
THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1962

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 5th February, 1963.

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

PRESENT

His Honour J. E. T. BRANCKER, Esquire, Q.C., (*Speaker*); Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, (*Minister of Development, Trade, Industry, Labour and Tourism*); Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P.; Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY, (*Leader of the Opposition*); Mr. F. C. GODDARD; Hon. C. E. TALMA, (*Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries*); Hon. J. C. TUDOR, M.A., (*Minister of Education*); Mr. S. E. SEALEY; Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, (*Minister of Communications, Works and Housing*); Mr. W. R. COWARD; Mr. R. ST.C. WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE His Honour E. L. CARMICHAEL, Esquire, J.P., (*Deputy Speaker*); Mr. N. W. BOXILL; 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 which were held on the 22nd and 29th January, 1963, respectively, have been printed and circulated amongst hon. members, and unless there be any objection, those Minutes will be taken as read and confirmed. (*After a pause*). There being no objection, those Minutes are now taken as read and confirmed.

Mr. WALCOTT entered the House and took his seat.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Premier, I beg to lay the following:-

Annual Report of the Commissioner of Police for the year 1961.

The Local Government (Ecclesiastical Grants) (Amendment) Regulations, 1963.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Government Notices were given as follows:-

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: (On behalf of the Hon. Premier):-

Resolution to place the sum of \$266,364 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. 34, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Resolution to place the sum of \$15,000 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. 35, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: (On behalf of the Hon. Premier):-

Resolution to place the sum of \$54,000 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates, 1962-63, Part II - Capital, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1962-63, No. 36, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Resolution to place the sum of \$368 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. 37, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: (On behalf of the Hon. Premier):-

Resolution to amend the note in the Capital Estimates 1962-63 relating to Item 7, under Head 9.

A Bill relating to the Provisional Collection of Certain Duties and Consumption Tax.

Mr. YEARWOOD entered the House and took his seat.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICES

Private Members' Notices were given as follows:-

QUESTIONS

Mr. CARMICHAEL: To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:

Is Government aware of the insanitary condition of the beaches between Prospect and Paynes Bay, St. James, due largely to the absence of public conveniences?

2. Will Government, in its programme of works for this year, give priority to the erection of not less than two public conveniences, - one by the Fitts Village Bay, another by the Paynes Bay Market?

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. With the greatest respect to the Deputy Speaker, I would like to find out if there is not some Rule which states that a matter appertaining to Local Government should not be directed to the Government in this manner.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is directing the attention of the Government to this matter. The hon. senior member for the City of Bridgetown may see me in my Chambers later on.

Mr. MOTTLEY: All right, Sir.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:-

Is the Minister aware of the acute shortage of water supply which the residents of Thorpe's Housing Area have been experiencing for the past four weeks?

2. Will the Minister investigate immediately the cause or causes with a view to having the normal supply of water restored in this area without delay?

Mr. BATSON: To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:

Is Government aware that the people of the parish of St. Thomas are subjected to much inconvenience in posting their mail?

2. Will Government immediately make provision for the placing of at least three Post Boxes in the following Districts in St. Thomas:

Welchman Hall, Prout and Hillaby?

Mr. BATSON: To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:

Would Government explore the possibility of providing a Dental Mobile Equipment Service for the rural parishes in an effort to reduce the number of children that travel to town to get their dental extractions?
2.50 p.m.

REPORT OF SELECT COMMITTEE

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to lay the Report of the Select Committee appointed to consider and report on the Bill intituled the "Church Village Girls' School Vesting and Disposals Act 1962".

The Report is as follows:-

The Committee held a meeting on Monday the 4th February, 1963 at 2.30 p.m. when the following Honourable Members were present, namely:-

Hon. G. G. Fergusson
E. D. Mottley Esquire
F. C. Goddard Esquire

The Committee carefully considered the Bill and recommended that the Bill be passed with the following amendments thereto namely:

1. By numbering Clause 2,
2. by deleting the letter "s" at the end of the word "Disposals" in line two (2) of Clause 1 and by deleting the figures "1962" at the end of the said line two (2) and inserting in place thereof the figures "1963", and
3. by deleting the word "and" appearing near the end of line two (2) of Clause 4.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill relating to the Provisional Collection of Certain Duties and of Consumption Tax be now read a first time.

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

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of my intention to move the House into Committee

of Supply at its next meeting to deal with the money Resolutions of which notice was given today, with the exception of the Resolution for \$15,000.

I should also like to give notice of my intention to ask for leave to deal with the Resolution for the sum of \$15,000 of which notice was also given today. Copies have been circulated to all members. We will explain the urgency which makes it necessary for this matter to be dealt with today in all its stages.

Mr. SPEAKER: I gather that copies are about to be circulated.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: It is a very simple Resolution, Sir, dealing with additional funds for the payment of Highways and Transport employees; so I am giving notice of my intention to ask for leave to deal with this Resolution in all its stages later on today.

QUESTION TIME

Mr. SPEAKER: It is now Question Time. Are there any answers to be laid?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that the Oral Replies to the Parliamentary Questions Nos. 57/1962, 63/1962 and 78/1962 are now ready.

Mr. SPEAKER: Oral Question No. 57 stands in the name of the hon. and learned member for St. James.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: Mr. Speaker, the question is as follows:-

To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:-

Is Government aware of the proposed sale of Trents Tenantry Land in the parish of St. James?

2. Is Government aware of the harm which threatens tenants of this land who have been served with notices to quit?

3. Will Government regard this matter as one of extreme urgency, and take immediate steps to investigate this matter, whereby tenants thereon may be given an option to purchase at a reasonable price the lands which they now occupy, or alternatively, ensure that a suitable site be provided for them to occupy?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, the Reply is as follows:-

"Government is aware that the Trustees of Trents Estate applied to the Town and Country Planning Officer for permission to develop about eight acres of the estate. Permission was not granted.

2. Does not arise. Tenants were not served with notices to quit.

3. Does not arise.

Mr. MOTTLEY: As a supplementary.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the Leader of the Opposition posing a supplementary?

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid it is inaudible to me.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The Hon. Minister replied that application was refused for eight acres of Trents land to be sold. Could the Minister say if this was part of Trents beach land or arable land?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, for the information of the hon. senior member for Bridgetown, I cannot say exactly at this moment what part of Trents this land is situated, but I will have it investigated.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I should like to pose a supplementary question to the Minister's answer.

Is the Minister aware that, appearing in a newspaper under Government Notices, the Registrar of the Supreme Court of this Island has put up for sale a plantation: "All that certain Sugar Work plantation called or known as 'Trents' situate in the parish of Saint James and Island of Barbados now containing by estimation 338 acres 3 roods 17 perches or thereabouts be the same more or less (inclusive of 1 acre 3 roods 20 perches running between the lands of a place called 'Thornville' and the Hometown River and abutting on the North-west on the seashore) butting and bounding on lands of Porters, Mount Standfast, Greenwich, Lancaster, Blowers and Lascelles plantations respectively, on the sea, on lands of the Executive Committee of this Island and on the public road or however else the same may butt and bound together with the mansion or dwellinghouse outoffices, etc.," and this has been set up for sale on Friday, 15th February, 1963?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, the question asked by the hon. senior member for St. Peter would not actually come under my jurisdiction. The Hon. Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries would be the most suitable person to give that information with regard to agricultural land for sale.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I was only asking if this Trents that the question has been asked about is the same Trents which has been put up for sale. That is all I wanted to know or whether there are two Trents in St. James.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, the whole question of the acquisition of Trents Plantation has been receiving the active consideration of the Government for a considerable length of time, and in reality, Sir, we have had our technical advisers to advise us as to the suitability of Trents for small scale farming and small scale development. The whole question is still under examination in that Trents Plantation has certain beach lands which can be of invaluable use for development purposes, and it is because of that that the matter is still being investigated. I must however draw to the attention of the hon. member who did actually bring this matter to the attention of the Government probably about a year ago - I refer to the hon. senior member for St. Peter - that the question of the sale of Colleton and Trents Plantations is under investigation.
3.00 p.m.

The technical advice has revealed that those plantations are situated in the restricted water zone, and there is certain difficulty as far as irrigation is concerned for small growers' vegetable gardening in keeping with our policy of diversification; but I can assure the hon. member that further consideration was given to the acquisition of Trents as distinct from Colleton.

As hon. members know, there is the question of foreclosure suits taking place on those plantations and the proposed sale of this plantation will be on the 15th March; therefore the hon. member can rest assured that the Government is following up the matter and, despite the water question and other matters, the Government has not ceased to display interest and is examining the matter very closely.

If the hon. member is not satisfied I can give him something further but, generally speaking, the Government is still interested in the acquisition of Trents.

WHITE WOOD WALK ROAD

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 63, to which I understand the answer has been laid and which was given notice of by the hon. senior member for St. Joseph.

Mr. COWARD: To enquire of the Minister of Communications, Works, Housing and Tourism:

Is Government aware of the poor condition of the road known as "White Wood Walk Road" in the parish of St. Joseph?

2. Will Government consider the advisability of repairing this road, and extending it to Cane Garden at the earliest opportunity?

3. If the answer is in the negative, will Government state why?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, the reply to Question No. 63/1962 asked by the hon. senior member for St. Joseph on the 31st July, 1962, is as follows:-

1. Government was aware of the bad condition of this road.

2. When this question was asked, plans had already been finalised to repair this road and were carried out during the month of August, 1962.

Consideration will be given to extending the White Wood Walk Road to Cane Garden in the 1963-64 programme of Road Works.

3. Does not arise.

Mr. SMITH: Supplementary to that, Mr. Speaker, I rise to find out from the Hon. Minister if the particular road which he said was finished in 1962 - if that part known as White Wood Road is finished.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Yes, that particular part is finished. The part asked by the hon. senior member for St. Joseph is finished, but the extension mentioned to be repaired is in the programme of 1963-64; that is to say, the part from White Wood Walk to Cane Garden.

Mr. SMITH: Yes, Sir, I understand that this particular part is completed: but I am asking him if as regards that other part in case the crop starts tomorrow, the people who live there can use that particular piece of road to get out their crops?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: For the information of the hon. senior member for St. Joseph, I told him that White Wood Walk Road was completed since August, 1962, and unless it has deteriorated to such an extent from that time until now it should be in good condition.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I know that I cannot make a speech on this particular road. I am not asking if White Wood Road proper is finished and is in workable condition; I am asking about the part extending to Cane Garden.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is White Wood Road the same as White Wood Walk Road?

Mr. SMITH: It is the same.

Mr. COWARD: If I understand the Hon. Minister correctly, he has said that the White Wood Walk Road is finished, but it is the extension to which I am referring. Nothing has been done about that part and the Hon. Minister is saying that it would be done in 1963-64.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the hon. member put what he is saying in the form of a question?

