr. SPEAKER: I got the idea that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition was just about to conclude. All that is before us now is whether this Bill should be sent to a Select Committee.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: We are willing to agree that this Bill be sent to a Select Committee. We cannot allow this debate to go on and on like this.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I will only just like to say that a lot of those backbenchers over there would like to be able to explain themselves on this. I do not want to abuse my privilege.

Mr. SPEAKER: Did I understand the Hon. Leader of the House to say that they are willing now to refer this Bill to a Select Committee?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Yes, Sir.

The question that the Bill be sent to Select Committee was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to appoint the following members as members of the Select Committee:—

The Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mottley); the hon. senior member for St. Michael, (Mr. Sealy); His Honour the Deputy Speaker, (Mr. Carmichael); the hon. senior member for St. George, (Mr. Lowe); the hon. senior member for St. Joseph, (Mr. Coward); the hon. junior member for St. George, (Mr. Miller); the Hon. Minister of Social Services; (Mr. Edwards); the hon. senior member for St. Thomas, (Mr. Batson); and the hon. senior member for St. Andrew, (Mr. Corbin).
(7.50 p.m.)

RESOLUTION re LEASE OF LAND AT THE DEEP WATER HARBOUR TO ESSO STANDARD OIL S.A.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Communications, Works and Housing:- To move the passing of a Resolution to approve the lease by the Executive Committee to Esso Standard Oil S.A. Ltd. of those two parcels of land, part of the Deep Water Harbour and described in the Schedule to this Resolution for the operation of the bunkering facilities in the new harbour.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, at this stage, I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended for three quarters of an hour.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: I beg to second that.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move as an amendment that this sitting be now suspended until 8.30 p.m. of the clock.

Mr. SEALY: I beg to second that.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: We accept that amendment.

The question that this sitting be now suspended until 8.30 p.m. of the clock was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. SPEAKER suspended the sitting accordingly.

On re-assembling,

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, there is no quorum, and I ask that the bell be rung.

On the bell being rung, a quorum was obtained.

RESOLUTION RE LEASE OF LAND AT THE DEEP WATER HARBOUR TO ESSO STANDARD OIL S.A.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Communications, Works and Housing:- To move the passing of a Resolution to approve the lease by the Executive Committee to Esso Standard Oil S.A. Ltd. of those two parcels of land, part of the Deep Water Harbour and described in the Schedule to this Resolution for the operation of the bunkering facilities in the new harbour.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, Esso Standard Oil S.A. Limited, a registered oil company for providing bunkering facilities at the Deep Water Harbour, had an installation at "Holborn" for the purpose of bunkering ships in the Deep Water Harbour. They had an area of land of 10,000 square feet and an additional 2,200 square feet for the purpose of accommodating their equipment. On the larger of the two areas, there is a pier erected for bunkering. There is a pier at the end of the south eastern portion of the larger area of land for the bunkering of ships. On the North-western side of the larger area there is a small area of 2,200 square feet of land used for the purpose of accommodating the equipment for bunkering facilities. These two parcels of land are not connected; there is a space between these two areas. The sum of \$2,400 per year is paid for the 10,000 square feet and another 2,200 square feet of land is to be leased also to the Esso Standard Oil Company S.A. Limited at the same rate which would amount to the sum of \$528 per year. That makes the entire amount \$2,928 per year for the 12,200 square feet of land.

These two areas of land, Mr. Speaker, are already occupied by Esso Standard Oil S.A. Limited and we are now seeking permission for a lease of these two parcels of land to this company, representing a complete area of 12,200 square feet.
8.40 p.m.

I think I should mention here, Mr. Speaker, that the dues collected only a month ago from bunkering facilities at the Deep Water Harbour have been in the vicinity of \$21,000. The dues collected are 14 cents per barrel of oil, with the possibilities of a greater increase as months

go on of more vessels calling here, due to the geographical position of Barbados, on their home-bound voyages as well as on their west-bound voyages. Many of the ships bound to Europe and the eastward part of the Atlantic Ocean use Barbados on both sides going westward and then eastward on the departure, thereby saving a considerable amount of time.

This Resolution, Mr. Speaker, seeks in accordance with provisions of the Executive Committee (Amendment) Act, 1951 the approval of the Legislature to lease two parcels of land at the Deep Water Harbour to Esso Standard Oil S.A. Limited to enable them to establish, operate and maintain a bunkering installation and terminal facilities in the Deep Water Harbour.

I therefore beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I beg to second that.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, I will say from the outset that we on this side agree entirely with the Resolution presented to us by the Minister of Communications to lease this land to Esso.

Mr. SPEAKER: When the hon. member says "we on this side", does he refer to all?

Mr. GODDARD: I mean my Party, Sir. I take this opportunity of expressing our feelings on this aspect of the negotiations by Government with Esso Bunkering. As we have heard, Government revenue from this at the present moment is in the vicinity of \$21,000 per month. We envisage an increase in bunkering, and if everything is favourable, there is no reason why we should not one day be receiving from bunkering \$1 million a year. That will go a long way to servicing the loan which we have had to raise for the Deep Water Harbour. The public should be made aware of the amount of revenue which Government is getting and is likely to get. For that reason we consider that every facility Government can offer to Esso in facilitating the bunkering of ships coming inside or outside the Harbour should be offered. This land is on the Deep Water Harbour and is at present being used, but this is what I would also suggest to the Government: in the very near future Esso will have to put down additional tanks to carry the volume of oil, both crude and diesel, for the increased business that we envisage. It must be made quite clear to them that these tanks must be put not on the Deep Water Harbour but on the Holborn side, away from the Harbour which we will need for other development.

If all the land around there has not been used up, there are other lots available to Esso, and it should be in their interest, if they are looking ahead, not to wait for the day to arrive when they want to secure additional properties around there in anticipation of what I foresee they will have to do in the very near future. I would like to see this business developed to such a point in a very short time whereby they will have a farm of tanks in and around Holborn - that is the term they use - maybe two dozen, and with ships coming in daily and hourly, Government will get a revenue of 14 cents a barrel of oil they put on board without the expenditure of one penny. They would not even have to put a penny stamp on a receipt, because this money is paid in to them. It is good and sound business, and that is one feature of the Deep Water Harbour that is going to pay great dividends, and so relieve the taxation with which we are now faced.

Mr. SPEAKER: May I advise the hon. senior member that a four-cents stamp is put on a receipt? I trust all firms comply.

Mr. GODDARD: My firm complies, Sir. Although this is something which is well known to many members in here, I think the public generally should be made aware of it, because it is every taxpayer who at the end of the year has to contribute a large sum of money for interest and sinking fund to pay back for the harbour of \$31 million. This is one large asset and it should be developed from all sides.

Those are the comments I wanted to make from this side, Sir, because I do not think this was envisaged when we first started with the Harbour. No mention was made of bunkering; it was an afterthought, but it has developed to a point where it will relieve the taxpayers of this Island to a great extent in the sinking fund and interest charges on a very large capital loan which we have had to expend for a very worthwhile project.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, courage and temerity are the answer to all this. When the last Government made its decision on the Harbour, to be honest I did not know that the Government had its eyes on as little as \$1 million, and if it will relieve the hon. member, it was probably three years ago when we discussed the original scheme with Esso. It would probably do the member's heart good to learn that we were told that there could be facilities for handling one million gallons per year.
8.50 p.m.

In the first venture — and I believe these are your crude figures — the Minister noted that it was \$21,000 a month and that would represent a \$1/4 million for a year — the average is \$252,000 — and in another three years I guess that this should be taken as \$1 million a year. I think the total cost of the Harbour at first was estimated at \$24 million but it has now gone to \$30 million. However, that is nothing to worry about as long as you can get this money from the item "oil" to pay for it. That is why my opening remark was *a propos* the temerity of the Government to decide on a Harbour without oil. With your sense of humour, you will look back on this debate and you will learn that from one item "oil", to say nothing of the other facilities of our trade, you can make \$1/4 million a year to pay back for this Harbour. I hope that the utilization of the land around the Harbour would pay the dividends which you have been dreaming of. Thank you again, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Sir, I do not want to say much on this. Probably, were it not for the last hon. member who spoke, I should not have risen because I think the hon. junior member for Christ Church made it quite clear; but the hon. junior member for St. George got up and talked about the temerity of the Government. Nobody in this Party or that Party ever offered any criticism to the last Government for building the Harbour. (A VOICE: Sit, you are wasting time.) There is nobody in this House who should be rude enough to suggest that I am wasting time. Nobody can tell me that I am wasting time. If I say things and you do not like what I say, the road is free; go outside.

Mr. MILLER: (*sotto voce*) You are filibustering and I can bring you to silence.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Nobody with your mentality can bring me to silence.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Is that something of a mental stricture, something which happens in the cavity? Will the hon. member enlighten us?

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the hon. junior member for St. George enlighten me as to the point of order?

Mr. MOTTLEY: Why does the hon. member interrupt me? That is what I mean.

Sir, what I was saying was that none of us ever objected to the building of the Deep Water Harbour and we all can take the credit for building the Deep Water Harbour. The hon. junior member for St. George suggested something of temerity. One thing the Minister has done is to bring out to us what is the revenue. The former Minister has told us today when they went into this agreement with Esso that they anticipated a \$1 million revenue. This is the first time that we have got this valuable information and we are happy. I have never heard it before.

Sir, one thing I have always said. We have never condemned you for building the Deep Water Harbour. As a matter of fact, we have always commended those of you for having built the Harbour. This is the first time that we have got this information on the floor of the House and we

hope that it will rise to over \$1 million because it is a valuable asset. Sir, it is a very wise thing to enter into the agreement.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: With reference to the hon. junior member for St. George making his remarks about Mercedes Benz and oil, for the information of the hon. member, I will tell him that when we the present Government came into office Esso was already occupying that berth and my Mercedes Benz has come to me from 35 years of hard earned sweat in war at sea and it is people like the hon. junior member for St. George to whom I would make use of the French phrase, "*honi soit qui mal y pense*".

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the hon. member conduct all debates in the English Language?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: It means "evil be to him who evil thinks".

Mr. MILLER: I did not think the hon. member would have got annoyed. I said nothing for him to worry about. Anyhow I am sorry that he has been offended by my remarks.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Sir, with reference to the hon. junior member for Christ Church, I am quite in agreement that the entire plant should be kept in one place. All the pipes have already been run and a very small amount of money is needed to be spent in connecting the other tanks.

I will also point out that the dues collected from shipping which enter this Port would be able to pay Harbour dues and compulsory pilotage, and tug fees which would be collected would offset money spent in stores and groceries despite what the sailors spent in other things. I have no doubt that within the next six months we will be doubling up on the amount of fuel sold as more and more companies are using fuel from here. I have no doubt that we will double up on the fees collected in a very short space of time.

Mr. MILLER: Sir, as a rule, a member should not speak after a Minister replies, but I would like to know what are the dues charged.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: The amount of dues charged on ships actually coming into the Island just for fuel purposes, landing passengers or taking tourists is 50% of the normal charge which I think is 30 cents per ton on the gross tonnage of the ship. Ships coming here only for fuel and which are not using the Harbour for cargo are allowed the special rate of 50% of the fees charged.