Mr. COWARD: As a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, is the Hon. Minister saying that this White Wood Walk Road extension is finished?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: The present condition of White Wood Walk Road is good, having been repaired during the month of August, 1962. An extension of this road to Cane Garden, a length of 1,075 feet, would be possible with the construction of two culverts and it would be considered in the Estimates of 1963-64.

Mr. COWARD: I thank the Hon. Minister for his answer.

EXTENSION OF BRIDGE GAP ROAD, BLACK ROCK

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 78 asked by the hon. senior member for St. Michael.

Mr. SEALEY: To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:-

Will Government treat as an urgent priority the extension of the road known as Bridge Gap, Black Rock, so as to connect the said road with Goodland Main Road, St. Michael?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, reply to Question 78/1962 asked by the hon. senior member for St. Michael is as follows:-

1. An estimate of the cost of extension of Bridge Gap has been prepared and it will be considered for inclusion in the 1963-64 Tenantry Road Programme.
3.10 p.m.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Minister says that the estimate is prepared; does he mean that the estimate is prepared for linking the two roads together?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, the Report from the Department of Highways only stated that the estimate of the cost of the extension of Bridge Gap is prepared. I do not know if that includes the joining of the two roads. I presume that it would include the joining of these roads because that was the direct question which was sent to him.

Mr. SEALEY: Would the Minister get a more accurate and detailed answer to this urgent priority? What I am asking is that the particular road be extended from Black Rock to Goodland Main Road and connected thereto.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the hon. member put it in the form of a question.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, the question asked by the hon. member is as follows:-

"Will Government treat as an urgent priority the extension of the road known as Bridge Gap, Black Rock, so as to connect the said road with Goodland Main Road, St. Michael?

I presume that that was the direct question sent to the Director of Highways and his reply was that the estimate of the cost of the extension is prepared. Therefore, it must be the cost of the extension and the connection of the two roads.

Mr. SPEAKER: There being no further questions to which answers have been laid, the House will proceed to the consideration of Private Members' Business.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

CHURCH VILLAGE GIRLS' SCHOOL VESTING AND DISPOSALS BILL

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day under Private Members' Business stands in the name of the hon. senior member for the City of Bridgetown:- To move the third reading of a Bill to authorise the Lord Bishop of Barbados and the Rector of St. Michael to sell the Church Village Girls' School.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, as I said when presenting the report of the Select Committee appointed to consider and report on this Bill, there are just a few minor amendments which the Select Committee made to the Bill and those amendments are as follows:-

(a) by numbering Clause 2;

(b) by deleting the letter "s" at the end of the word "disposals" in line two (2) of Clause 1; by deleting the figures "1962" at the end of the said line two (2) and inserting in place thereof the figures "1963" and

(c) by deleting the word "and" appearing near the end of line two (2) of Clause 4.

Those are the amendments which have been actually recommended by the Crown Law Officers to the Select

Committee of which I had the honour to be a member. With those amendments to the Bill as recommended by the Select Committee, I beg to move that this Bill be now read a third time.

Mr. GODDARD: I beg to second that.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Speaker, I have seen that the hon. member has introduced this Bill asking that this property be sold, but I do not know for what purpose it will be sold. Can the hon. member tell me for what purpose it will be sold?

Mr. SPEAKER: Does any other hon. member want to contribute to this discussion before the hon. introducer of the Bill replies? (After a pause.) No other hon. member apparently wishes to contribute to this discussion; therefore the hon. introducer may reply.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I know that the hon. senior member for St. Andrew was not here when I was moving the second reading of this Bill; otherwise he would not have asked that question. If the hon. member had been here, he would have heard that I said that this property was the property of the Church since 1863, and it was the express desire of the Public Assistance Committee as recommended by the Bridgetown City Council that this property be acquired so as to extend the Department dealing with scavenging, street cleaning and so on. I know that the hon. member will realise how cramped the area is and with the extension of the Municipality we had to acquire more space. This is a matter of acquiring better accommodation; that is the sole reason for this Bill. I may say that we have already had permission from the Cabinet to acquire this property and we have been allowed to borrow money for the purpose of purchasing the property.

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

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

Mr. GODDARD: I beg to second that.

The question that this Bill do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.
3.20 p.m.

RESOLUTION re FARM WORKERS TO THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Peter: to move the passing of a Resolution re Farm Labour Programme in the United States of America.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I do not regard this Resolution as a controversial matter. It has been raised by me to draw to the attention of the Government here something that the Trade Unions in the area have agreed should be done in the respective territories in which farm labour is recruited for the United States of America. That is to say, in Jamaica where Mr. Michael Manley is a member of the Legislature, in Trinidad where Mr. John Rojas is a member of the Legislature and here where I am a member, it was felt that with the workers being recruited to the United States of America, the Trade Union representatives in this area should voice their opinions and let it be known how they feel about this programme, notwithstanding the Report that was made to the Government of Barbados when I was a member of a Mission which visited the United States of America in January, 1962. It was felt that the number of people returning to Barbados and other parts in October and November last year should be investigated. An amount of 109 people left Barbados, and though not necessarily the same persons, 109 people have returned in a matter of days. Some of these complaints have been made in the territories, and it has been considered that there is not much opportunity for investigating these matters to

ascertain from some of the men who returned what were the reasons that caused large numbers of them to return to Barbados.

We feel, Mr. Speaker, that matters such as these should not be left to the glib speech of people who read the newspapers and who do not investigate these matters, and then the currency of their language and even the currency of the newspaper language would make people believe that they are speaking on a factual basis when they do not know anything of the background. We consider that it would be appropriate not only for the Barbados Government which has carried out an investigation, but that all the participating Governments should conduct an investigation into this matter to find out — using the Report of the Barbados Mission as a basis — what really caused so many people to return in October and November. It is true we are far from that date and I cannot speak with any authority as to whether these things have been rectified. For example, there was a meeting of the Regional West Indian Labour Board in Jamaica at the beginning of this year, and I do not know if that matter was on the Agenda of the Conference.

In this Resolution, Mr. Speaker, you will note that I have indicated that it is my desire that a representative of the Trade Union bodies in the area should be put on the Regional Labour Board, because we feel that as this is labour which you are taking from the area, though it is true that workers are unorganised and the Trade Unions are not sending them, if a representative from the Caribbean Congress of Labour is put on that Board, it would help to alleviate some of the fears that exist. I have asked for that because I think that if a representative body is set up and if the Trade Unions have representatives there to meet the American employers, it would help to put this thing in the right perspective. I raise this, Sir, and I do not need a long debate because there is nothing in which the Barbados Government in itself is involved, but the Barbados Government is involved with other Governments and other workers concerned, and we would like to have this programme run on a basis that it is not open to too much criticism from people who are not aware of all the facts.

This Resolution as it stands is a simple Resolution. It simply requests the Government to investigate these matters and draw these things to the attention of the Regional Labour Board. I have some indication from the Minister concerned that he would not be in a position today to give a full reply to this Resolution, and I have been informed that the Minister would be prepared to answer this debate at a subsequent meeting. When this Resolution is seconded, I am going to ask leave that further consideration of the debate be postponed in order that the Minister would be in a position to give a full reply to the matter.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, the calmness and mild manner in which the hon. member.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the Hon. Leader of the Opposition seconding the motion?

Mr. MOTTLEY: My preamble should indicate that.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid it does not.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I am seconding the passing of the Resolution; and in doing so, I should like to say that the mildness and calm manner in which the hon. member approached this matter has caused me to rise to second his motion. I say the calmness for this reason: he is absolutely correct in saying that we should not like people using unnecessary and unfounded criticism without having some facts to go on, because it may be a hindrance to our carrying out our programme and getting emigrants to the United States where we really need to send some of our people for the purpose of getting work. That is why I feel myself that the whole idea of an investigation into this matter would do well, because those of us who have been reading have noticed that of the number which went from Jamaica and other places, a very small percentage of those

people returned. Speaking of weather and living conditions, we have similar problems in our areas and territories, and work under similar conditions, and therefore it is but right that we should like to know why so many people have returned.

3.30 p.m.

In fact, in that investigation, whatever the Hon. Minister or the members of the Government have done, we should like to make it clear that we do not want to have an investigation which is one-sided and not in the other case.

I, myself, like other hon. members of this Chamber, became very interested as to why this thing was happening, and I made certain investigations: and what I have discovered on the local scene — and I believe other hon. members have discovered too — is this. Immediately after this Government came into power, the Government selected the Hon. Minister of Trade and the Trade Union leader — the hon. senior member for St. Peter — to go to the United States to see conditions at first hand with respect to this matter. It would do well still for representatives of labour — such as he mentioned, the Congress of Labour — to be on this Board. With that I heartily agree. You often hear people who go up to do this agricultural and manual work saying that someone should be there to represent their interest. However, the reason why I rose and said that I do not want this to be a one-sided investigation is because I have been told in some respects that those persons whom they send from the United States here to select emigrants for United States for work have been misjudging the thing altogether, because of not knowing the circumstances and the true state of affairs from this point of view. They forget that the 18 to 22-year-old youngsters are born in the machine age; therefore, those youngsters look for a different type of work than this hard agricultural and manual work, and so they are not so willing to do this hard work. Cutting canes is a very hard job. Everybody knows that except those who were born in a cane-spinning chair. The mistake which a lot of people make is that they think the man of 40 years has finished working. That is absolute nonsense. I take a man at 40 years and put him against any 20-year-old man to do manual work and he will do it better than that youngster.

I offer that as a criticism. I know of workers, 38 years of age and 40 years of age who can throw down more work than young men. I have seen able-bodied men at 40 years who are able to do more work than some of those ne'er-dowells. When those workers return, it gives Barbados a bad name.

I am not going to say why they are coming back, but I have had the opportunity to discuss with some of them the matter. I asked one or two of them: "Why have you come back when Government has gone out of its way to do every possible thing to help you?" I have had to work in America and I told them: "You know when you go to America, you have to work; they are not going to let you draw money for nothing." Some of them started to tell me something about food. I told them: "You cannot go up to America and get beef stew and rice or fried pork." I asked them what is the trouble about the food. One fellow told me that on mornings they got two sausages, some bacon and a cup of coffee and two slices of bread and after they go outside they get some milk. I said to them that is a diet which is not to blow you out; it is nutritious. They are accustomed to eat a lot of peas and rice: but when you go outside you will find that you have to eat a different diet.

I say if that is one of the reasons which they are giving, I will tell this Government not to let that type of fellow go to the U.S.A. or outside at all. I repeat; whatever investigation you make, make it clear to those gentlemen who come down here to select emigrants that the limit of the age should be over the limit which they are selecting now. I think that they select men between the ages of 22 years and 32 years, but if you are 40 years old they do not take you. That is nonsense. If you want to see Barbadians who can put up work, look for men between 36 years and 40 years. But if you have people being selected who have never done a good day's work and who, when they go and see the lot of

canes, think that the canes are going to fall, that is not going to work.

Sir, I second the motion for this investigation and, as an hon. member has said, the Hon. Minister has promised to give a reply. In the meantime, there is one thing I want to repeat. I deprecate that men who are willing to go and work are being cheated out of the opportunity by somebody selecting their friends. I see a lot of that stupidity going on. I see every day men who are really willing to work and who want to go to the U.S.A. to do this kind of work and you get some people making a selection of their friends — people who do not really want work. This is giving Barbados a bad name.

Here it is, I saw the report that a lot of Barbadians were coming back and the Jamaicans were sticking it. I understand that the temper of these people is one that they can really get hot and get excited over nothing, but they are sticking it and you find so many of the calm Barbadians returning. In the meantime, until an investigation is carried out, I would like the Ministry of Labour to point out to those authorities who come here to select men that the best men whom they can select are the men who have families and not the man who has just left school.

Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure in seconding the motion and I hope the investigation will be carried out.

Mr. CORBIN: Sir, speaking on the motion for the postponement, I must say that I have sat and listened to much of what has been said on this Resolution. I have received and still am receiving letters from the U.S.A. as regards farm workers who have been sent from Barbados to work, and it is a fact that when we send Barbadians to the U.S.A. as farm workers, they know what is their duty, their pay and all that they should get. A certain amount of money is laid out for this work and they look for that facility to be given them from that amount of money: but it seems to me that they do not get these facilities. I have questioned certain workers and they have told me that they have certain contractors and they do not give them the necessary meals to satisfy their desire. That is the problem facing us. I understand from one of the workers that when the hon. senior member for St. Peter visited the U.S.A. and he made application to visit one of these camps, he visited a camp and on that occasion there were never so many baked chickens which the workers ever saw at that camp before, and after he returned they never got baked chicken or even baked fowls. I do not know if it was because he had not visited them unofficially.

3.40 p.m.

I say that if we are providing a Liaison Officer, he should be a man who is in contact with the Union — one who knows the sufferings and the difficulties of these poor labourers whom we send out — and he would have been able to give a better report. It seems to me that the Liaison Officer or Officers seek after their own aggrandizement and filthy lucre, and that will prevent them from performing their duties towards the poor people whom we send up there. Mr. Speaker, in sending immigrants to the United Kingdom, I am sorry that we did not have the door open for men and women and we would also send out Liaison Officers, both men and women. When people are selected to go to the United States of America they are tested here and then they do not meet with the conditions for which they have signed. A Barbadian would curse his mother, far less me or you, if you did not give him proper food to eat. After he has given a proper day's work he expects to get a proper meal; otherwise he will get a bad impression. If he wants potatoes, then he should have potatoes; if he wants meat he should have meat. If he wants corned beef, crushed yam or cauliflower he should have it because we are paying for it. The contractor gives whatever he likes and we believe that these poor people are getting the best to eat and drink and they do not work. I am saying, Sir, that these men are not receiving the facilities for which they have signed. I know that they are glad to work; it is true that there are certain men who do not like to work, but that is not the type of persons of whom we are speaking. Do you want to tell me that an agricultural labourer would leave here and go to the

United States of America just to kill time? Mr. Speaker, he would have his family over here and he has his debts to meet so that he would have to work; but the position is that when he signs here for certain conditions, when he gets to the United States of America he does not meet those conditions. The American employers are looking for an adequate day's work and the Barbadian worker is looking for adequate facilities and respect. Where we are getting all of this trouble is in relation to the Liaison Officers whom we are sending out to the United States of America and they are not doing their duties; they are receiving filthy lucre. I hope that this Government which is in power will do the best it can in order to provide in future proper Liaison Officers, both men and women, who will take care of these people so that they will get adequate food, lodging and wages, that they will be given the service for which they have signed and this Government will be quite satisfied about it.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, at this stage, I beg to move that the further consideration of this Resolution be postponed.

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

The question that the further consideration of this Resolution be postponed was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

RESOLUTION re REDUCTION OF CONSUMPTION DUTY ON BEER

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day is to resume debate on a Resolution re the Hon. Premier's Statement laid on the 27th November, 1962, re the reduction of the consumption duty on beer. When the House last dealt with this Resolution, the Hon. Premier had just completed his address. Is there any other hon. member who is disposed to speak on this Resolution?

Mr. SEALEY: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the motion which has been made by the hon. senior member for the City of Bridgetown. This motion is taken into account as it is worded; the motion which has been made by the hon. member shows the wisdom of the Government in moving so quickly in order to reduce the consumption tax on beer in November, 1962. Mr. Speaker, the object of taxation is to raise or to bring in money, much needed revenue, but if an item on which a tax has been imposed has suffered a defeat in sales, then undoubtedly the object of the tax has failed to be achieved. I feel that it would take a lot of courage on behalf of the present Government to reduce the tax on beer almost within six months of having introduced it and I think that the present Government should be commended for that. I feel that a reasonable case can be made out by the present Government for reducing the tax on two other commodities; I refer principally to rum and chicken parts. There is nobody who could say that there should not be any increase on rum at all, but the increase on rum is definitely too heavy. As rum is the most popular drink in the island of Barbados, the heavy increase does not only create a hardship on the man or on people in the lower brackets but it also creates a hardship on those in the higher brackets. I feel that four cents on a mere snap of rum is definitely too heavy. There are many avenues in which I feel that the Government should spread out this tax and bring money into the Treasury. For instance, you will go around throughout the length and breadth of Barbados and you will discover that the village shops lack sales on Saturday nights; those shops are practically empty.

3. 50 p.m.

These people are not in the big clubs or in the smaller clubs, and I think it is time enough that the Government should relieve the poor man on his most popular drink, which is rum. I have no intention whatsoever of creating any hardship on the hard-working men, but let us say, for argument's sake, that the average man drinks about four snaps a day which is about 16 cents more. From the time I knew myself, Mr. Speaker, a bicycle licence used to be 64 cents and in those days we did not have good roads. I am making this point to show the different avenues in which the tax

could be spread over and the four cents on the poor man's drink taken off. I cannot see why a bicycle licence which is supposed to be an annual tax could not be doubled. Another thing, Sir; there are strangers who come to the Island of Barbados for the first time or the second time and they can arrive at the Airport and produce a driver's licence and receive a licence free of cost to travel all over the Island of Barbados without paying one cent. I feel they can pay \$5.00 for a licence as is done in Trinidad and other places.

I remember, Mr. Speaker, from the year 1942 when I first started to inspect motor vehicles for the Police Department, the price went to five shillings per vehicle and eventually rose to 10/- for inspection. There are over 25,000 bicycles in the Island of Barbados, and there are over 20,000 drivers' licences in the Island, and I feel that the tax on rum and chicken parts can be reduced by raising a driver's licence from 5/- to \$2.40. As staggering as the new Trinidad tax proposals are, Mr. Speaker, you will notice that they have left their foodstuffs untouched, and I am asking Government to move now and reduce the tax on rum and chicken parts. I therefore associate myself with the remarks of the hon. senior member for Bridgetown on this Resolution.

Mr. COWARD: Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure in supporting this Resolution moved by the hon. senior member for Bridgetown, while I compliment the Hon. Premier on his pronouncement *re* the reduction on beer.

Since this Resolution was tabled, Sir, I have been told that there has been a reduction in the price of chicken parts, and I am sure that the hearts of every Barbadian both rich and poor alike would be made glad to know that a reduction is made in the price of rum. I can assure you, Sir, that since the reduction in the price of beer, Banks beer has risen considerably in sales, and I must say that what matters is the amount of sales. I know that this is a Socialist Government, and I feel that each and every member in this Assembly should be interested in the people of this colony, and I would suggest to the Hon. Premier that whenever and wherever he finds it possible to make a pronouncement in this House with a view to lowering the price of commodities, he may do so.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Speaker, speaking on the present item which reads "To resume debate on a Resolution *re* the Hon. Premier's Statement laid on 27th November, 1962, *re* the reduction of the consumption duty on beer," I think it is a rather unusual method of printing an Order. As a matter of fact, Sir, we know that this is not the ordinary manner of presenting a Bill and I find fault with that. It looks as though it is becoming a gradual deterioration in the way matters are presented to the House. This is a new method of presenting matter to this Honourable Chamber, and if hon. members are satisfied with it, I am not. I am bringing this most forcibly to your attention at the beginning, Sir. This is not the way in which a matter should be presented to the House, and it evolves on Your Honour's shoulder in the discharge or your trust in Parliament to see that this thing does not recur. It just is not good enough. It seems to me as if some short cuts are devised, and at some other occasion I am going to speak with more momentum on this. If I had left Barbados and had returned and was served with an Order Paper which read "To resume debate *re*" something, I would not know what was being conveyed, Sir, this is a serious matter. I am not going to elevate it to the question of raising a motion of privilege, but if it continues, I will do so.

4.00 p.m.

I pass on now. As I have said, Sir, the motion is in the name of the hon. senior member for the City of Bridgetown. Apparently, he tabled the Resolution before this Chamber. Undoubtedly, since I have not left Barbados during the time, I must have had somewhere in my possession a copy of this Resolution but I am sorry that I do not have a copy right now. If I tax my memory —

Mr. SPEAKER: Would the hon. member like me to read the Resolution which stands in the name of the Hon. senior member for the City of Bridgetown?

Mr. HUSBANDS: Thank you, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: "BE IT RESOLVED that this House view with approval the decision of the Government as contained in the Statement of the Hon. Premier laid in this Honourable House on 27th November, 1962 to reduce the consumption duty on beer,

AND BE IT RESOLVED that this House urge the Government to consider the immediate removal of the increased duty on other essential commodities, especially rum and chicken parts."

Mr. HUSBANDS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The hon. senior member for the City of Bridgetown views with approval the statement made by the Hon. Premier in connection with the reduction of the consumption duty on beer. We all do. The whole Island does. But I am afraid, Sir, that the Resolution does not go far enough. If a Premier or Financial Minister within a few months decides that he is going to reduce a tax which is imposed not very long ago, it is obvious that such action would meet with general approval.

Now, I think this Resolution is extremely mild. I am not going to make the sort of speech which would be expected if we were now considering the Draft Estimates or the imposition of any particular tax on any particular item or items. I just want to say that it is rather unique in the history of Government budgeting that within the short space of a few months the Hon. Premier has had to see to it that he reduced his taxation because obviously when you impose taxation, you expect to collect revenue, and if that taxation is burdensome, then the commodity to which it is related becomes not very saleable; well then, there is no revenue coming in and that is what you were hoping for.