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

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (AMENDMENT) (No. 2) BILL

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Premier: To move the second reading of a Bill further to amend the Local Government Act, 1958.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, in 1961 an amendment was passed to the Local Government Act, 1958, for the purpose of redistributing the burden of taxation throughout the island and to impose a uniform rate of tax relating to trade assessments. The Local Government Authorities derive their revenue from two main sources, that is, the rate on property on the annual rental value of property throughout the island and those rates vary between Council and Council. Prior to the amendment of the Act which was passed in 1961, the Councils also had authority to impose trade tax, that is, a tax on the profits made from business concerns within the boundaries of the Local Government Authorities which were susceptible to variation from year to year and having not necessarily been imposed at the same rate as the property rate. It was found after a time that the Central Government had to make subventions to the Local Government Authorities in order to prevent an inordinate trade tax being imposed upon businesses in the rural districts of the island.

The effect of the 1961 amendment was that a common rate of trade tax was imposed on the whole island, because it was felt that the businesses in the municipality benefited from the purchasing power of the inhabitants of the other two local District Council areas. The reason why the trade tax rate was inserted in the Act itself was a very simple one; it was because it was felt that if the rate were susceptible to change purely at the dictates of the members of the Councils, it would leave a certain amount of uncertainty in the business community when they made their projections and plans for improving their businesses and paying wages and so forth. The machinery for the amendment of the trade tax is a very cumbersome machinery in that we have to come to Parliament so as to make a different rate if the necessity arose to raise more money from trade or the same amount of money because of the difference in the total volume of business transacted in the financial year in respect of which the rates and taxes have been laid. That is the kind of burden which Parliament assumes unnecessarily when they are considering the question of necessity, because we do feel that there must be a certain amount of stability in planning both by way of private enterprise and in the Government sector. That is the reason why we have come to the House with this amendment to the Local Government Act of 1958 as amended by the Act of 1961.

Briefly, the purpose of this Bill which is now engaging our attention, is to increase the tax on trade from 18.5%, at which level it was fixed in 1961 by an amendment to the 1958 Act, to 19.5%. The various Councils have submitted their Estimates of Revenue and Expenditure for 1962-63. This normally should have been done for the financial year ending the 30th April, but due to financial difficulties which I do not consider — well, it was difficult for them to submit their Estimates before the 30th April and extensions have been given to the Local Government Councils from time to time to submit their Estimates of Revenue and Expenditure. It was not possible to make any accurate projection for the financial year 1962-63 before the Governor-in-Executive Committee had the opportunity to scrutinize the Estimates and bring down the proper amendments to the House.

Mr. Speaker, there are two main provisions in this Bill. Under the old Vestries Act, a trader was assessed not on the basis of his profits made in the year of assessment which is usually the year before the actual levying of the tax; but he was assessed on the basis of the average of the profits made in the five years immediately preceding or prior to the year of assessment. Under the Local Government Act, 1958, this provision was abolished and traders and businessmen have since been assessed on the basis of the profits made in the income year immediately preceding the year of assessment. They are being assessed in 1962-63 in respect of profits made in the financial year 1961-62. The difference which this makes to the income of the Councils, the Northern and Southern District Councils and the City Council, if a common rate is imposed, is that it would have been called for a trade tax of 20.5% which would be 2% over last year's rate. I use the term "rate" and "tax" interchangeably but it is strictly trade tax at the rate of 20.5%.

9.10 p.m.

If the basis of assessment was a single year, with the five-year average which we are introducing in this same Bill and which is a principle from which I think the Government should never have departed, in order to raise the same amount of money, it would be necessary more or less to impose a tax of 19.2%, which is more than 1% less than the projected tax based on a single income year; but after considering the matter very carefully, although the existing state of the law recommended that the amount could only be raised if a tax at the rate of 20.5% were imposed and with the five-year average we would need only 19.5% to raise the same amount of money, my examination of the finances of the three Councils during the past year in which there has been a major fluctuation in the volume of business even before we came into office — and it is now improving, I am very happy to say — is that the Councils at the end of the financial year very often found themselves

in a position where they had to go to the Banks in order to borrow sums of money to meet their commitments for the current financial year.

I have therefore allowed a margin of .3% in order that these Councils, taking into consideration the difficulty of getting in all of their tax receipts by the 31st March, would have a working balance which would obviate the necessity of their having to go so frequently — I would not say they would not have to go at all — to the Banks to borrow money and pay interest thereon. What I am explaining to hon. members is that with the five-year average, we have estimated that a tax of 19.2% would be sufficient to raise the same amount of money as a tax of 20.5% with the single year of assessment; but instead of making it 19.2% where we would be cutting our cloth very closely as it were, I have allowed an additional .3% in order that a working balance may be carried forward from the end of the financial year in order to prevent them from having to run to the Banks to borrow money very early in the new financial year.

I do not think, Sir, that there is very much more I can add usefully at this stage. Members have sat here very patiently since noon today, but I will inform hon. members that the question of the Local Government Commissioner retaining substantial amounts of the trade tax due to the wording of the Act is being considered. He cannot distribute all the trade tax that has been paid in, and there is an amount of \$73,000 at the present moment, up to last week anyhow, in the hands of the Local Government Commissioner, although the Councils are going to the Banks to borrow money. We are at the present moment drafting an amendment to the Local Government Act. I do not like to do things in a piece-meal manner, yet it is vitally important that the Councils be allowed to send out their demand notes without delay, and for that reason we are introducing this amendment. It does not mean that we do not contemplate a revision of the 1958 Local Government Act in relation to the building up of reserves in the hands of the Local Government Commissioner. We think this is undesirable and imposes an unnecessary burden on the Local Government Councils.

The question of property rates will be decided within the next 24 hours, but that is not the concern of the House. We merely inform the Councils that their Estimates have been approved or amended as the case may be; so within the next 24 hours the Councils will know the position, I hope, so that they can send out all their demand notes and collect the revenue necessary to carry out their duties. The amendment to the 1961 amendment which will make it possible for the Local Government Commissioner to completely liquidate the trade tax fund and pay out all the money in his hands to the Councils by 31st March, will be presented in the House at its very first meeting after the summer recess.

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

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: I beg to second that.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, there is very little to be said on this Bill other than that from experience it will be recalled that we pointed out that there must have been some reasons why the old business people who administered the affairs of Local Government had stuck so tenaciously to the five year average, because from the fluctuation of business in Barbados, it was found that if you did not do that, you could hardly run the Government. I cannot speak for the other two areas, but I know what difficulties arise; and I am very happy to hear what the Premier said, because I anticipated asking him about that amendment which allows the Local Government Commissioner to pool the trade taxes together after they are collected, 80% of which goes to the Municipality and the other 20% is divided among the North and the South. By 31st March, as the Premier said, the Commissioner pays out the money; if the Councils do not collect all the trade taxes which are due and owing by 31st March, he cannot pay out that proportion. I am very happy to think that the Government has been wise enough to see the folly of that and will be following up shortly with

an amendment so that it will prevent us from having to borrow money and pay interest on it while money is lying down in the hands of the Commissioner, and he cannot pay it out because of the definition and interpretation of the law. I am happy that the Government will be shortly introducing legislation to that effect.

There is one further point I should like to make, and it is that I am happy to hear the Premier say that from his information of the fluctuation things are beginning to look better from the point of view of returns, because you know, Mr. Speaker, the returns of the various Councils are now made by the Income Tax Commissioner after which we can lay our rates upon that amount. I take it that they have arrived at this 19.2%, but although I have been trying to work it out with my colleague, the hon. junior member for Christ Church, I have been unable to figure out what this .3% would put into our hands as reserves. I do not know what figures the five year average would bring, but I was looking through the Act as it stands at present and I am wondering whether it is going to be the duty of the Income Tax Commissioner of himself to provide such figures and send to the Treasurers for laying the 19.5% rate, or whether the Treasurer must take the trade returns for two, three or four years.

That has been engaging my attention since this Bill was introduced here, and I have not been able to decide whose duty it will be. This can be so easily done by the Income Tax Department, but it would take us a tremendous amount of expenditure which is not provided for if we had to do it. Anyhow, speaking purely for the Bridgetown City Council, I should like to say that while we appreciate this decision which the Government has taken on the five year average, I want to make it clear, lest anybody misunderstands the situation, that the last Government in paying increased salaries, paid retrospective pay to all its employees. Within the Municipality, we have not been able to provide any such sum in our Estimates. I am sorry the Trade Unionist member is not here. While we are able to stave off what we considered a strike after seven repeated requests for this retroactive payment ranging over the whole of last year which we really could not provide, it is not a matter of our having just 30 or 40 people for whom we have to provide retroactive pay; we have to provide retroactive pay for 800 employees.

9.20 p.m.

Therefore, I make my position abundantly clear lest the people in the Municipality, our employees, think with this Bill being passed today it gives us the right to give them retroactive pay. We were unable to provide it.

I think the Civil Establishment understands in this country that the principle on which salaries are paid — and you can see it if you look into a Whittaker's Almanac — is that Federal employees are usually the biggest paid employees. Then you come to Government employees being paid the next biggest salaries. Then next are the Local Government employees. Therefore you will find that people employed in Local Government are always trying to get into the Central Government so that they can earn a little more salary and people in Central Government look forward to going into the Federal Government.

I want it to be made abundantly clear that we are unable to do it. We have to bear in mind that there are 20,000 odd taxpayers and it would mean an increase in taxation which we cannot afford to do.

It will go down well for people to know today that what has been done by this Bill we can only describe as being absolutely fair; but we regret to say that what has happened before we could not consider as fair. The Hon. Premier said that if this did not happen, there would be a tax in the other parishes which would be out of proportion to this. For the first two years that this thing was done, the then Government thought fit to give to the two areas which they controlled sums of money amounting to \$30,000 so as to reduce their taxation, forgetting that people in the other area also wanted theirs reduced. Well, in my opinion, I say that what this Bill is making provision for today is quite fair. I

would have taken quite a different stand if the Southern or Northern Councils had been given a grant from the Government for taxation and there was no grant to the Municipal area. Outside of that, I have nothing more to add.

I will say this in passing. You have amended the law to give the Treasurer the authority to sign for loans. That was a wise thing to do, but then there is something else which is causing a tremendous difficulty. I want to draw to the attention of the Hon. Premier that there are between 21,000 and 23,000 taxpayers in the municipal area. The law says that within six months after taxpayers have received their Bills and they have not paid their taxes that the Treasurer must of necessity lodge cases in Court against them. That means that the City Council has something like 10,000 cases to lodge. It is not that these people would not pay but it is due to the law as it stands. There is something radically wrong from this point of view. The fact is that as I have said, the municipal area has to lodge something like 8,000 or 9,000 cases, and if you lodge a case, let us say in December, that summons comes out about six months after that and sometimes longer than that. As a matter of fact, we had to go and ask the Chief Justice what could be done to expedite matters. Everybody knows that there is difficulty in levying executions. We were told that it was a question of the Writ Servers' Department. I have got much co-operation from the Commissioner of Police, but then there is the case of our having 300 cases a week being tried now; and although it is only a question of going to the Court, the difficulty is caused by not having enough staff there, and on account of that we have to wait 18 months sometimes before we get a case summoned at all. While we must do without borrowing money, we have this great difficulty. The law says that you must collect that money by 31st March.