This is not any occasion for using the word "approval" or "commendation." The Hon. Premier was in his seat when hon. members — not members of his Party — voiced their disapproval over this taxation and he heard what was said. The Hon. Premier does not live with his head deep down in the sand. He, too, overhears and despite what he overheard and heard from us, he acted as he did. He did something which is unique in the history of Government; that is, to reduce a tax within a year. There is nobody here around this horseshoe who knows of any such thing ever done before.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Sir, I rise on a point of order. It appears that the hon. member who has just sat down is not often in the House when statements or matters of importance are laid. I have now spoken about five times on this matter and the whole business of a consumption tax. Of course, hon. members are free to make criticisms.

It is quite true that Barbados never had a Minister of Finance before; therefore, the former Speaker though having extensive knowledge of conducting the affairs of the House is rather limited so far as a Ministerial Government is concerned. The Minister of Finance in Trinidad last month removed a tax within 48 hours of putting it on; so when the hon. members says that this is unique in parliamentary government, obviously, the hon. member cannot mean in a place like the House of Commons where a tax is removed in two months, far less six months. The newspaper took up this battlecry and gave out to the public of Barbados that this Government does not know what it is doing when they themselves have brought about this reversal of policy.

Mr. HUSBANDS: The Hon. Premier has said that in the neighbouring colony of Trinidad about two weeks ago — (Hon. E. W. BARROW: I said last month.) This is the 5th of this month. Last month can be just a week ago. Let us say three weeks ago. The Hon. Premier said that the Finance Minister of Trinidad withdrew the tax which he had imposed a short time ago, whether it be three weeks, four weeks, six weeks or even eight weeks ago. To us in Barbados in that case, the Hon. Premier's action was strictly new before it took precedence to that in Trinidad by the Finance Minister of Trinidad. As far as what takes place in the House of Commons, the Hon. Premier has generalised, I

still maintain despite his interruption on a point of order that his action was unique. I will give him the benefit of the doubt.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I rise on a point of order. When the hon. member says that he will give me the benefit of the doubt, I always credited him with the three R's, — reading, writing and arithmetic. I never accused him of being innocent on this point. I take it that he reads the newspapers and the Parliamentary Hansard. I made a qualitative statement.

4.10 p.m.

Any individual who is also innocent of reading, writing and arithmetic knows that that is true. It is not a question of the benefit of the doubt; the benefit of the doubt is where you carry away something from somebody's bureau drawer and you say that you did not carry it away.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Speaker, I spoke not in respect of the fact or denial as to whether or not the Hon. Minister had done something which he had done, but in respect of time. I will give him the benefit of the doubt again. I see that he is not rising. I am saying that his action, if it is not unique, is perilously near to being unique. This motion has been extended to include that similar duties imposed on chicken parts will increase but they may also be reduced. Mr. Speaker, whenever you impose a tax it does not matter who you are, when you have credit for reading, writing and whatever else the hon. member has said, not even including thinking now — when an Hon. Minister of Finance imposes a tax, the least he hopes is that the item on which he imposes that tax will continue to be very saleable and that the Government will have revenue coming in to it as a result of sale of that item. When the Hon. Minister discovers very quickly that these items are not so saleable, he knows that there is no taxation coming in and he therefore withdraws the tax. That is commonsense. I would praise not only the Hon. Premier for exerting a modicum of commonsense, but anybody else. We do not have to use grandiose phrases in relation to commonsense.

Mr. Speaker, I say that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition has been very tame in his motion. The hon. member knows that what I am saying is true and he appreciates it. This is no undue criticism of this Resolution; however, I am saying this; the public is watching. I am not one of those people who believe that rum is a food, but I am one of those people who pay some respect to the habits and customs of the community. The workingclass man in Barbados has been, for a long time, drinking the wine of this country which is known as rum. I can give many illustrations. I have had several man-to-man talks with sellers of rum, and I know that their sales have gone down. I know too, that the tax that was expected, the amount of revenue that was expected, is going to fall very short of the mark. When you have a country with services to maintain out of revenue and revenue is lost on particular items, the Premier, the Minister of Finance, is going to have many a headache in trying to find ways and means to have that amount of revenue replaced in the Treasury. Let him get up on a point of order; I see that he has not got up on a point of order. This is not any nonsense; this is more than reading, writing and listening to. I see that the hon. member is smiling; of course he is human and sometimes he has to be human even in this House.

Mr. Speaker, I will not speak on the other items at all because, as everybody knows, it is simply a matter of time. I do not know if the Hon. Leader of the Opposition has just puffed out this Resolution with these additions for the sake of better form; but, in reality, he knows, and the Hon. Premier knows, that it is just a matter of time and the tax on these other items will have to be reduced. We advocate things which are just measures of expediency because we must always have an eye on the Electorate. You cannot risk too much. The outsiders are not in this popular Chamber and some day when we become elevated to higher spheres where we can live and delve into political philosophy, we too will criticise our lesser brethren in this Chamber. The time for that, however, has not yet arrived. I want to deplore anybody who is trying to get it into the Premier's head

that he deserves any wonderful encomium on this measure. He has just shown that he is a human being who is facing facts. Probably in some other realm the Premier will show to us that he deserves real commendation, but not in respect of this matter. As I said, I am glad, as John Citizen of Barbados is glad, for this measure because this Banks Breweries business looks to me — well, this is a commercial company; but the ordinary shopkeeper in Barbados, the man in business with a small amount of capital, has for the first time been drawn into a big share-holding company, and if anything very untoward does happen to that company it will so shock the ordinary business man of Barbados, the man with the small amount of capital, that it will deter him and others like him from venturing again into any share-holding Company.

4.20 p.m.

I think very much and very strongly about that. I was very glad when I heard the Premier in making his remarks say how much he had done for Banks Breweries, whatever that meant. I was glad to see that the Premier had in mind how the ruin of Banks would affect the small shopkeeper who for the first time had put his small amount of money into the formation of a big company. There again I am not showering any extraordinary amount of praise for that. I am not going to say anything at all about the reduction of tax on chicken parts and rum because I know that is bound to come if commonsense prevails. I do not have to canvass for that; it is automatic. Politicians have to see to that, and those on the Ministerial benches have even greater responsibility; and so, Sir, if there is one thing I wanted to point out and I have succeeded in pointing out, it is just a matter of hard, Barbadian commonsense that produced the Premier's Statement, and for that I still feel he has his head in the right place. There is nothing more to be said about that, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: It does not appear that any other hon. member who has not yet spoken desires to contribute to this debate.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, the fact that several hon. members of this House have joined this debate is an indication of the importance which fiscal matters should have in a Legislative Chamber; but I am afraid that listening to some of the speeches, at any rate, one gets the impression that hon. members do not quite grasp with any firmness the things that motivate Ministers of Finance in matters of this sort. The hon. member who has just sat down referred to the reduction of tax and the Premier's action with respect to it as being unique, and the very use of that word on his part betrays, I think, a slight unawareness of the things involved. Some hon. members, Mr. Speaker, appear to think that taxes are imposed or taken off, as the case may be, on the whims and caprices of individual Ministers of Finance as if, for instance, the Minister of Finance were to survey the whole range of taxable commodities in the territory and just by accident, as his fancy takes him, decides where or when he will levy a tax. Now that idea may be true in some imaginary country, but it could not possibly hold good here. It is not by whims or caprices that budgetary considerations are entered upon, but by hard calculation, by earnest and far-reaching attention to the whole economy of the territory and by careful examination of the *pros* and *cons*; so to assume, Mr. Speaker, that there has been something unique in what has been done is to miss the point and to ignore the whole range of contemporary and recent practice.

HOUSE COMMENCES GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER: It now being 4.30 o'clock, the time for Private Members' Business is completed, and the first item under Government Business is in the name of the Hon. Leader of the House: to move the House into Committee of Supply to consider the grant of sums of money for the service of the colony.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, before the House goes into Committee of Supply, I find it my duty to ask your permission to raise two matters of privilege, and I think one of them has already been drawn to Your Honour's attention arising out of the publication of the *Gazette*.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid it has not been, and I am sorry if the Hon. Premier was misinformed.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I can assure Your Honour that it is a matter of immediate and urgent privilege of this House arising out of the publication of proceedings in this House which did not take place.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the hon. member proceed.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On the first matter of privilege, I should say in prefacing my statement that I fully realise that under a Cabinet system of Government, Ministers have full responsibility for the running of Government Departments, but it is very difficult to break Civil Servants well indoctrinated in the tenets of colonialism to make them understand that it is a Ministerial system of Government and that directions should come from Ministers and Ministers alone. This is not really a criticism of any branch of the Civil Service for doing things which they should not do. This is a matter which really goes much further than that, and would be a cause of indictment against even the Ministers themselves if they were part of this conduct. Therefore, although I am quite prepared to defend any member of the Service in so far as carrying out his normal duties and to make sure that he is not the target of unjustified criticism, when attempts are made to subvert the proceedings of the Legislature and to go into matters which are directly contrary to Government policy and to go so far as to fabricate Resolutions, I think that it is a matter which calls for very, very close investigation and scrutiny. 4.30 p.m.

In the *Official Gazette* of 31st January, 1963, on page 106, there is printed there, with the signature of Your Honour attached, a Resolution alleged to have been passed by this House on 22nd January and then immediately thereunder there is the statement "Concurred in by the Legislative Council the 29th day of January, 1963." And, there is the further fabrication in this alleged Resolution that His Excellency the Governor assented to it on the 30th January, 1963.

I, myself, have no personal recollection of this Resolution passed by this House and I made a very careful check. The Resolution is still on the Order Paper.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Will the Hon. Premier say what page is he reading from?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Page 106 of the *Official Gazette* on the 31st January, 1963. As I was saying, the Resolution is still on the Order Paper. It has not been discussed by this Chamber, by the Other Place nor has it been assented to by His Excellency the Governor.

I do not want to make any predictions as to whether this was deliberately done; but when I discovered there was such a Resolution on the Order Paper, I asked the Hon. Leader of the House not to proceed with this Resolution as I could not myself in my conscience come to this House and ask the House to approve of this Resolution for the lease of any land to the Savannah Club. I feel that public property should be used for all people regardless of colour, class, race or creed.

This Resolution came down to the House unknown to me. We do have collective responsibility, but three members of the Cabinet were absent when this thing was inadvertently allowed to come down to the House.

Having discovered that it had come down, no further steps were taken; but what I think is perhaps most unfortunate is that three signatures are attached to this Resolution and the subscription of your Honour's signature means that this House has agreed to the disposal of this matter. That is a very serious state of affairs and there is no one who can convince and satisfy me that this was not deliberately done. I apologise to Your Honour that such a thing should have occurred.

The other thing which I want to bring to the attention of the Chamber is a matter which has caused me much

concern. I was dumbfounded to read that a Private Member's Bill with regard to peaceful picketing was being discussed by local authorities.

I have made investigations because this matter to the best of my recollection was sent to Select Committee and, as I understand the constitutional position, when a matter is sent to Select Committee it is virtually *sub judice*. A Select Committee has full power and authority to summon witnesses, especially since we have passed the Immunities Bill, to invite opinion or evidence from any member of the public inside or outside of the Island and to investigate all aspects of Private Members' Business. It is not within the competence of any member of the public at that stage, unless they are making an intelligent survey on that Bill, but it is certainly not within the competence of any member in the Government Service to send around and circulate different bodies at that stage on a Private Member's Bill either soliciting support for or against the measure.

I would almost say that I was horrified when I discovered what was done in this case without any authority except the time-worn colonial authority with which some members of the public have been indoctrinated, and I will not continue to discharge my duties to this House and to the public of this country if we are going to have this kind of procedure carried out, when people do not realise that this House has a certain amount of dignity to maintain and uphold, and if we are going to have people acting along other than well defined channels of colonial practice and doing things which are an insult to that dignity which this House and every member tries to maintain.

The traditions and the customs and the prerogatives and privileges of this House must be observed and no member of the Government Service is above this House. Although I am a Minister of Government, I have no control over the appointments or dismissals of Civil Servants except in certain cases like in a case of a Permanent Secretary being appointed, where as a matter of courtesy I will be consulted. We have to draw a line in protecting Civil Servants, and we are still fighting a battle in this country to try and educate the people of this island as to the meaning of responsible and representative Government. However, I am not going to sit as a Minister or even a member of the Opposition and allow this kind of thing to go on, and I therefore invite Your Honour to use your powers under the Immunities Bill to have both of these matters investigated.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I would like to explain to the Hon. Premier that I think the second part of what he spoke was some misprint about the Trade Union Bill owing to what I saw in the newspaper. What I know of it is that the Government sent out a revised Bill.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The Government has sent out nothing. I want to make a clear defined line between the administration and the executive. That is what appeared in the *Official Gazette*.

Mr. WALCOTT: I am not speaking about the first matter; I am speaking about the Trade Union Bill. What I would like to explain to the House is that my organisation was sent a copy of a draft Bill from the Ministry of Trade, Industry and Labour inviting our comments on the proposed Bill to be introduced and within that proposed Bill there is a Clause dealing with peaceful picketing.

I would say this to the Hon. Premier. I have not participated in any discussion on the matter dealing with the Select Committee, but I have participated in a discussion on the proposed Bill when the Government was asking for comments. I have participated in this discussion; but I think what I saw in the newspaper, that is to say, that people were discussing the Bill sent to Select Committee was an error because in truth and in fact, there has been no discussion which I have taken part in on the Bill sent to the Select Committee. I discussed a draft Bill in which the Government asked comments from the Trade Union organisation. I, therefore, think it is an error by the newspaper in not being able to differentiate between the Bill sent to the Select Committee and the draft Bill sent out by the Government. 4.40 p.m.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am glad to hear that it is the Press which is responsible for this, because I could never sit down here and condone a situation in which a Bill is before a Select Committee and people's comments are invited on this particular measure, and this situation arises.

Mr. SPEAKER: I may say in respect of the Bill intituled an Act to determine and regulate the powers, privileges and immunities of both Chambers of the Legislature, and of the members thereof; to regulate the conduct of members and other persons in connection with the proceedings thereof, to give protection to persons employed in the publication of the reports and other papers of the Legislature; to regulate admittance to the precincts of the Legislature; and for purposes incidental to the matters aforesaid; that that Bill has been returned to this Chamber by the Other Place with certain amendments.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Speaker, I caught your ear some-time ago, but not your eye.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is exactly what has happened.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Premier has really brought to the attention of this House two matters both of which we have to regard very, very seriously. It is rather heartening that my colleague, the hon. senior member for St. Peter, has shed a considerable amount of light on the second matter of privilege and, of course, nothing more may have to be done about that. However, as regards the first matter about which the hon. member spoke, that is a horse of another colour. The Hon. Premier has got up in here, and I believe him to be a very responsible man apart from the fact that he is Premier of this country, and he has quoted a date, 31st January, 1963, and he has told us that we can find in the *Official Gazette* of that date on page 106 the publication of matters affecting this honourable Chamber, things which never happened at all. The Hon. Premier is again like the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, and in a mild manner he has suggested that you should invoke all the powers relative to the privileges and immunities of this House, which have not yet been defined, and it is just in time that Your Honour has told us about the return of a Bill relative to the immunities and privileges of this House, which has just been returned to this Chamber. Mr. Speaker, that has happened at a very appropriate time. I can speak on a matter of privilege and combine two very important matters. Earlier in the day, before I spoke on a certain measure, I pointed out to you that I think that certain things were deteriorating in this House. That was referring to an item, to the manner in which it was printed on today's Order Paper. We have now come to a matter which is very serious. This is no laughing matter; I am a bit surprised that I do not see much enthusiasm being expressed on the faces of hon. members who have listened to the words of the Hon. Premier. Imagine that hon. members are hearing today that, under the guise of the House of Assembly, in the *Official Gazette* dated 31st January of this year, something is purported to have been done that was never done, and imagine that the signature of Your Honour, the Speaker of this House, is supposed to be affixed to such a matter! We do not have to take action with His Excellency the Governor — I suppose that he will be able to defend himself — nor as far as the President of the Other Place is concerned; but as far as we are concerned anything can happen if nothing is done about this matter. Mr. Speaker, hon. members can make fun and I can sing a "swan song". (Mr. MOTTLEY: No, you are not.) Mr. Speaker, this is just the beginning of things; this is the wedge with the blunt edge.

I do not believe that hon. members — and I include myself — have yet read that issue of these debates. I have to go home tonight and see if I can find a copy. If I do not find a copy of these debates, I will have to get in contact with the Acting Clerk of this House or some other Officer of this House and read those debates for myself. Sir, I came here today with the intention of raising a question on a matter of privilege but I am deferring it for one week and there is going to be another storm in here. I promise His Honour the Speaker to get ready for next Tuesday, God willing. The Hon. Premier has used the word "dumbfounded" but I cannot find a word which is strong enough to use. The word

"surprised" is not strong enough; as I say, Sir, I cannot find a word in my English which would describe what the hon. member has given us notice about. I know the procedure. Hon. members spoke about debates; the Clerk and his assistant take the Minutes, the Reporters take down the debates and, as far as I remember, the Clerk or some other official of this House sees to their being edited, and when the editing is done he sends these debates to the Government Printer and they are still the property of the House of Assembly; but how can debates on Resolutions, decisions and signatures be affixed to those Resolutions from the office of the Government Printery at Bay Street? How can that be done? Something is wrong. These things, Mr. Speaker, are directly under your attention and your responsibility is all important. I do not think, Sir, that any enquiry on the level that we know enquiries go, should proceed in this matter; this is a matter for the House to proceed upon, bearing in mind that His Honour the Speaker, as an elected member of this House and then elected by his colleagues to office, has responsibility to this House. That is the position. 4.50 p.m.

We are able to call on you, Sir, to say how these faked documents — because that is what they are — found their way to the Government Printery with your signature as Speaker of the House, and we have got to see to it that there be some tightness presumably placed upon the actions of the officers of this House, if what the hon. member gave us notice of is true. I do not doubt it is true, because the hon. member has quoted an issue of the *Official Gazette*. I have not had the faintest doubt of the words of the Hon. Premier; but Mr. Speaker, I have been hearing rumours quite recently about matters affecting the officers of this House, and I know that we hon. members are going to hear much more in the near future. There must be a proper way for doing things.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is quite right. I now have a copy of the *Gazette* in my hand, and on page 106 you can see "Res. No. 3/1963" and in the right-hand corner "13/2/7/T.2". All that is there and then this, and I read:

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Resolved that the House of Assembly approve the grant by the Executive Committee of a tenancy from year to year to the Savannah Club of a parcel of land situate at the Garrison in the parish of Saint Michael, described in the Schedule hereto, and that the Legislative Council be invited to concur herein and, if concurred in,

Resolved that His Excellency the Governor be asked to assent and take the necessary steps to give effect to this Resolution.
22nd January, 1963.

J. E. THEODORE BRANCKER
Speaker.

Concurred in by the Legislative Council the 29th day of January, 1963.

H. G. MASSIAH
President.

I assent
J. M. STOW
Governor.
30th January, 1963.

And then the Schedule follows. This, Sir, is the *Official Gazette*. It makes me remember years ago when I was a school teacher that something appeared in the *Official Gazette*, and when I asked the then representative of St. Peter about it, he said it was unofficial. I hope the *Official Gazette* is not going back to what it used to be, being official sometimes and being unofficial at other times. We are back in this position, and I know other hon. members feel just as I feel. I was waiting to get the cue, and now that I have, I think I have said enough and will sit.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I think I should deal with the second part of the hon. member's point of privilege, and I would like to say that as far as I know a letter was re-

ceived from the administration dealing with the Trade Union Bill as explained by the hon. senior member for St. Peter in which it was stated that the Government was about to have the Act amended to include domestics, agricultural labourers, Civil Servants and Local Government employees, and provide for peaceful picketing at a home, and we were asked to express our views and comments in so far as it affected Local Government, and send a reply back by a given date. I cannot say offhand which Ministry it was, but I know this is the communications which we received in the Local Government Commissioner's Office from the Government Departments, and I believe the hon. senior member for St. James and other members of Local Government in the North and South will agree with me in this respect. We were not therefore in any way usurping any authority or taking upon ourselves anything which any Select Committee was dealing with. We were asked to give our comments, and as a matter of fact, we felt it was very magnanimous of the Government to ask for an expression of opinion which we submitted.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: If I may interrupt the hon. member on a point of order, the point which I was making is that there is a Private Members' Bill to include provision in the Trade Union Act for peaceful picketing where it should be lawful for a person to wait or attend at or near the premises where a person resides or carries on business for the purpose of bringing information, etc. I merely paraphrased the provisions of the Bill. That Bill is before a Select Committee. The newspapers in an article said that this Bill was being discussed by the Local Government authorities.