I appreciate what has been done here. I am not commenting on the law which is passed, and I do appreciate what the Hon. Premier has said that he took up the matter with the Judiciary to see what could be done because if we do not lodge these cases we are in great difficulty.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I think the hon. member knows that Local Government Councils have power to levy executions without getting into Court at all. We have a certain establishment in the Law Courts and we cannot let that establishment fluctuate depending on the number of complaints which the Local Government Councils decide to lodge from time to time.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Sir, once it was said that I could not capture the Government for 300 years; but I want to tell the Hon. Premier that as long as I have the honour to have any voice in the City Council, I shall not live to see any bailiff taking away anybody's bedstead and putting them to sleep on the floor.

9.30 p.m.

I was born poor and I have seen too much of that being done to people. This Government would have to pass legislation compelling me at the point of a gun to carry a woman's bedstead, pot or pan out of her house. I know that the hon. member would not do that. That is the same answer which I gave to the Chief Justice; that will not be done by me either in this world or in the world to come, not as long as I have a seat in the City Council. I counsel the Government to lodge the cases and give people the opportunity to pay. I do not think that any one could quite seriously believe that a politician with my experience would look at 12,000 people and send bailiffs to them and then look for people to look for the bailiffs; then you see the bailiffs going through people's windows bringing out their articles. I am too old a politician for that.

I see that the hon. senior member for St. Andrew is smiling. But if you were to do a thing like that, you would be committing suicide. I do not see the bailiff who could get me to do a thing like that. I am appealing to the Government to consider this legislation because I do not see anybody compelling me to have or to cause people's belongings to be brought out of their houses. The Chief Justice told me that that is my remedy and I told him that I am a

politician, that he is a Judge and that is a big joke. I say that East is East and West is West. I am not committing suicide politically or otherwise; I am not going down Westbury Road yet. We should try to see what we can do in the circumstances. I am very strong on this matter. The Government gave retrospective pay to all its employees. We would not like to think that the Government would create difficulties for the Councils which it controls, but we are trying to avoid the burden of taxation which is so great that we can offer retrospective pay. If the other Government persisted in that, we would have no alternative but to make flesh of one and stone of the other.

Mr. Speaker, that is my contribution to the debate. I appeal to the Government to get the summonses out and to employ a few girls and a few writers to get them out. I counsel hon. members never to try to embarrass persons since they saw what used to happen with their grandfathers and grandmothers when the other type of people were in the Vestries, when people were exposed to their friends and neighbours.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, I think that the hon. senior member for the City has covered the ground fully but there is something which I would like to clarify somewhat. I would not like to see any greater delay in the sending out of our demand notes. When the Local Government Act was being debated in here, we said that this matter of a five-year average was a mistake; we made a change and we have come back to it. We are now going to have a five-year average; that means that we will take one of the Vestry years in which the return was done in a different manner. The Commissioner of Inland Revenue has no recollection of that; he has four years. I presume that he will have to have that information furnished from the Councils involved so as to make the assessment with the division of five years or else he would have to send in four years to us and we will add last year on to this year and make the average of five years. I have thrown out that suggestion because it has not been thought of and that would make a further delay. If the Treasurers feel that it is the other fellow's responsibility, they will wait until such a thing happens. It may not happen with the Bridgetown City Council but there are two other Councils involved. However, they should be alive to the fact because the demand notes have already gone out.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I am very glad to see that the Government is making some effort to help in one way or other with respect to this Local Government Act. I may say that from the time the Bill was introduced, it has been amended; I have never seen an Act with so many amendments made to it as have been made to this Act. Every minute you have to amend this Local Government Act. For the four years during which this Local Government Act was in operation, I, as a Councillor, thought that we would have been able to do something tangible for the pensioners in the Northern District; and when I mention pensioners, I am referring to the Old Age Pensioners. You would be surprised to know, Mr. Speaker, that the various Public Assistance Boards and Committees are still paying an adult 1/6 and 2/- per week; that is a positive disgrace. We have done nothing whatsoever to help these people. I am sure that the taxpayers have to pay their taxes and more, and we have not yet done anything to help these poor pensioners.

9.40 p.m.

It is impossible for these old people who have done all the work and who are responsible for the wealth of the country.....

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member would give way.....

Mr. SPEAKER: On what is the hon. member rising?

Mr. CORBIN: On a point of consolation.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is a point not provided for in the Standing Orders.

Mr. CORBIN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the law relating to old age pensions has been amended.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has risen on a point of elucidation.

Mr. CORBIN: Yes, Sir. I want the hon. member to realise that the Act has been amended whereby Old Age Pensioners will get \$1.50 as a maximum per week.

Mr. SMITH: I do not know if the hon. member for St. Andrew is speaking about Government Old Age Pensioners or those of the Councils, because he did not say which. (Mr. CORBIN: Public Assistance). The hon. member has said Public Assistance; so I am very glad to hear that. It means something is being done; but as I said, it has not been done yet because I do not know if they have paid out this increase yet. If they have not done so, I am still right that up to the present moment nothing has been done for these old people in the line of help, though I am sure that the taxpayers have paid their taxes.

Mr. Speaker, I am appealing to the Hon. Premier to take what I am saying about the administration of the Northern District Council seriously, because that Council is comprised of nearly all members of the Government Party. The administration there, Sir, is none of the best. There are a lot of inexperienced members who were elected during the last elections, and in truth and in fact they do not know much about Local Government administration, nor do they want to hear anything from those who know about it. They are going too far and, I will say, have caused the life at least of one person through trying to interfere with the professional administration at some of the almshouses in that area. One may feel that, because he belongs to the ruling Party and is a Councillor, he can go into the Institution and give his own directions and orders to the Matrons or nurses of that Institution against the knowledge of the District Medical Officer.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will counsel the hon. junior member for St. Joseph to bear in mind that this is an amendment to the Local Government Act in respect of an increase in the rate of trade tax and to provide for the levying of trade tax, and not to stray too far.

Mr. SMITH: I am not going too far, Sir. I am only drawing something to the attention of the Premier, and I am sure that after I have finished, he will be more than pleased.

Mr. SPEAKER: A word to the wise being sufficient.

Mr. SMITH: What is going on in the North can be responsible for the downfall of his Government, and I feel he would be only too glad to hear it.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, the hon. member would say that every fool has got his sense and every field its hedgerow, and as he has said before, a clock that has stopped for ten years can tell the time twice a day; so I am prepared to listen to the hon. member. At the same time I must ask the hon. member to observe the Rules of the House and not to abuse the privileges of the House by suggesting that a person unnamed has been directly or indirectly responsible for the demise of any citizen of this Island, because these words coming from a member of this House may not be protected by the immunity of the privilege. I am only counselling the hon. member in the same way he is counselling me now; but he has been reported to have said before that even a clock that has not been working for ten years can tell the time twice a day, and I am prepared to listen to him.

Mr. SMITH: Really and truly, Sir, this is something on me now because I have not read that report, nor have I heard anything about this clock stopping and starting off again and things of that sort. I am only advising the Premier to have an investigation into the administration of the Northern District Council, and I would be very glad if he does, because there are a lot of irregularities existing there. I hope by the next meeting of the Council that I will have an

opportunity to go into the irregularities that occur in the North. The fact that one is the Chairman of a particular Committee does not make him the D.M.O. of the parish or the Institution. One of the District Medical Officers gave instructions to one of the Institutions in the North not to allow a particular patient to leave the Institution except....

Mr. CARMICHAEL: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, the hon. junior member for St. Joseph is evidently speaking from what he has heard. He is not a member of that particular Committee. For his information, a sub-Committee was set up to deal with that matter, and I suggest to him that it is useless asking the Hon. Premier to go into the administration of the North. With all due deference to the Hon. Premier and the hon. member, the North is comprised of members who are responsible and intelligent enough, with the exception of one or two, to take charge of the affairs of the Northern District Council.
9.50 p.m.

When he speaks of irregularities, if there are irregularities, I can assure him that the irregularities are less than what he had last year.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member who has just sat down says that I am speaking of what I heard. I can show you in writing, the Hon. Premier or the same hon. member, the letter which was written.....

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the sentence be completed by the hon. junior member for St. Joseph.

Mr. SMITH: Every time I get up, the hon. member gets up and adds a little piece. I promise him that I can show him communications in writing from the D.M.O.

Mr. SPEAKER: Not before you finish dealing with this Bill.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: Sir, I rise on a point of order. The hon. member says that he can show me something in writing from the D.M.O. I challenge the hon. member to show that the D.M.O. has written something to the Secretary of the Council saying that a Councillor has allowed an orphan child to be taken into the Institution. It was done with the approval of the Public Assistance Officer and when the matter was called up, it was said that the D.M.O. was wrong. If an officer has any grievance against a Councillor, I am going to see to it that he who is enthusiastic and has patience and the well wishes of the patients is not going to be humiliated.

Mr. SMITH: As I have just said, the hon. member will introduce something every time. I know nothing of this gentleman. This is news to me. I know a man, James Roach, was discharged out of this particular institution without even the knowledge of the Matron and against the instructions of the D.M.O. and the next day or two the particular patient was found dead in a canefield.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: There is no law in this Island to prevent a patient leaving an Institution whenever he likes. I will be quite frank. I have been in a specialist hospital in Hamburg with German specialists feeding me with drugs, and I got up and left that institution because I was unable to speak German sufficiently to tell them that the drugs were reacting unfavourably on me and I consider that I saved my life by so doing. There is no law which can make any doctor or matron even if you are in a General Hospital and you are foolish enough to walk out of a surgery and go on Brandon's Beach, prevent you from going out. There is no law which can restrain the liberty of the subject.

I have in a calm way counselled the hon. member not to make derogatory statements of people who are not here by suggesting that somebody killed a patient by letting him leave an Institution. You cannot prevent people leaving an Institution, not even the Mental Hospital.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, not even the Hon. Premier would allow me to make the point. If he is willing to en-

courage such actions, I am quite willing to sit down and say nothing more today. The Hon. Premier is saying that you cannot prevent one from leaving an Institution. It was not that this particular person wanted to leave; it was that a particular Councillor went and gave instructions to discharge that person. (A VOICE: He could not do that.) The Councillor went and instructed the nurse to discharge this particular patient.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: The hon. member is misquoting the case. He said that two weeks after that particular man left the Institution he died. I do not know if he knows the difference between two weeks and seven weeks. It is unjust to the Councillor to bring this matter here. This particular person who left was a blind or helpless man. I would suggest to the hon. member, if he cannot confirm anything he says, to look at the instructions and look at the discharge ticket and see the erasures which were made just to fool people.