It is normal Government procedure when we intend to bring down any measure which will affect or is likely to affect different sections of a community to canvass opinion before we bring it here, but not after it has gone to a Select Committee. It is only the Select Committee that is then competent to ask or to invite people to come in. I am not suggesting, Sir, that the Local Government authorities were usurping their function by answering the enquiry. I am merely suggesting if the newspaper report is correct that it is quite improper for anyone to invite opinion outside of the Select Committee itself on a matter of this kind, whether it be a Minister, Your Honour, a member of the general public or a Civil Servant. Since then the hon. senior member for St. Peter has stated that the newspaper report is wrong and that what the circular really invited was opinion on a new measure altogether; but this matter was brought to my attention, and therefore it is my duty whenever any privilege of the House is likely to be infringed to get a full ventilation of the matter. It does not alter my view in any way that it is not competent for anyone outside a Select Committee to canvass support either for or against a measure at this stage, and I do not make any reflection on the Local Government authorities, because that is our standard procedure before we bring a Bill here; but once we bring it and put it before the House, we leave it to the House.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I suppose that settles that matter. The hon. member for St. Peter said I am mild, but I have been mild throughout this entire Session. I do not think, however, there is much to be gained in worrying about the accuracy of newspaper reports, because within recent months or years and since the transformation of the leading paper in the Island, the accuracy of the reports cannot be vouched for in any way at all. Either there is continuous misreporting and misrepresenting people or apparently not reporting some people and things of that sort. Those of us in public life get accustomed to that and never worry about it; but the hon. senior member for St. Peter thought he would have been singing some solo, but he is not.
5.00 p.m.

May I be permitted to say that a question such as this, although not of the magnitude of the one raised by the Hon. Premier, was raised by me privately with the Clerk in respect of having a tremendous lot of things on the Order Paper which we have and we knew nothing about. I am going to make a bold statement now. If he chooses to contradict it, he can do so. When I saw these things and I asked him how this is being done, he said that is a responsibility for

which he knew nothing about. He said that these Bills went straight to the Printery. Some matters coming to the House went straight from the Attorney General's office to the Government Printery and he knew nothing about them. Those which went straight from this House was what he knew about.

As far as this Resolution which appears on page 106 of the *Official Gazette* is concerned, we have got in our hands this Resolution and it is still set down on the Order Paper. What is astonishing about this is to find that His Honour the Speaker signed it on the 29th last month and His Excellency the Governor assented to it the next morning, that is to say on the 30th day of January. That is unique. The Other Place passed it on the 29th also. I am absolutely sure that it was not passed here and it is very unique for Your Honour to have signed it and for His Excellency the Governor to sign it the next morning.

With the situation as it stands today with the present Government, it does not seem likely that the contents of this Resolution for the leasing of land to the Savannah Club is something which this Government is going to agree to. If I were in the position of the Government, I would have taken the same view as they have taken. I would come to the conclusion that this was a deliberate action on the part of somebody. This calls for an immediate investigation. If there is not an immediate investigation into the matter, then I would have no hesitation in saying that the Government behind closed doors wants to give a lease of this land to the Savannah Club on the old terms and conditions, which young people deprecate and object strongly to.

This reminds me very much of an occasion when I was in here and I raised a question of the renting of land to the Empire Theatre. This was land which was owned by the Governor-in-Executive Committee. The agreement was made by the Executive Committee and we only knew about it when the land was rented and when we realised that they could have got a lot more money for the lease of it.

This matter to which the Hon. Premier referred is a serious matter and I hope it is an honest mistake and not somebody trying to sabotage the Government. I am hoping that it is a genuine mistake. This is not a mistake of a newspaper; this must have gone to the Government Printery. Sir, I am going to tell you something which is happening nowadays. Let the Printery deny this. Three or four days before a thing appears, it is set up in type at the Printery and at times they print it. Let the Minister get up and deny that. May be, this is one of those things. May be, it was so decided that the land would have been rented — it was a foregone conclusion — that everything was printed there.

Sir, you who always carry a level head would certainly have looked at this and would certainly have enquired how is it that the Government could have passed this, even though you were out of the House. This is a very serious matter because, as the hon. senior member for St. Peter has said, this is a Resolution approving the grant by the Executive Committee of a tenancy from year to year to the Savannah Club of a parcel of land situate at the Garrison, in the parish of St. Michael, described in the Schedule hereto, and that the Legislative Council be invited to concur herein and, if concurred in, resolved that His Excellency the Governor be asked to assent and take the necessary steps to give effect to this Resolution, 22nd January, 1963. Concurred in by the Legislative Council the 29th day of January, 1963 and assented by His Excellency the Governor on 30th January, 1963.

In the Schedule it is set out: All that certain piece or parcel of land situate at the Garrison Savannah in the parish of Saint Michael in this Island containing by admeasurement 37,820 square feet or thereabouts abutting and bounding on three sides on other lands of the Garrison Savannah and on the public road leading towards the North to Bush Hill and to the South to Highway 7 or however else the same may abut and bound.

Mr. Speaker, let me make this clear. I am not now taking this opportunity to say this: I have said this already.

I believe that every person of every section of this community has an absolute right, whether he be White, Black, Yellow, Blue, Mulatto, to have a club of his own, and to prevent whom they do not want coming into it; but what I am going to stand up for at all times is that anything owned by the Government of Barbados and by the people cannot be entered into by any agreement of this House of Assembly unless you make it abundantly clear that you cannot bar people on account of their colour. Let me say that the Savannah Club does not bar people of a particular colour; they bar white people too.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. You must pay some attention to what is going on. The hon. senior member for the City of Bridgetown is speaking about a particular point of privilege and that deals with something which should not have been printed. I think that is what the hon. member should stick to and not the substance of the Resolution.

Mr. SPEAKER: I was just about to say the same thing to the hon. member.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am saying, Sir, that the hon. senior member for St. Peter is not singing any solo and that Your Honour should appoint some Committee or the Debates Committee to go into this matter and report to this House and to the public. This is not a secret; this is public business, and a matter of this sort should be gone into, and a proper report should be given of how it came about; and if it is proved that it came about by sabotage, then somebody should be dealt with severely. Matters are printed at the Government Printery which this House of Assembly is dealing with today and they are not printed today, but they have been printed three or four days ago. I do not know where this has come from. I am not censuring the Clerk or anybody, but I am saying that Your Honour should appoint a Committee to investigate into this matter and report to this House on how this has happened, how a Resolution like this could appear with your signature, with the signature of the President of the Other Place and with the signature of the Officer administering the Government and made public without any of us knowing.
5.10 p.m.

I agree with the Hon. Premier. This is more than privilege; this is something which borders on sabotage and I feel that you should take very, very strong steps in this matter.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I do not want to prolong this discussion, but there are two courses which are open to us. One is that the Hon. Premier himself is the Premier of a Government with a Cabinet System and it has Ministerial functions; therefore the printing of the *Official Gazette* is not the business of the House. There are two matters which we have to separate; the printing of the *Official Gazette* is the business of the Administration and therefore the Hon. Premier would have to carry out an investigation into the Administration on the basis of how it comes about that in the *Official Gazette* there can be printed a matter from the House of Assembly which did not take place in the House at all. The *Official Gazette* is printed by the Administration and not by the House of Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, where we take exception is on the basis of how can something be printed in the *Official Gazette* or in any other organ whatsoever, something which has not been debated in this House? That is a point of privilege in respect of which all hon. members would have to be protected. I feel that, as far as this House is concerned, there does not have to be any investigation taking place, not in this House. As to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition and the Hon. Premier, I differ with both of them in that there cannot be any investigation where a matter has been on the Order Paper and has been printed. I would like you, Mr. Speaker, not to go on that wide and open statement that the Debates Committee can carry out an investigation into the printing of the *Official Gazette*. I repeat that the printing of the debates is a matter for the Debates Committee. The printing of the debates is done in the *Official Gazette* so that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition is not aware that the de-

bates — I may say that the position of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition is a responsible one and he made a statement to which we cannot pay credence. The Debates Committee is nothing to do with the printing of the *Official Gazette*; that is not the business of that Committee; it is the business of the Premier and the Administration. The printing of the *Official Gazette* is nothing to do with the House of Assembly and the Hon. Leader of the Opposition must understand that. There need not be any investigation by the Debates Committee because the matter is on the Order Paper. The *Official Gazette* is nothing to do with the House of Assembly, it is for the Hon. Premier to carry out an investigation into the administration of the *Official Gazette* for which he, as Minister of Home Affairs, is responsible. The *Official Gazette* comes under the portfolio of the Hon. Premier because it is a matter of Home Affairs and he is the Minister of Home Affairs.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of Order, Mr. Speaker, I am quite aware of the fact that this is not a matter for the Debates Committee; but surely when something is on the Order Paper with which we have not dealt and it appears in the *Official Gazette* for which the Debates Committee is responsible, that could hardly have come up for a debate in the House, a debate in the sense that the hon. member in charge would have had to introduce the matter. I am quite conscious of that fact. If a report of the proceedings in this House appears in the *Official Gazette*, that is a matter for the Debates Committee.

Mr. WALCOTT: The Hon. Premier has raised a matter of privilege in that something has been printed in the *Official Gazette*, but has not been debated in the House of Assembly. That has to be established. This matter is still on the Order Paper and by raising the matter here, the Premier has to satisfy us as to the fact. We can take exception about a decision which has not taken place; this is something which has not been printed in the debates at all; it is printed in the section of the *Official Gazette* which informs the public that all Bills and Resolutions which have been passed in this House of Assembly must be printed in the *Official Gazette*. The Hon. Premier himself has to carry out that investigation into the administration and take what steps are necessary in order to ascertain how the persons responsible for the printing of the *Official Gazette* can print that a decision has taken place on a matter which is still on the Order Paper. That is what I am suggesting. Now that the matter has been drawn to Your Honour's attention, Your Honour can only draw it to the attention of the powers-that-be. We are protesting against the publication of this matter which is a very serious matter. The Premier has to carry out this investigation because it is an extremely serious matter; it is a matter of giving legal sanction to something which the House of Assembly has not dealt with. This purports to give the impression that something legally has been done.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know what the legal people would do if the people in the Barbados Turf Club read in the *Official Gazette* that this matter has been dealt with; they would probably say that they have the authority to go ahead and rent this land. Mr. Speaker, I say that this is a serious matter. An amendment would have to be made in the *Official Gazette* pointing out that this error has taken place. I have said to myself that it may be that the time has come when the Government would have to get an expert seconded to it so as to carry out a very searching investigation, and I say that without any aspersions being cast upon the people in the Civil Service.
5.20 p.m.

The Civil Service in the United Kingdom and in the United States of America have a secret Service police, and they make no secret about it that they watch the whole service. In one of the Middle East countries, although they are not the same type of people and their behaviour is not like ours, you will see that a Prime Minister was executed for misconduct. When I say "misconduct" I mean "corruption," because it was discovered that he was plotting against his very country during the time he was in office. This is not a suggestion that you should carry out an investigation of the Premier and his Ministers, but I think the Govern-

ment would be well advised, if they have these doubts and these things occurring now as blatant as this, to have someone from the British Secret Service to go into these things, because I have been hearing rumours here and I do not like to voice them, but somebody should be able to know whether it is a fact that Civil Servants will do things that would work against the best interest of the Service. There is nobody in the Barbados Service who can carry out these functions, because we do not have a spy ring, and there is no expert to see that official secrets and absolute security can be maintained beyond a shadow of a doubt on the civil and administrative side. You may have it on the other side in dealing with explosions and things like that, but I think it is very important to have these things so that the Government would know quite clearly what to look for, as Governments all over the world today operate on that basis. This is the case with Nkrumah in Ghana, and in Tunisia somebody was plotting against President Bourguiba; so you cannot have a situation where these things can happen. The machinery for dealing with it is not available and this reveals a very serious matter, because it has revealed that something can be printed in the *Official Gazette* which has not taken place in the House of Assembly. If this can happen, what would happen on the basis of some other information?

I do not want even by giving that away to cast any bland aspersions against the integrity of the Civil Service, because individual people here are extremely foolish. If you say anything about any one person or about any one thing, somebody must take that as an offence; and if you read in the newspapers tomorrow morning or the next day that the Civil Service was attacked, every person in the Civil Service puts on a cloak. It is a most stupid thing, and you should think the minds of Civil Servants should be so emancipated that they would be intelligent enough to appreciate something being said about a section of their work people without implying that all of them are of the same kind you have spoken about. I think it is a serious matter and should be dealt with as seriously as it is, and my suggestion is that the Premier should carry out a very searching investigation. I doubt very much, Mr. Speaker, that apart from this official letter there is very much we can do about this matter, because it is really a matter that does not come within the pure confines of the Debates Committee, but within the House as a whole; and therefore if the House protests against this, then it is a matter for Your Honour to draw the House's protestation to the appropriate quarters.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Speaker, this is a very serious matter which we have under consideration now, and is one of the most serious actions you can think about in history where things are published that we know not of. I read in a newspaper where two men were charged for writing things of which they knew nothing in an English newspaper. One got three months and the other got six months, and they are confined until they can give the source of their information. As far as I can see, Sir, this is an action of conspiracy, because I cannot see how something we have not done could be published. Only what we debate in this House should be published in the *Official Gazette*, but something we have not done has been given publication. How has that happened and how did it get there? Do they want to sabotage this Government? Those who wrote these things without the knowledge of the House of Assembly should be charged with conspiracy. Do you mean, Mr. Speaker, that they can make law and put it in the *Official Gazette*, put Your Honour's name on it, put the name of the President of the Other Place to it and put His Excellency's name to it without our knowledge?

Mr. Speaker, if this were not a civilised country, those in charge of the *Official Gazette* and those in charge of the debates would be hanged tonight; they could not live until tomorrow morning if they were in Russia, Communist China or such countries, but here they get away with murder. We have to bring an end to this kind of wickedness that is going on. This is one of the biggest pieces of wickedness I have seen since I was in the House, and I am calling on the Premier to make an immediate investigation to find out where the evil lies. He has the power to find out where it came from and those who are responsible should be punish-

ed regardless of what the punishment may be. This Government in power today has been criticised, molested and spoken evil against; therefore we have to be very careful with ourselves. Sir, even the very Governor has been involved, we have been involved and the Other Place has been involved in such an evil. It seems to me that they are amalgamating one with another to hold evil consultations against us. Are they not willing to let us go ahead with this Government? We will not stand for such evil, and I hope that this Government will step on the gas and speed up and see where the evil is and stop it immediately, and I hope that those involved will be punished severely. I am sorry it cannot be death because it is very serious.
5.30 p.m.

This is a very serious thing, Mr. Speaker, To think that we come in here with our people in our minds to lay down legislation in this Island, and after we come here, something has been said which we have not said, something has been written which we have not decided on. What then is Parliament? Who are we?

I do not want to comment too long on this matter, but I say, Sir, that this matter must be dealt with immediately. I trust the Hon. Premier will get on with this case because it is a very serious accusation. I want to see such evil and conspiracy come to an end and I want to see harmony and justice in this House.

Mr. SPEAKER: May I mention before we proceed with the next Order to go into Committee of Supply that I have received not only from the Other Place returned with amendments the Bill to determine and regulate the powers, privileges and immunities of both Chambers of the Legislature but also I have received returned with amendments the Bill to consolidate and simplify the law relating to perjury and kindred offences.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: May I ask if they are extensive amendments?

Mr. SPEAKER: Not too many.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: If they are not extensive, I would ask leave to deal with them later today. If they are extensive, I would ask that they be printed and circulated to hon. members.

Mr. SPEAKER: May I just say *a propos* to the matter of privilege to which my attention has been drawn that I have had a careful examination of the Minutes of the Chamber. On the occasion in question they were taken by the Acting Clerk and there is no record at all that that Resolution was discussed or passed. It was merely given notice of on that date which was the 22nd January. I am grateful for the matter to be brought to my attention. Naturally, I will institute such investigation as I can on my own to satisfy myself where the fault lies.

That is a Resolution which purports to have been signed by the Speaker, the President of the Other Chamber and also by the Queen's Representative. I am hoping that I will be able to examine a copy of the document from which the Resolution which appears in the *Official Gazette* was printed. I wonder if any hon. member has seen that document?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I am satisfied that the amendments from the Other Place to those two Bills are very simple amendments and later on today I shall ask leave to deal with them.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I now ask that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply.

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

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1962-63 No. 33

HEAD 22 - PREMIER - CABINET AND GENERAL

Head 22 - Premier - Cabinet and General - was called.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Part I - Current - Head 22, stand part.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, this item deals with *ex-gratia* payment for compensation and the Note states that this sum is required to enable compensation to be paid to Mrs. Lillian Parris who fell in the Casualty Department of the Barbados General Hospital in August, 1961, and sustained injuries to her fingers.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure that the Hon. Premier is aware of another incident at the General Hospital and I hope the appropriate Minister would carry out an investigation into the matter. As regards this particular matter, the person who sustained these injuries is one of my constituents. I understand that she was taken to the Hospital and the allegation was that she fell from a cot and died. (Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Oh no). Sometimes Ministers really think that we are fools. I am dealing with this question of *ex-gratia* payment to someone who sustained injuries at the General Hospital, and I am pointing out to the Hon. Premier that there was a general Press statement about a woman who died at the Barbados General Hospital recently in which it was alleged that she fell from a cot and died, and I saw subsequent to that first statement in the Press that some of the Orderlies employed at the Hospital made a statement and signed their names to it.

I do not consider it is my duty to carry out any investigation into these things, but when there is a matter of such public importance I consider it appropriate that the responsible Minister should see about it. I know that Government has a problem at the General Hospital. I know that the doctors work hard, but I would like to say this to the Hon. Minister of Social Services and the Hon. Premier and his Cabinet. We know the doctors there work hard; but tell them if we are going to have a free medical service there not to regard people who come there for treatment like serfs, because the service which we are providing there for the people is a service which the people themselves are paying for.

It was reported to me by a young woman who went to the General Hospital early in the morning with her hands cut which eventually took four to six stitches that she had to wait in the Casualty from 9.00 o'clock until 4.00 o'clock in the afternoon before she was attended to completely. By any standard, that is ridiculous. 5.40 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, I have been up there and I know that it is a trying time for the Nurses and the people at the Hospital, but I do say that somebody should investigate the manner in which the Casualty - it is a Casualty - is being run. Something will have to be done in order to see that better services are provided up there. If they are short of doctors we do not want to overwork the doctors, but there is a general complaint about the sort of efficiency that we get up there. I am not going to make any allegations against people unless I have been into matters, but I have not heard anybody say that when you go to that Casualty, the service is as efficient as it should be. There seems to be this growing feeling that persons who go up there need not be attended to too quickly because they happen to be part of the vast army of the unemployed and therefore they have nothing to do. I know that some people do exploit the service up there because it is a free service; I know that some people go up there with trivial things that they could attend to at home, but it is the people's Hospital and the people go up there.

On the other hand, Mr. Chairman, working men and women want to get back to their jobs and they want to be attended to as quickly as possible. This is not an indictment against anybody; this is merely a plea for efficiency and we want to have efficiency in our working sectors. When people go from their work and are kept back for long hours, that gives the impression that doing things efficiently does not matter.

On the last occasion when I spoke about the Magistrates, the Hon. Premier said that I was promoting a class war in that I regarded these people because of who they are. I have no objection to Doctors getting as much rest as any other human being can get, but I do not subscribe to the idea that doctors should not be giving the needed service which we know they are capable of rendering. Let the doctors realise that the people are poor and they do not have the facilities which other people have, but they should not be regarded as outcasts and that it does not matter whether they are rehabilitated or not. We provide a service for the people, we want it to be done efficiently and we want the people to get the treatment which they deserve.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, we all know that all is not well at the General Hospital, especially where the Casualty is concerned. I quite agree with the remarks which have been made by the hon. senior member for St. Peter; there is a case of which I know myself because it has happened with my chauffeur. He took me to the doctor, and then when I came out of the doctor's office I found him lying prostrate on the side-walk feeling badly. I would have taken him to the Hospital but I was suffering with my eyes and I had to call the 999 service to take him to the Hospital; they kept him waiting so long up there that he got better without seeing a doctor. (Laughter)

Mr. Chairman, I believe that they keep you long up there so that you will be able to get better before the doctor arrives. (Laughter). Things are getting worse up there. As far as the Casualty is concerned, people have to go up there and wait for hours and hours without seeing a doctor. The note to this item reads as follows:-

"This sum is required to enable compensation to be paid to Mrs. Lillian Parris who fell in the casualty department of the Barbados General Hospital in August, 1961, and sustained injuries to her fingers."

Sir, that is the explanation given in this note, but it is very vague. All the Hon. Minister did was to move that the item stand part of the Schedule and he did not give any explanation either. I would like to know if Mrs. Lillian Parris was a patient, a nurse, a janitor or what at the Hospital and what caused her to fall. It is not good enough that the Hon. Premier is asking us to vote this \$500 and all he has done is to move the passing of the item when the information is so very vague. As I say, I do not know if this person was a doctor, nurse, patient, janitor or what or if she fell off the bed while she was awaiting the attention of the doctor or what. This is not good enough; Mr. Chairman, I am constantly appealing to the Ministers that they supply the necessary information to this Chamber. They know all about this matter but I do not know about it. They could not pay this compensation in respect of this lady without the sanction of this House. Even the backbenchers would want to know about this matter and I do not blame them for wanting to know about it.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I hope the hon. member is not referring to me because, I, too, am a backbencher.