Mr. SMITH: Sir, I cannot understand the hon. member at all; I really cannot understand him.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: The hon. junior member for St. Joseph thinks that because a few Councillors are in here he can either insinuate or otherwise mislead; but I am willing to join battle with him in here.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. This matter which the hon. junior member for St. Joseph is speaking about concerns Local Government; it does not belong in here. He is only seeking an accusation.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, if it does not concern in here, how have I got the chance to raise it? This is something to deal with Local Government. The hon. member must know that Local Government matters concern this House of Assembly because Local Government cannot do certain things without our giving sanction here. What is he saying then that it does not concern here?

Mr. SPEAKER: This particular matter before us is a matter dealing only with trade tax, and I think we have had enough discussions under this Head of this matter which is extraneous to the levy of a trade tax or increasing the rate of it. As a matter of fact, it is a long while now since anything has been said in this debate about increasing the rate or providing a levy. I will ask the hon. member to continue his address, if he so wishes, on the increase of the trade tax or to provide for the levying of a trade tax. Another opportunity may arise for the going into of this matter which he is talking about here. I am not saying that it cannot arise in here.

Mr. SMITH: Sir, I am sure it will arise somewhere else and I can take on any of them without any difficulty.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. If the hon. member brings it up somewhere else, it will be properly taken care of.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is no point of order. That to me is like a point of consolation.

Mr. SMITH: I can take on any of them, even the hon. senior member for St. James. I can take him on and throw him overboard at any time.

Sir, we are talking about trade tax. It is all right. We are increasing trade tax and it is all right. I am also warning the hon. senior member for St. James who is Chairman of the Northern District Council that now we are increasing the trade tax in order to help the administration in the North to see to it that it is properly spent. I am not going any further.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: Mr. Speaker, the hon. junior member for St. Joseph is asking the Chairman of the Northern District Council to see what has been done by way of increasing the trade tax, as a result of the increase which will accrue to the Council, that it be carried out and that money be properly spent. He can be assured that just as a stop was put to money which was spent or supposed to be spent and not accounted for, all other matters necessary for the smooth and efficient running of the Council will be dealt with.

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

On motion of Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. BATSON in the Chair.

10.00 p.m.

Clauses 1 to 3 inclusive were called and passed.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that you do now report the passing of this Bill in Committee.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: I beg to second that.

The CHAIRMAN reported and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

On motions of Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSON in each case, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

BOUNDARIES COMMISSION BILL

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 3 be taken as the next Order of the Day.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: I beg to second that.

The question that Order No. 3 be taken as the next Order of the Day was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day is to resume debate on the Second Reading of a Bill to provide for the establishment of a Boundaries Commission and for matters connected therewith and incidental to the same.

It will be recalled that the hon. senior member for St. Joseph had risen to address the Chair when the debate was postponed on the last occasion. The hon. member may now proceed to address the Chair.

Mr. COWARD: Mr. Speaker, in my remarks in support of this Bill I must, first of all, compliment the Government on the introduction of this Measure. I know, Sir, that it is an election issue and the people of this Island are always looking forward to this Measure. I have listened very carefully to the comments which have been made by previous speakers and I must say that I disagree with certain remarks which I have arrested and which were made by the hon. junior member for Christ Church. If it is true to say that those of us who are representing the country parishes are representing cane fields as was stated by the hon. member, it would also be true to say that the representatives of Christ Church, of which the hon. member is one, are representing hotels and boarding houses. However, I will not say that, because all and sundry must be represented. We have got to represent persons and things which go to assist in the development of the economy of this Island.

Mr. Speaker, what I am going to say now may sound a little strange, but I am saying or suggesting to the Government that they should so model this Bill that when it becomes effective the parishes will have no fewer than two representatives. I am not concerned with how many representatives there are in the parish of St. Michael or in any thickly populated area, but I feel that it would be an injustice to the people of this Island, if, by an amendment to the Representation of the People Act, the amount of representation which they now get is reduced.

10.10 p.m.

As it stands now, Sir, each parish has two representatives, and if at any time one is indisposed, there is yet another representative who would be there to look after the parish. I fail to see if a country parish is reduced to having one representative and at any time he is indisposed through

no fault of his own — he may be sick or it may happen that he may be out of the Island — how the people in that parish could leave and go into another parish and ask one of the representatives there to look after them. If, in the parish of St. Lucy which you represent, Mr. Speaker, or St. Joseph or any other rural parish, you are indisposed at any time, and you are the only representative, I fail to see how any of the electors could leave their parish and go to one of the representatives in Christ Church and ask for any help. I am sure they will be told; "Depart from me, I know you not".

It is not a question, Mr. Speaker, of the amount of people in a parish, and I will draw a little instance to you. Even in my own business I have buses licensed to carry 25 passengers and buses licensed to carry 58 passengers, but all are buses carrying two employees. It is not because one bus carries more than another that you can have one employee on a bus; if you had a bus carrying 100 passengers, it would carry the same two employees. The position is exactly the same, therefore, where the parishes are concerned. I do know, Sir, that when the hon. junior member for Christ Church said what he said, he was more or less defending himself, because if you divide Christ Church into four, I am sure the hon. junior member for Christ Church would remain here until he dies; so I do not think he has anything to fear.

Anyhow, Mr. Speaker, I am quite satisfied with the constitution of the Committee, and I feel that they are members who will do their best in the interest of all concerned.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, this is one of the most difficult Bills for me to speak on. Every time I think of this Bill, I think of how some people would like to destroy, remove or eliminate me. Sometimes I wonder why I did run in the City and why I did not run in the Local Government in St. Michael. Now there are a lot of people who can give, but cannot take. This question of single member constituencies has been mooted for a long time, nearly as long as the disendowment of the Church and adult suffrage.

Last year, after the Deep Water Harbour was finished and there was an absolute certainty of the last Government going back in power, members of the hierarchy of the then Labour Party meeting together with the reportorial staff of the Advocate at Seawall asked one of the most-then-distinguished statesmen in the West Indies, the Leader of the Labour Party, what did he think about single member constituencies. I was most shocked to hear the unstatesman-like reply when he said "I have advised that if it will cause you to lose an election, do not have it." Well, Mr. Speaker, if you can give, you must learn to take. The present Government campaigning all over the Island promised single member constituencies in their manifesto, and they are now implementing it. At the time it appeared as though I was the fly in the ointment, but I must congratulate the present Government in not taking that attitude. The past Government did not realise what would happen at the time and they referred to my friend, the hon. senior member for St. Michael, as a big, ugly, black man. He was a fly in the ointment then, but he proved to be a real blue-tailed fly, a fly that is a winner. Wherever you turned you could hear people saying not to make the foolish mistake of dividing the Island into single member constituencies, because that man Mottley in St. Michael is buying votes, giving away money, stealing money. The only thing they did not say was that I killed a man. They also said that I gave away cod liver oil.

Mr. Speaker, the last senior member for St. Michael used to run away with 12,000 votes as against 5,000 and 6,000 to the other member, but he never had any real competition at the time. This Bill, however, seeks now to provide for the establishment of a Boundaries Commission and for matters connected therewith and incidental to the same. I have read certain sections of the Press prejudiced against myself and obviously prejudiced against the present Government aligning us together as a coalition for the purpose of dividing up the constituencies in Barbados to suit ourselves. It is unfortunate that you are in politics and therefore must read all these things. The gentleman who writes these articles, I notice, is losing his belly every

week, because he used to have a belly hanging over. They used to tell me during the election that I looked as though I ate razors and nails, I was so hard; but fortunately for me I have remained and have kept my size like the hon. junior member for St. Michael.

This Bill, Sir, provides for the Government to appoint two members, the Opposition will have the right to appoint one, Your Honour will be Chairman of the Committee, and on the advice of the Premier, the Governor will appoint another. I understand that the Labour Party is offering grave criticism to this.
10.20 p.m.

It matters not how you divide if you can win the hearts of the people. So, it does not matter to me how you divide. I do not take umbrage at that. I do not see the idea of this criticism which is offered because I understand it is being said that this is the only democracy which still has dual member constituencies. This is the only part of the Commonwealth that you still have this sort of thing. But if you are in power, you can do anything. Sir Grantley Adams said at the Airport to members of his Party: "Do not have it if you think you are going to lose the elections by it". That is good advice to the Hon. Premier. Just as you have made a promise to have eighteen-year-old people on the register, the last Government did not think that you should lower the franchise to that age rate. They did not agree with it because they thought it would make them lose the elections.

I have sat and watched the Labour Party. If they had sense and were not so vindictive — I mean some of them — and they had decided to open the Deep Water Harbour three months before, they would have won the elections. Of course, they got bankrupt of ideas. They said that we of the City Council were showing off and Mr. Mapp was trying to keep me as Mayor down in the back and did not want me to come up on the rostrum at the opening of the Harbour. I think you all will well remember that. Where is Mr. Mapp now? He is walking about playing "warree" and writing "White Rabbit".

Mr. SPEAKER: Do not mind what he is writing about now; let us hear something on the Boundaries Commission.

Mr. MOTTLEY: He said that there was a coalition between the Mottley Party and the Democratic Labour Party to divide up the Island. The leaders of the Barbados Labour Party cannot keep their own members together and cannot get sufficient members now. As a matter of fact, the hon. junior member for St. George said that we actually robbed him out of the position of being Leader of the Opposition. But I would like to suggest to him that it makes not the slightest difference to me if he were selected or if it was suggested in the Bill that he would have the right to select somebody to serve on this Commission.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. You hear all these statements being made — who won the elections, and all of that.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is that a point of order, in the sense of the term?

Mr. MILLER: Yes, it was on a point of solace.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Sir, I personally agree with the recommendations in this Bill as have been set out here. It is not my duty to give my views, from the point of view of being the Leader of the Opposition, of who should be appointed from my Party or not, but I do think that the Government has acted quite wisely with one exception. I should like to suggest that the person for whom the Hon. Premier would have the right to recommend — I would like to see someone connected with your Highways and Transport, someone who is well acquainted with the actual division of the area, be appointed on the Commission.

I have heard a tremendous lot of talk about the membership of St. Andrew, the membership of Christ Church and what not. I would like to throw out this suggestion.

I want to say here and now that I have been in here for a long time and I do not see any reason why you cannot appoint members of the Commission from among yourselves. I hope the Government is not afraid of any criticism on this. It is up to any Government in power to say what it wants done. When it comes to the last Government in power, if they did not appoint members of this House, they would have appointed them from their friends outside. It is a question of winning the hearts of the people and therefore getting their support.

Sir, I feel this Bill is worthy of our support and I offer it very strong support and hope by the time of the next election which we have in this country we would be able to have single-member constituencies. I am not afraid of single-member constituencies. It is universally known that I was the fly in the ointment with the last Government or you would have had it before in Barbados. There was the dread in St. Michael that if you divided St. Michael into single-member constituencies, I had at my disposal \$2 million in poor relief according to them; but they forget that if their Government had any ideas of granting assistance or of finding work for people, I would not have had the opportunity of administering \$2 million in poor relief.
10.30 p.m.

Therefore, I very strongly support the Bill and I hope that the prayers of some of my friends in the Labour Party will not be heard; that is to say, that I will be removed from the scene before the time comes. Stupidly enough, some of the yard fowls of the Labour Party have been accusing me and saying that they have no right making any division of boundaries while I am alive. That is so very stupid. As I see it, when the qualifying age for voters is reduced from 21 years to 18 years, in St. Michael it will take a thunderbolt to remove the present Government. There seems to be very little hope in the other Party introducing young men who can induce young women — you must know what is known as political sex appeal. The Chairman of Committees knows exactly what I mean. I see that he is shaking his head. You must have what is known as political sex appeal if you want to win an election. Mr. Speaker, I offer my support to this Bill and I hope it will soon be put into operation; however, it will take some time. We want a person who would be officially appointed to survey the boundaries.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to delay hon. members for any length of time in replying. As I explained at the beginning, it is not competent for any member of the House to think that we would think of fettering the discretion of hon. members to make any remarks on the Second Reading of this Bill, as he may think fit; yet, at the same time, I regret that hon. members have found it necessary to have the Island back in the same way as heretofore. This matter is peculiarly the province of the Boundaries Commission itself. The purpose of this Bill is to introduce single member constituencies in this Island and our representation is based on the provisions of the Representation of the People Act, 1957. I have already made reference to that Act and I want to repeat it. The debates in a Legislative Chamber form no part of judicial interpretation; but I am repeating that, when we look at the Schedule of the present Bill, we will find that the first Rule says this:—

"The Island shall be divided into as many constituencies as there are members of the General Assembly."

It does not state "as there are members of this General Assembly" because the number of members in the General Assembly will depend upon the provisions of Section 3 of the Representation of the People Act as amended. When we pass this Bill and it becomes law, Your Honour will be the Chairman of this Boundaries Commission. The Leader of the Government will nominate two members who need not necessarily be members of the Government Party at all. Therefore, the fears of the hon. senior member for St. Peter are unfounded. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition need not necessarily recommend a member of his Party either, although he would have their advice, and if he had the opportunity to have a voice in the deliberation of the Commission he would not abdicate that right and vest the authority in another Party.

Right away we have four members of the House sitting on this Boundaries Commission. We went further than Trinidad to democratise the Bill. We are following the House of Commons practice. They have had three Commissions, one for England, one for Scotland and one for Wales. They have had at least three Boundaries Commissions and the Speaker is Chairman of each of these Boundaries Commissions; and on these Commissions are members of the House of Commons. Anyone who is interested in this matter would find the provision in Halsbury's Statutes. In Jamaica, there is a similar provision. If hon. members were to look at the comparative table at the beginning of this Bill, they will see that the Acts relied upon are as follows:-

The Trinidad and Tobago (Electoral Provisions) Order in Council, 1960; the Constitution of Trinidad and Tobago - Annex to the Trinidad and Tobago (Constitution) Order in Council, 1961; the House of Commons (Redistribution of Seats) Acts, 1949, of the United Kingdom and the Jamaica (Constitution) Order in Council, 1959.

There are therefore three countries which have legislation similar to that which we have or which we enjoy in Barbados and from which we drew our material. And from this legislation which is found in the United Kingdom, in Trinidad and in Jamaica we have worked out a formula which is very similar to theirs. One major departure from the Trinidad provision is that in the Trinidad Ordinance there is no power to appoint somebody to the Boundaries Commission who is not a member of the Legislature, and therefore in appointing a Vice-Chairman, it is competent for a person who is not a member of the Legislature to be a member of the Boundaries Commission.

10.40 p.m.

If we wanted to bring in a High Court judge from England, a person of political background or someone of legal experience in Barbados, but who is not currently a member of the Legislature or a Local Government Commission, it would be competent under the provisions of our Bill to draw upon such experience whether the person is inside Barbados or outside, because the effective voting power would still reside with the members of the Legislature. I can say that under Section 4 (b) in appointing the Deputy Chairman, I would naturally consult with the Chairman of the Boundaries Commission and the Leader of the Opposition. If I have any intention of appointing or suggesting or advising an appointment of a person not of the Legislature, I would normally do so after consulting with the Leader of the Opposition and the Chairman of the Commission itself.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that our Bill is a great improvement on the Trinidad Ordinance in that respect, because it does make it possible for us to draw on the experience of a person, let us say, of the eminence of Mr. Justice Wynn-Parry who did the British Guiana Boundaries Commission, and who is an eminent judge of the High Court in England, that is, if he is still alive. I do not know if he is and you can correct me on that. A person of his calibre was the single Boundaries Commissioner in British Guiana. In some other countries they have invited people from abroad to adjust their boundaries; but we do not think in this pre-independence era in which we are now living that we should call in anybody from outside to adjust our Boundaries, but only for technical assistance and advice if necessary, and we may not even need that. Therefore, Sir, members need have no fear at all about the provisions in Clause 4.

There is a matter to which I referred before and it is that in Section 1 of the Schedule the Island shall be divided into as many constituencies as there are members of the General Assembly. I want to make this absolutely clear: I start off by saying it is not for us to decide what the Bill means, nor is it competent for a Minister of Government to say what is Government's intention by such and such a provision. All it means is that we shall have single member constituencies, but it does not necessarily mean we are going to have twenty-four members; so anyone who wants to say that he wants the Boundaries Commission to understand that there shall not be more than twenty-four members, does not understand the spirit or the intention of the

Bill which we are now debating. All the provision in Clause 1 of the Schedule means, when it says the Island shall be divided into as many constituencies as there are members of the General Assembly, is that they could have worded it a different way and said that there shall be single member constituencies in the Island of Barbados, but the legal draughtsmen elected to put it that way. The number of members of the House of Assembly will be decided, as it is presently decided, by section 3 of the Representation of the People Act of 1957; and in the Representation of the People Act, 1957, section 3, it says that the Island shall be divided into the following constituencies, and it goes on to specify the City of Bridgetown, the parish of St. Michael, the parish of Christ Church, the parish of St. George, the parish of St. Philip, the parish of St. John, the parish of St. Thomas, the parish of St. Peter, the parish of St. Joseph, the parish of St. Andrew, the parish of St. Lucy and the parish of St. James. I think I have mentioned the eleven parishes and the City of Bridgetown. Then under subsection (2) it says that each constituency shall return two members; so section 3 of the Act says how many constituencies there are, and then it says each constituency shall return two members; but the duty of the Boundaries Commission is to recommend how many constituencies the Island shall be divided into, and all the Schedule is saying is that there shall be as many constituencies as there are members. They could have put it the other way and said there shall be as many members as there are constituencies, but the legal draughtsmen put it this way.

Mr. SPEAKER: Perhaps the words "there are" confuse certain people.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: The words "there are" could very well be omitted, but I do not like to interfere with the work of the legal draughtsmen except where they have patently made a mistake; but I am not satisfied and I have checked it back since last Tuesday's sitting with one of the senior Crown Law Officers, and he has assured me that there is nothing wrong having in mind the Government's intention that we could veto the discretion from time to time of the Boundaries Commission to represent fifty constituencies. Obviously there is a limitation to the seating capacity in this Chamber, and we will only recommend so many constituencies as we deem necessary and expedient. We would like to say right now that there are only going to be twenty-four members. We had twenty-four members when the population of this Island was only half of what it is, and the mere fact that in Great Britain they only have six hundred odd members for 50 million people does not mean there is any pre-ordained ratio of population to representation which has got to be followed strictly. If you believe in democracy, you will believe in the *Comitia Centuriata* and the Tribunes of the People in the General Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, we are the General Assembly of this Island, and the people have delegated to us, twenty-four members of the community, the right to speak for them. The population is growing and we have to be very careful, without in any way giving any sign-posts or guidance, not to give people the impression that we want to deprive them of representation. Let us be very clear on this matter that Clause 1 of the Schedule does not in any way mean that there are only to be twenty-four members of the General Assembly for all time. I know that it has been bandied about the West Indies that there are too many Ministers and that we are over-governed and that kind of thing, as if the economic viability of the country depends on how few Ministers or representatives you have in the General Assembly.

As I pointed out before, Sir, the machinery of administration is geared in every country to the needs of the moment and the limitations imposed by time and space on an overburdensome kind of representation. How you run a country depends on what is necessary from time to time.

10.50 p.m.

People of one age have different plans from people of another age. Because 175 years ago we had 24 members of the General Assembly, it does not mean we must treat

with awe and respect the decision of our forefathers. Again, Sir, I am not necessarily urging that there should be an increase; neither am I suggesting that the number of seats should stay as they are. The Boundaries Commission may suggest that there should be twelve members. What would be the view of those protagonists to that? The Government Party has fourteen seats. If we recommend fourteen members of the General Assembly, then the very people who say; "Barbados is small; so we do not need all of these seats, we do not need more than 24 seats" - the very people who want to restrict us with 24 seats would say that you want to institute a dictatorship.

I want to emphasise and make it clear to hon. members that when the Boundaries Commission makes its recommendations, the House will then have to amend the Representation of the People Act, Section 3, to decide how many members shall constitute the General Assembly of this Island; and all the Schedule is adding is that there should be single-member constituencies. But the Legal Draughtsman did not elect to do it that way. He drafted it that the Island shall be divided into as many constituencies as there are members of the General Assembly. As I was saying, the Boundaries Commission having made a recommendation, we will amend the Representation of the People Act to say that there shall be so many, and each member would represent a constituency because Section 3 says that each constituency shall return two members and the Schedule is saying that each constituency shall return one member although it does not say it in those words.

Mr. Speaker, bear in mind that we are not introducing any innovation in the parliamentary machinery, but we have actually improved on the machinery which exists in the United Kingdom, in Jamaica, in Trinidad. All these countries now have independent constituencies: they are completely independent. I think when this is done it would take Barbados one step forward and it is a step which should have been taken a long time ago.

We are merely implementing the promise which we made to the people. Let us not go into details now of how the Island should be carved up. Let us appear before the Commission - those of us who are not on it - and tell the Commission what we think about it. Let us make our suggestions to the Commission; but do not let us carve up the Island in this Chamber on this Bill because that would have the effect of circumscribing the activities of the Commission itself.

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. W. A. CRAWFORD, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. BATSON in the Chair.

Clauses 1, 2, and 3 were called separately and passed.

Clause 4 was called. It reads as follows:-

4. The members of the Commission shall be --

- (a) the Speaker who shall be Chairman;
- (b) a Deputy Chairman who shall be appointed by the Governor acting in accordance with the advice of the Premier;
- (c) two members of the General Assembly who shall be appointed by the Governor acting in accordance with the advice of the Premier; and
- (d) one member of the General Assembly who shall be appointed by the Governor acting in accordance with the advice of the member of the General Assembly for the time being recognised by the Governor as the Leader of the Opposition.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I beg to move that Clause 4 stand part.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I did not hear all that the Hon. Premier had to say on this Clause. As I have said in my second reading speech, I make no apologies for speaking on the carving up of the Island. The Hon. Premier said that there is no magic in numbers; but there is commonsense in not having an Assembly overweighted because you are going to have a Boundaries Commission. My view of it is that I am still of the considered opinion that the constitution of the Barbados House of Assembly does not necessarily mean that we should have more than 24 members. Therefore, I am of the opinion that as this Bill now stands, as it is worded here, two members of the General Assembly who shall be appointed by the Governor acting in accordance with the advice of the Premier; and one member of the General Assembly who shall be appointed by the Governor acting in accordance with the advice of the member of the General Assembly for the time being recognised by the Governor as the Leader of the Opposition, I cannot agree with that.

Now, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition is a good friend of mine and he is a Member of Parliament. I was in this present House of Assembly when it was elected on the 4th December, 1961. The present situation in the House of Assembly could not give the Leader of the Opposition this position as is set forward in this Clause as to what is taking place in this House. If you take the members in the House of Assembly as it presently exists, you will have to come to the conclusion that in these circumstances the leadership of the Opposition is for the minority; therefore, with the number of members in the House as it presently exists, you could not elevate the Leader of the Opposition in a similar way as he is elevated in the United Kingdom because if you do so you are not taking the facts of life as they are. In the United Kingdom at the time that they set up a Boundaries Commission, there were 208 members in the Labour Party. There were only six Liberals. If you give the Leader of the Opposition in this Assembly the right to nominate a member of the Commission in these present circumstances, in my opinion, it could not be a true representation because there are ten members on this side which form the Opposition and he represents 40% of them. If you grant that to the Leader of the Opposition, the Hon. Premier would have to say what is the position as regards the other membership of the House for which you are granting the minority. The Leader of the Opposition only represents four members. It would be unthinkable for the Leader of the Opposition to go outside of his Party and nominate somebody. You are saying that the Commission should represent so many members of the House of Assembly and then you say that you hope the Commission would reflect the views of the people. As it now stands, it seems difficult to have a Commission to reflect the representatives of the House of Assembly.

11.00 p.m.

I agree with my colleague who said that the Deputy Speaker should be named as the Deputy Chairman in the Act to continue the sort of status which you have already given to the Speaker. If it is intended that the Speaker should be the Chairman of the Commission, suppose, for the sake of argument, that the Speaker had an accident as he had sometime ago - and we hope and pray he will not have another one; but as I was saying, the Speaker of this House is to be Chairman of this Commission and when he is no longer able to perform the duties of Chairman we would ask somebody else who would be the Chairman. You will have this untenable position. The Speaker is Chairman, but the Deputy Speaker is not Deputy Chairman. It does look to me that, in view of the fact that you have a Deputy Speaker there, the Deputy Speaker is the logical successor in this House to the Speaker. There is nobody who can succeed the Speaker in this Chamber in an acting capacity in our law. I cannot countenance the idea that you will have, as set out in this Bill, 'That a Deputy Chairman

should be appointed by the Governor in accordance with the advice of the Premier....." It does not mean that the person who is appointed as Deputy Chairman will be a member of this House. I do not think that we should have this idea that you are peeping outside and bringing in somebody to act as Deputy Chairman, somebody who is not a member of this House. Who is this oracle from outside? Let him come in here. Do not tell me that you will bring a retired Chief Justice to put on this Commission. Further, as to the composition of the Commission, the Bill says in Section 4 that: "Two members of the General Assembly who shall be appointed by the Governor acting in accordance with the advice of the Premier", and lastly "one member of the General Assembly who shall be appointed by the Governor acting in accordance with the advice of the member of the General Assembly for the time being recognised by the Governor as the Leader of the Opposition."

The Speaker is the fourth member and the fifth member can be a man from Australia. That is why I said that I do not agree with this. If this Commission is going to be a House of Assembly Commission - if you can get any thing out of four-fifths which is closer to five, I do not know what that is. This is another bit of colonial mentality which I do not like. We have a Deputy Speaker and I do not see why he should not be placed in the capacity of the Speaker. I have given credit to the Government for making the Commission members of Parliament, and I do not see that there is anything wrong in placing the Deputy Speaker in the capacity of the Speaker.

Mr. Chairman, some days ago, I was sitting and I looked at Barbados. I said that we will divide Barbados into boundaries, but when it comes to terms and matters political, the whole of Barbados is a boundary. The Federal Election made it a boundary. You cannot think about Canada, Australia, Brazil, the United States of America or England and talk about making the whole place a boundary. I do not like to make heavy weather of light work; the Commission will have to work out where the boundaries are concerned. As the position now stands, the present membership of this House is twenty-four and you have a Government Party with fourteen members. The Governor has the right of the appointment of three members to this Commission, acting on the advice of the Premier. (Mr. MOTTLEY: Not three members of the Party.) Mr. Chairman, I am an intelligent man. I do not waste my time in looking after affairs and then delegate my rights to somebody else. If a person has not been to school, I would not tell him to go and do my job. It is for the Premier to say, in so far as advice to the Governor is concerned, and he has to take the whole thing into consideration. If the Premier is going to make the hon. senior member for St. George Deputy Chairman of this Commission, I would say that the Hon. Premier has the right to do so; but it may be that the hon. senior member for St. Joseph and other hon. members would have the right to be considered. If you were to work it on that basis, you could not say that the Governor is setting up the Commission. I say, with all due respect to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, that the proposal here is extremely kind treatment. As I have already mentioned, there is no right for a membership as this. 11.10 p.m.

I repeat that with four members in the Official Opposition, and six other members, giving the Leader of the Opposition the right to name some person is more than kind treatment, because even based on the Government's position, the Government has fourteen members, you are appointing three members and giving the Leader of the Opposition the right to appoint one when his Party is in the minority. The Party in opposition does not have any numerical votes to upset anything; it is only a recognition. In normal circumstances if the Government failed, the Leader of the Opposition could not form a Government with four members, and if any of the members on the other side should die, God forbid, the Leader of the Opposition could not take over. He would have to look around and beg some of the other members of the Opposition to come with him along with some of the members from

the other side. That is the situation as I see it, and with four members forming the Commission, it would be fair to the present membership of the House for better representation to be given.

Mr. Chairman, you do not want one group having a Boundaries Commission now, and then after another election another group comes in and changes the boundaries, thus making boundaries a political football. It does not make for good parliamentary sense, and that is why you want it to be politically representative so that when you do something, it is something which reflects the nation. Those of us who fought the last election did so on the basis that we preferred single member constituencies, and I told the people in St. Peter in 1956 and again in 1961 that I considered that the House of Assembly should be represented by twenty-four members from twenty-four constituencies. When it comes to the Boundaries Commission, I feel that the Government has a right to take into consideration what is at present prevailing. What does not prevail does not interfere with us. I have no axe to grind, and that is why I said that if you had the Deputy Speaker deputising for the Speaker, he is a lawyer and there would be no row because you would have a legal Chairman. If the Premier is willing to say that so far as he is concerned his advice to the Governor would be based on the composition of the House, I think not only members but the public would feel at home.

I will say this to the Premier advisedly: I have been in Parliament long enough and I have been watching the last Government. Mr. Chairman, you happen not to have had the good fortune, but I think the present Minister of Education more so than any other Minister would repeatedly look over this side at the then Government and say "when we take over", and sometimes I felt he used to overdo it; but when he used that phrase, the attitude of the members in the Government would make you believe he was talking about taking over the moon. They would say "never", and laugh because they had got into the habit of believing that Government was something like a legacy which somebody had left them in a will, and you could not get it unless you went into Court. I want to tell the Premier not to begin to act in that way, because it throws out a bad psychological bearing. In view of the composition of the House, whether or not you like the hon. junior member for St. George, let some of them sit on the Commission even if they say that a boundary should be put in St. George or somewhere; but I consider that they have a right to be there. The hon. senior member for St. Joseph and the others have a right to express their point of view, unless they have shown or said that they do not want to or have aligned themselves with the major Parties. That would represent a fair basis.

I am not a politician, Mr. Chairman, who believes that any means to an end is the right thing. I am like Ghandi. An undesirable means even to a desirable end is wrong. Your means must be as good as your ends, and for that reason I think it would be a good means to an end if the total membership of the present House of Assembly in this Commission would be considered. I think it would be fair to everyone.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, there is very little to add to what the hon. senior member for St. Peter has said, and I suppose it is along the same strain that you expect me to address this Chamber. No matter what has been said by any member of this Parliament including the Premier, I will venture to say that no British political institution would want to apply this method. Say what you like of Trinidad and Jamaica or even of the United Kingdom, you have got four members and it is clearcut that this is purely political. Why do you think of what took place in Jamaica? The hon. member knows what happened in Trinidad where they created the constituency of Belmont to save Bertie Gomes, and this was hinted at in all the world's newspapers including the United States. In every English speaking territory something had to be said over the two years that followed that decision in the election where a constituency was created, destroying every decent tenet of democracy. Why don't you want to examine what happened

in British Guiana? There is no intention, as the hon. member for St. Peter has said, that the six of us should have anything to say.

Mr. COWARD: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, there is no quorum in the House at the moment.

Mr. MILLER: I suppose we can have that interruption; but for the sake of the record somebody will want to examine this. You cannot tell me that with four out of five members where the final decisions rest that you could not have applied democracy in a Commission of this type re boundaries for an election.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, before you put the question, I must intervene to correct the impression which the hon. member who has just sat down has given. He accuses this Government of doing something which is political as if he had expected that we were a basketball association, and therefore had no connection whatsoever with politics. Representation of the people is politics, and to say that the proposed composition as set out in this Bill of the Boundaries Commission is a political act, is to labour the obvious. If it is one body of people in this Island, Mr. Chairman, which ought to be completely silent on a matter like this, it is that Party opposite.
11.20 p.m.

Not one of them, not even the hon. member who has just spoken, took the trouble to berate Adams when he told them not to have single-member constituencies unless it suits them. They did not have the courage to tell him that he was wrong and now they want to accuse us of doing something. We made it possible for everybody to have a say; we are not preventing them from having a say because presumably, if the hon. members feel so strongly on this matter, they would appear before the Boundaries Commission and give their views. But the idea that a Party which tried to make the electorate believe that single-member constituencies was the worst thing to have and now a member of that Party is saying that we are wrong in not giving representation, that takes the cake.

I cannot see the force of the hon. member's contentions and it is not a fact that we have connived with anybody to deny them a hearing. As a matter of fact, it is stated in the clause under discussion that two of the members of the Commission should be members of the General Assembly appointed by the Governor acting in accordance with the advice of the Premier, and they need not be yard fowls or cellar ducks of the Party. They need not be both from the Government Party or from the opposition Parties; they can be any two members of the House. Therefore the hon. member need not disturb himself unduly.

However, I must say quite clearly that the Government cannot be accused in any way of fixing this Boundary Commission. As the Hon. Premier has explained, we have gone beyond the proposals contained in the Jamaica and Trinidad Ordinances. I daresay that the hon. member may feel that because minority parties are not named specifically some injustice has been done; but by any interpretation of the clause under discussion, such a feeling is unwarranted. You perhaps do not need to spell out in detail the kind of representation the Boundaries Commission should have, but it is firmly in the hands of the General Assembly where it should be because it is a matter dealing with representation of the people and certainly the majority of the members should be members of the General Assembly. To accuse us of playing politics is unjust because the Boundaries Commission is truly a representation of the people. So I do not want the hon. member to feel that we cannot answer him.

The Party to which the hon. junior member for St. George belongs resisted this bitterly. They made it an issue during the election campaign and told the electorate quite frankly that this Party which is running the Government wanted it; they did not want it. Well, the electorate did not take their views, they took ours. We have the mandate and we are not preventing the hon. member's Party from stating its views or offering its opinions, but it will do that by giving evidence.

Mr. MILLER: Look at the frame up between the two! The Hon. member admits it today in his usual technique. I do not think we have ever had that, not even on that charge that the man, Jesus, perished. They are saying this in Parliament. Suppose it was that the last Government failed to agree with them on this; is it right now for you to twist the truth and in all innocence tell us.....

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. There is not anything in what I say to show that I attempted to twist the truth.

Mr. MILLER: Sir, if you think my remarks are unkind, I will withdraw them to say this. I know the hon. member knows deep down inside of him that that is so, but he will have to answer for this. The hon. member knows that in the way this is set out, it is intended to deny us the right. When you say it is democratic why did you not look at the legislation of British Guiana? Why do you want to set yourself up as a member of the Commission and fix the boundaries of St. Lucy? No matter how you attempt to conceal it, I can see it, I want to see Christianity in politics.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member addressing the Minister or the Chair?

Mr. MILLER: I promise to honour you and keep all the rules. I am dealing with Clause 4 of the Bill. I would like to warn the Hon. Minister of Education that there is a limit to all the things which you should say and a limit to what you should do.

Mr. WALCOTT: I raised this matter but not on the same point as the hon. junior member for St. George. I can get some fun out of things. If the hon. member is squeaking now, it serves him right.

Mr. MILLER: Two wrongs do not make a right.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has risen. On what has he risen?

Mr. MILLER: I rise on a point of order, a point of discipline, a point of solace, a point of consolation and a point of the Pope. "Is it nothing to you, all ye that pass by?"

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, the hon. junior member for St. George must not be so philosophical today about this measure when he and his Party was very pragmatic and brutal about it a couple of months ago when they took the whole of Barbados and turned it into one voting constituency with their own Tom Harry rules. They said that you must go around to 109,000 people and beg for a vote.

What I said was more magnanimous. I thought the hon. member would have allowed me to do it for him because it would go with better grace. He said that two wrongs do not make a right. Sir, you do not talk about what is right or wrong in a matter like this. What is right or wrong is a matter of opinion. This pays up. You are getting repaid now in your own coin. They are giving you back the same coin which you gave them; therefore it is nothing wrong.

Mr. MILLER: Do you mean that the right of the electorate is something to talk about being paid back in your own coin? Is there nothing else that you can say? Already you can hear them marching; you can hear the cries of battle.

Mr. WALCOTT: Sir, it is getting on to midnight and we can have a nice pastime hearing the hon. member speak; but those of us who believe in single-member constituencies came back in here triumphantly after the elections.
11.30 p.m.

You have to salute now when we pass by. If the hon. member has any sneaking suspicion that they are hoping for a revival, well, some of the Pentecostal missions have revivals. However, if they have any sneaking suspicion that they have a hope of their return to glory, I do not know. The

hon. member further said that if they were to win the Election, they are going to have single member constituencies, and they will set a Boundaries Commission for that purpose. I have said that I want eighteen-year-old people to vote and the members on the opposite side of the House laughed at the idea. The people who are twenty-one years now have agreed with that. My constituents have sent me back to this House and therefore they must be in favour of having the qualifying age for voters reduced to eighteen years. The Party of the hon. junior member for St. George now comprises three members in this House. I have made one speech supporting the reduction of the qualifying age of voters from twenty-one years to eighteen years, if you can remember that, Mr. Chairman, I think that I would be the hon. member's representative in this matter, rather than that they should try to represent themselves, so that it would go down with better grace.

The question that Clause 4 stand part of the Bill was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clauses 5 to 15 inclusive were called and passed.

The Schedule was called. It reads as follows:-

SCHEDULE

RULES RELATING TO CONSTITUENTS

1. The Island shall be divided into as many constituencies as there are members of the General Assembly.
2. The electorate shall, so far as is practicable, be equal in all constituencies.
3. The Commission may depart from the strict application of rule two of these Rules if it considers that it is desirable to do so having regard to the difference between urban and rural areas in respect of density of population.
4. For the purposes of these Rules the expression "electorate" means, in relation to a constituency, the number of House of Assembly electors (within the meaning of that expression in regulation two of the Registration of Electors Regulations, 1955) whose names, with respect to that constituency, appear on the register of House of Assembly electors that is in force on the date on which the Commission commences its review under and by virtue of section eleven of this Act.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that that be the Schedule to the Bill.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: I beg to second that.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the Hon. Premier to explain the Schedule (Mr. MOTTLEY: He explained it already.) I am sure that the hon. member does not know about what I am asking. Paragraph 4 of the Schedule states this:-

"For the purpose of these Rules the expression "electorate" means, in relation to a constituency, the number of House of Assembly electors (within the meaning of that expression in regulation two of the Registration of Electors Regulations, 1955) whose names, with respect to that constituency, appear on the register of the House of Assembly electors that is in force on the date on which the Commission commences its review under and by virtue of section eleven of this Act."

What I am asking the Hon. Premier is this: if you are restricted to the people on the registration roll and not people who are eligible to be the electorate, you should ask the Commission to look into the electorate on the basis of the number of people who will be eligible to be on the roll; because the people who are at present on the roll do not represent the total number of people in the constituencies. You can have any constituency as you may have found it since the days we have stopped registering people. I am not now a grass root politician getting heels. You will find that the people are not at home, but then you find them on the roll. You will have to know the population

in the area in order to be able to say what your constituency should be. We do not want to have an area with so many people on the voters' list and then you will find that that is a small percentage of the number of people who are eligible to vote. We should do something in Barbados to stimulate voting; if not making voting compulsory, we should try to do something to make the registration a little easier than it is. Although there was a restrictive qualification, a higher percentage of the people who were eligible to vote were on the roll. Now we are paying for it; we have been told that a lot of people are not on the voters' list. There is not a member of this House who has not had the sad experience to find that people were not on the registration list. We are aiming at getting the maximum number of people on the roll; that is why I would like the electorate to be defined as people who are eligible to be registered as voters rather than those who are on the voters' list. 11.40 p.m.

That is the point I have already made, and that is why I asked for that explanation.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I do not really understand why the hon. senior member for St. Peter is objecting so strongly to the wording of Clause 4 of the Schedule. If we look at the Schedule very carefully, we will see that Clause 2 says that the electorate shall, so far as is practicable, be equal in all constituencies. That is really the Clause to provide for the equalitarian number of representation and not the disproportionate number which prevails at the present moment where in Bridgetown there are 35,000 electors, and in some of the rural parishes there are less than 5,000 electors returning the same two members to the General Assembly as a parish with 35,000 electors. Therefore Rule 4 has got to be read in conjunction with Rule 2. Rule 4 says that for the purpose of these Rules the expression "electorate" means, in relation to a constituency, the number of House of Assembly electors, (within the meaning of that expression in Regulation 2 of the Registration of Electors Regulations, 1955) whose names, with respect to that constituency, appear on the Register of House of Assembly Electors that is in force on the date on which the Commission commences its review under and by virtue of Section eleven of this Act. All of that merely relates to the equality.

If the hon. member or any hon. member really studies the electors' statistics of Barbados, he will see that the voting population is just under half of the total population of the Island, and it is so in every constituency. In other words, you do not find in some constituencies that the voting population is 20% of the total population and in others it is 50% and in others 70%. In nearly every constituency plus or minus one percent, you will find that the voting population is approximately half of what the total population of that constituency is. To insist therefore that the equality in each constituency should be based on the total population in the areas is doing violence to the whole principle of parliamentary representation, because what we are normally concerned with is not the question of how many people live in an area, but how many people are entitled to vote. In Barbados there is an almost absolute equation which establishes that it is really an irrelevant consideration where you take the whole population which would include children born yesterday and children born the day before yesterday, all those persons in being and under the Queen's peace at the time when the Commission goes to work—which you are not really concerned about; in Barbados it really does not matter, because whether you take the numbers to be based on the voting population or the actual population proportion, the figures are going to be the same; that is, they will work out at about the same proportion in every district. It is really of no importance, but you must have a basis on which the Commission can go to work.

Now we do know, Mr. Speaker, that under the law every year the electoral roll has to be revised. A census is only taken once every ten years, and right now we are not likely to get our census statistics until the end of 1963 although the census was taken in 1960. The census year is once every decade at the end of the decade. The Trinidad Statistical Office that is preparing and processing our census figures cannot possibly give us those statistics until the

end of 1963; therefore the Boundaries Commission would have to wait until it gets accurate census statistics, and then they would have to be registered on the basis of migration of population and so on; but when you come to the electoral register, it is a much more accurate way of assessing the number of persons of voting age in a given area than relying on population statistics. That is the reason why we have had recourse to this method of basing the equality of electors in a constituency on the electoral register, because there is a duty cast on the registering officer and the revising barrister to keep the electoral roll constantly up to date.

Now the Jamaica Bill had exactly the same thing, because in their Bill they said in Clause 2 that the electorate shall, so far as is practicable, be equal in all constituencies, and then in Rule 4 it said:

"For the purpose of this Schedule —

(a) the electorate of a constituency means the number of persons whose names appear on the official list of electors for the area comprised in that constituency in force on the enumeration date under the law for the time being regulating the conduct of elections;

(b) the enumeration date means in relation to any report of the standing committee the date on which the notice with respect to that report is published in accordance with subsection 6 of section 45 of this order."

The change that we have made in our Schedule is that instead of using the enumeration date, we say the number of House of Assembly electors whose names, with respect to that constituency, appear on the register of House of Assembly electors that is in force on the date on which the Commission commences its review. What fairer method of arriving at equality of representation there can be than to base it, not on population figures of the children who have just been born and the old people who are on the way out and probably do not worry to register, but on the people who are intimately concerned with the voting processes, that is, the people who not only take the trouble to register voluntarily but the people who have been put on the roll by the returning and registering officers of the particular district, whose duty it is to go around twice a year to bring the electoral roll up to date?

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I am not now dealing with the question of total population, though from what the Premier said, you can work it out in a general way, but I am dealing with boundaries. What this says is that the electorate at present on the roll is what the Commission must take into consideration. I am a practical politician, I am not satisfied with the number of people at present on the electoral roll. I want to say that the electoral roll in Barbados only has 106,000 out of 240,000 people on it. If you go to Port-of-Spain, you will find that we have higher percentage, taking the constituency of the hon. senior member for the City, because there is a higher density of voting people in the City to its total population, and whenever you take a count, you will find that a higher percentage even of the people on the electoral roll goes to the polls in the City than in the other constituencies where you get between 60% and 70%, but in the constituency of the City you find 80% of the people on the electoral roll. Why is that? The people in the City were telling me to come up, because they would like to see the hon. member and myself represent them. It is a question of having somebody to get people to come out and vote.
11.50 p.m.

Do you know that more people come out to vote when they feel that they come to vote for you? But when the candidates are not popular, you get a low percentage of voters going to the polls. Suppose you do not elect to put on the roll the question of the eighteen-year-olds, there is still the other question which you have to take into consideration. I am not now dealing with these on the roll. The question is: are you satisfied that the Electors Roll as it stands at present is the best indicator for the Boundaries Commission to be guided by to assess the bounda-

ries or does it also need to be a question of knowing in large constituencies the number of people eligible to be put on the roll? For instance, I would say that the number of people eligible to vote in St. Michael is more than 38,000 people; I believe the number is more in the vicinity of 50,000 people. Therefore, in creating a boundary, you should create one with the non-voting strength also because you cannot change a boundary in a week.

The hon. member must bear in mind that you are setting up a Boundaries Commission to demarcate boundaries which cannot be changed next year. You do not want to say that we are going to have this breaking up into boundaries now; that this is a boundary and next week you have to revise the boundary.

If the hon. member would look at the statistics of this Island, he would see that there are some parishes which have a younger population than others. If you go down to Bathsheba you will find that the density of the population is among the younger people. You go to St. Lucy and you will find that there is an older population in St. Lucy than you get in other areas. That is why I say that your boundaries should indicate the actual position as regards your potential voting strength and should not be guided by the position as regards the number on the electoral roll. On the way in which this is done at present, you will find that if you stick to this, after you have made your boundary you may have an influx on your electoral roll and you will then have this uneven situation arising.

I am not contending that the voting population in St. Michael is 35,000; but I am saying: why should I consider 35,000 as against what I know them to be — 45,000 because the other 15,000 or 10,000 people are not on the electoral roll? If you go to the parishes, you can safely say that 50 percent are not registered. That is why I say that it is more in keeping with modern trends to do it in that way.

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

On motion of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order under Private Members' Business stands in the name of the hon. senior member for the City: to resume debate on a Resolution re the Premier's Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals.

The hon. junior member for St. George was speaking when the debate adjourned. I do not know if the hon. member is willing to proceed with it now.

Order No. 2 stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. George: Second Reading of a Bill to authorise the sale of certain lands at St. George's Rectory, St. George. The hon. member is on his feet and I gather that he is asking for leave to proceed with it.

THE LEEWARD ISLANDS CONFERENCE OF SEVENTH DAY ADVENTISTS BILL, 1962

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, while the hon. member is looking for the Bill, I think I can do this in the meantime. The Report on the Bill to change the name of the Leeward Islands Conference of Seventh Day Adventists to the East Caribbean Conference of Seventh Day Adventists and for matters incidental thereto is ready and the Committee has recommended no change.

I beg to move that the Report be adopted.

Mr. SEALEY: I beg to second that.

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: I beg to move that the Bill to change the name of the Leeward Islands Conference of Seventh Day Adventists to the East Caribbean Conference of Seventh Day Adventists and for matters incidental thereto, be now read a third time.

Mr. SEALEY: I beg to second that.

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Bill do now pass.

Mr. SEALEY: I beg to second that.

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

ST. GEORGE'S RECTORY (RECTOR'S RESIDENCE) BILL, 1962

Mr. LOWE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 2 of Private Members' Business be the next Order of the day.

Mr. YEARWOOD: I beg to second that.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 2 stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. George: Second reading of a Bill to authorise the sale of certain lands at Saint George's Rectory, St. George.

Mr. LOWE: Mr. Speaker, this Bill is one to authorise the Bishop of Barbados and the Rector of the parish of St. George to sell certain lands belonging to the St. George's Rectory.

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

Mr. YEARWOOD: I beg to second that.
12.01 p.m.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to appoint the following hon. members to serve on the Select Committee to consider and report on this Bill:-

The hon. senior member for St. George, (Mr. Lowe) the hon. junior member for St. George, (Mr. Miller); the Hon. Minister of Education, (Hon. J. C. Tudor); the hon. senior member for Christ Church, (Hon. C. E. Talma; the hon. senior member for St. Joseph (Mr. Coward); and the hon. senior member for St. Thomas, (Mr. Batson).

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS CONCLUDED

Hon. J. C. Tudor: Mr. Speaker, the consideration of that Bill concludes the Business of the House for the day.

MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 9th October, 1962, at 2.30 o'clock p.m.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: I beg to second that.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I should just like to make a few remarks at this stage. Just before we started the consideration of Private Member's Business during this sitting of the House, the Hon. Leader of the House, the hon. senior member for St. Philip, had a discussion on this side and gave us an undertaking that if we would be prepared to waive Private Members' Business, at the end of Gov-

ernment Business as it was being dealt with, he would revert to the debate on the White Paper. There was no mistake about that at all, and I may say that it is rather unusual to find that we were assured by the Hon. Leader of the House that this debate on the White Paper would be dealt with tonight, so much so that the person who is representing Redifussion Ltd., is still there. (A MEMBER: Three hon. members are now on their feet.) It is rather undignified that the hon. member would wrench from us the opportunity of reverting to this debate; it is rather unusual that we are not allowed to speak on this White Paper. We have had two members of the Opposition who spoke on this matter, but what is disgraceful is that today the Hon. Leader of the House - he is not now present - was at pains to come around here and request that we surrender the consideration of Private Members' Business and there was an undertaking given by him. I remember asking the hon. member this: "Are you perfectly sure that we will be provided with an opportunity to speak on this White Paper? And the assurance was "Yes" all the time, that if it is necessary for us to go on until 2 o'clock or 3 o'clock in the morning that debate would take place. I do not like this state of affairs and I feel that the Hon. Leader of the Government should say something on the matter; otherwise, I will have to be back on my feet.

Mr. Speaker, there seems to be some reason why we were denied the opportunity to speak on this White Paper. On the last occasion I asked for an undertaking that before the Summer recess we would be given the opportunity to speak on this White Paper, but today the Hon. Leader of the House gave me a very clear undertaking that if we were prepared to give up Private Members' Business he would go on with the debate on the White Paper. The hon. member is not now present in the House but I can say that the Clerk has been around to me on two or three occasions in connection with this matter.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, this is the greatest exhibition of hypocrisy which I have witnessed for a long time. When the debate on the White Paper was first introduced, the hon. member was the loudest in his protest that we should not push through the debate on the White Paper. He was the loudest in his protest that they did not have sufficient time to consider the matter and so on. That is a way back; as far as I can remember, it was either late in June or early in July when we introduced the White Paper. We have adjourned from week to week and not even one quarter of the members of this House have spoken on this matter.
12.10 p.m.

How can he assume that he has got the last say in rounding off this debate for the mythical group that he is supposed to represent and that therefore he is being denied the time? Would not the hon. member who has just sat down, any more than any of the Government Ministers on this side who may have a lot more intelligently to say on the matter than he and his colleagues over there, suggest that the Government after 12 hours and ten minutes with the same three reporters working in relays for twelve hours, should give them further time so that the implications of the White Paper may seep into their dim consciences so that they may be able to make a more intelligent contribution? The hon. member in the first place complained that we did not give them enough time, and even if we continue with the debate tonight, there is no guarantee that the debate is going to finish; so we are acceding to their prior request in every possible respect and giving them all the time in the world. I think it should go on record that we have been sitting and this staff has been working, not without remuneration but certainly without meals, for the last twelve hours, and therefore I second the motion that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday October 9th, 1962, at 2.30 p.m.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, every breathing soul in this Island knows the bitterness and insult in anything he has said.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I have not sat down yet, Sir, and I ask you not to fall to sleep, but to listen carefully to what

that questionable character on the other side is saying. He is accusing the Premier of this Island of dishonesty. I am on my feet and I have not sat down or appeared to sit down.

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

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Are you going to allow the hon. member to interrupt me?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has risen on a point of order.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Do you know what a point of order is?

Mr. MILLER: You are challenging the Rules now. Imagine the hon. member, torn in the minds of every thinking soul in this Island, when he talks about dishonesty! I do not know what he means by "questionable character". That is all he has survived on. That is what has brought him here and what is taking him out, and that is why the country is asking for an election.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is not making a point of order.

Mr. MILLER: I am making a point of privilege, and that gives me the right to.....

Mr. SPEAKER: There is no point of order being made by the hon. member.

Mr. MILLER: His whole life is.....

Mr. SPEAKER: No point of order is being made by the hon. junior member for St. George. Let the Hon. Premier continue his address.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I want to say right now, Sir, that the disreputable behaviour which is allowed on that side of the House by the members of the Barbados Labour Party is bringing this Chamber into disrepute.

Mr. MILLER: On a point of order, this disreputable behaviour.....

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I say 'disreputable behaviour by dishonest people'.

Mr. MILLER: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. senior member for St. John may proceed because the hon. member said "Mr. Chairman".

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Will you ask him to sit?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. George will have to sit, but is entitled to rise again.

Mr. MILLER: On a point of order, will you ask the Premier to sit down, Mr. Speaker? All this dishonesty he is talking about; I do not know what he is talking about.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am saying that a point of order is not an opportunity to abuse members of the House by disreputable characters, and I do not think you should allow that.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will both hon. members be seated?

Mr. MILLER: On a point of order, the hon. member talked about disreputable characters.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I am not going to be interrupted. (To the microphone operator:) Turn this on. Do you want to go home for good?

I am saying, Sir, that points of order in this House have given members an opportunity to get up and abuse others and you should stop it.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will both hon. members be seated?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: You should not be here at all.

Mr. SPEAKER: I trust the hon. member is not addressing the Chair.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I was addressing an employee of the House who is tinkering with the public address system of this House. He does it all the time.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would be grateful if the hon. member would address me on such a point and I would have steps taken.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I have been complaining about it for two years. The employees of this House seem to think we have passed a law that they do absolutely nothing for the money they get from this Chamber, and there are at least four of them involved. People are dragged in here on questionable grounds without the House having any say, and all they do is sabotage the Government whenever any member from the Government gets up to speak. I have put up with this nonsense for long enough. We are going to adjourn for a summer recess, and when we come back in, this Government will be introducing an Immunities and Privileges Bill, and there will be certain other matters in which we will be taking very strong steps to eradicate the subversive elements in this community, subversive to the Government from the point of view of loyalty, and questionable people whom they bring here. I only serve notice to hon. members of what would be happening. The Bill is already drafted and completed, and it is only because we had orders of priority that it is not down today.

What I want to say, Mr. Speaker, is that I do not think it is incumbent on you to allow members of the Labour Party to rise on a point of order to abuse members of the Government and make all kinds of unfounded, unwarranted and unwarrantable statements imputing dishonesty and other motives to the Government. They are the biggest bunch of scoundrels in creation, and I only knew good from evil when I joined the Labour Party and tried to associate myself with members like the hon. junior member for St. George, the lowest form of animal life on the face of the globe.

Mr. MILLER: On a point of order, are you hearing me now?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order to do what? I am suggesting that the.....

Mr. MILLER: His whole life has been in a cloud of dishonesty.

The question that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday 9th October, 1962 at 2.30 p.m. o'clock was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.
12.20 a.m.