Mr. SMITH: Well, Sir, I will say some of the backbenchers. You may know about it, Mr. Chairman, because you sit close to the Hon. Premier and you may have asked him about it; but the other backbenchers who are sitting near to me do not know. If any of our constituents were to ask us who is Lillian Parris, none of us would be able to tell him. We are being asked for permission to spend this money and I say that we should know something more about this matter. Imagine my asking the Hospital authorities for money in these circumstances! I do not think that the Hon. Premier would have brought down this Resolution before finding out who this woman is. 5.50 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, the Premier would have to get the necessary information and we would like it too. I am continually asking the Ministers to get the necessary information when they are bringing these Resolutions here, because they are disregarding us as members of this House as well as the taxpayers. The hon. member only moved the Head without saying one word, which makes me believe that he does not know much more about it himself, because if he did, he would have told us. He cannot blame me for asking, because I must know, I do not mind how the members on the other side look at me; I am a member of this House and have been elected by the people, and I know that when money is to be paid out you should know everything about it. No businessman at all would have paid this out until he knew everything. Who is Mrs. Lilian Parris? Is she a nurse, a doctor or who? I hope that the Minister will let me know now who is Mrs. Lilian Parris, what she was doing at the Hospital, if at that time she was in bed and fell out, if she was sober and things of that sort.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, before the hon. junior member for St. Thomas speaks — if the gentleman looking after the equipment of the House would vouchsafe me the advantage of being able to hear, I would be very grateful. I would just like to outline the procedure. The hon. member who has just sat down has been here for at least seventeen years. We do not set out the Government file in the Addendum to a Resolution. The hon. member is entitled to get up and ask a question on any item which appears in the Schedule to that Resolution. It is as simple as that. We do not come here and go into people's private and personal business except in so far as questions are asked. We said the reason for this is that something has happened on which we have been advised that the Government is liable, the amount we require is so much and we move that the Head be passed. The hon. member went on and on as if he had asked a question and somebody over here said it was none of his business, she is not a friend of his, so why does he want to know. All he was doing was shadow-boxing and fighting against himself. All he had to do was to ask a simple question and we would have gone home an hour ago. I do not know if it is that the hon. member feels that the lady having \$500 may be a potential client of his and therefore she would be well in a position to afford the luxury of his erstwhile establishment, but I will give him the information. The lady had an attack of bronchitis. She went to the hospital and had to wait a considerable length of time because there were 300 patients that day. This was in 1961 and not under our dispensation, as you will appreciate. She had to wait a considerable length of time, and there were in the Casualty Department in the Hospital at that time two tables; one was a regular examination table, and the other one was a thing called a fluoroscope which apparently had been introduced in the Hospital in the days of yore when the X-Ray Department was busy and doctors in the Casualty wanted to make quick examinations for things like chest complaints and soon. It is like an examination table, but this has some kind of ratchet and wheel so that you can tilt the patient at a particular angle.

Now according to the Medical Superintendent, this contraption should not have been in there at all, because quite apart from the mechanical advance over twenty years ago, this kind of contraption was condemned by all Hospital authorities; but because there was a shortage of furniture, they used to use this fluoroscope as an examination table. I regret to say that a member of the Staff of the Hospital tried to make it appear — and this is why the matter took so long, and I do not mean a professional member of the Staff — that the lady did not have any right there because that person did not hear anybody tell the patient to go to that particular table; but the doctor herself who was doing the examination made it quite clear that she had ordered the patient to go to that particular table, not being conscious that there was something defective at that time. The lady went to the table, fell off and injured two of her fingers. One is now deformed and the amount of compensation which was claimed was \$2,000, but she finally agreed to accept the lesser sum of \$500. She is right-handed and the injury was to her left hand, and the Crown Law Officers have advised that the Hospital authorities are liable. It would be much more expensive if this matter had to go to Court, and therefore we considered it not only expedient, but just

and equitable that the lady should be compensated for the damage she incurred through no fault of her own, having been ordered to go and lie on this defective table. I think I can inform hon. members that the cause of the complaint has now been removed. I hope that satisfies the hon. junior member for St. Joseph. I cannot give the lady's address because I am not sure of it, nor her telephone number.

Mr. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, speaking on this Resolution, I am still not satisfied with the way things are being done at the Hospital. For some misguided idea people get it in their heads that doctors should be specially treated people. I do feel they should be specially treated in the same way we treat an engineer, a lawyer a Minister of religion or anyone like that. Only Tuesday night last, I took a small boy to the Hospital, and much to my surprise the nurse was somewhat lackadaisical in writing the report, and when I asked her what time she thought the boy would see a doctor, she told me that the doctor had just left and she did not know when he would be back.

Mr. Chairman, I have been a watchkeeper for almost twenty years, and if I had to take watch between the hours of eight and four, it meant I had to be on duty between those hours; so if we are paying a doctor to be on duty between certain hours, the doctor should remain there between those hours. He has no right going off and telling the nurse not to wake him. Who knows how sick this boy might have been? Fortunately the boy did not die. I know that the hospital is run on a shift system: that is, a doctor may be on for two hours; and if he is to be on duty for two hours, he should be there for two hours and not spend one hour and fifty-nine minutes in his room. It is unfair to the taxpayers and to the Island and I do not feel it is good enough. If you want the name of the doctor, I can give it to you. Not only was this man off his duty when he should have been on duty, but the man is also very impolite. 6.00 p.m.

We cannot go on in this Island as taxpayers employing people who are impolite, whether that person is a doctor or not. It is conducive to the health and welfare of anybody that a doctor should be polite. If a doctor is impolite he is able to bring about a feeling of despair in the patient which would lead to a downfall in the patient's sickness.

I am therefore appealing to the Hon. Minister of Social Services to check with the Hospital authorities to find out the doctor who was on duty around the hour of three o'clock on Wednesday morning and whether he was in his place of duty. As a matter of fact, the child did not see the doctor until 8.00 o'clock in the morning. If you are going to continue to put up with this thing happening at the Hospital, it would be no better to go to than the Courts. Even in the Courts today you are being expedited quickly with matters.

I am therefore appealing to the Hon. Minister who is in charge to get on to the Superintendent of the Hospital and tell him that I say that I am not satisfied, as a representative of the people, with the way how things are run at the Hospital, and when a doctor is on duty, irrespective of whom he may be, if he is on duty in the Casualty, let him remain in the Casualty.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, I have been listening to the various complaints of hon. members with respect to their dissatisfaction at the General Hospital. I will deal with the complaints of the hon. member who spoke last first of all.

He said that he was not satisfied with the conditions there and he felt that doctors should not be specially treated. The hon. member also complained of taking a child to the Hospital on Tuesday night and the child did not get any attention then because a doctor was not there.

I would like to make this abundantly clear. Prior to this Government taking up office, there was one doctor on duty in the entire Hospital compound and he was on duty while the others were on call. On assuming the office of Minister of Health, I issued instructions after we had been able to recruit more doctors that there must be a doctor in the Casualty Department throughout the night and a mini-

mum of two doctors during the day. That is the present position obtaining at the General Hospital.

The hon. member said that the doctor was in his room. I would like to ask the hon. member how far is this room from the Casualty?

Mr. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. I never said that the doctor was in his room. I would never make that statement. I said that the doctor was in a room. That is what the nurse told me. I will go a little further. The Hon. Minister has said that since they have more doctors, one is on duty in the Casualty and the others are on call. I say that if there are twelve and the twelve are somewhere in a room away from the Hospital playing cards, it would be better that you never had a doctor at all.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: If the Casualty is empty, the doctor on duty is provided with a room where he can rest. When someone comes to the Casualty, there is a nurse on duty and the instructions are that the nurse should call the doctor at once.

I will answer now the point raised by the hon. senior member for St. Peter. A doctor is always there during the day and two doctors are always on duty, at least a minimum of two. We have 14,000 patients to look after a month at the Hospital. Besides a minimum of two doctors who are allocated to the Casualty Department — and prior to 1962 there was only one, I am speaking of the time from 8,00 o'clock in the morning to 4,00 o'clock in the afternoon — there are four private medical officers who come into the Hospital at 1,00 o'clock every afternoon of the working days of the week to look after out-patients and, as I have pointed out before, people do not understand the difference between a true casualty case and the case for a doctor's out-patients' clinic. If you are to see a doctor in the out-patients' clinic and if your case is not a true casualty case and you go to the Casualty Department at 8,00 o'clock when the doctors who look after the out-patients do not arrive until 1,00 o'clock, you must wait until that time.

Recently, we have come in here with a Civil Establishment Order for two additional medical officers. This would enable us to reduce the number of visiting medical practitioners, and instead of having only two doctors in the Casualty Department from 8,00 o'clock in the morning onwards, we would be able to have more doctors there. We will be able also to look after some of the out-patients before 1,00 o'clock; but until that happens, out-patients are advised not to go to the Hospital for treatment before 1,00 o'clock.

Sir, there is one other important point to which I must reply. It is the question of the allegation of a lady falling from a cot which the hon. senior member for St. Peter made mention of. I am going to say this now. There is no foundation of fact in that statement at all.
6.10 p.m.

Sometime last week the *Advocate* published an article under the caption "Woman falls from stretcher" and it was suggested that she died as a result of that. I have carried out the necessary investigations, and as a result of those investigations, I am saying that there is no foundation in fact, as I said before, in what was reported by the *Advocate*. This lady had been a patient at the General Hospital. I think it was in November last year, suffering from a very serious ailment. She was re-admitted to the Hospital and, according to the report, she was only given a few days, or rather, hours to live by the doctor who was looking after the case. According to the investigation which I carried out and according to the doctor's report, this lady died as a result of the ailment for which she had been treated at the Hospital since last year. I do not want to say what the ailment was, but it was a very serious case; the lady did not fall from the stretcher according to the information which I have received from my investigation. The only thing which fell from the stretcher when the Hospital Orderlies were taking the lady to the Ward was her hat. I do hope that that satisfies the hon. senior member for St. Peter.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I must thank the Hon. Minister for his reply. My style is not the style of saying

that the lady fell from the stretcher; I said that it was alleged that she fell from the stretcher, and therefore I am asking if the Hon. Minister carried out any investigation into the matter. There has been a public airing of the matter and I feel that both of us have a duty to perform to the public. It happens that this lady was one of my constituents, and I did not want it to appear that I am so indifferent as to things which take place in my constituency that I do not ask anything about them. The Hon. Minister has said that an investigation has been carried out and I thank him for that.

Mr. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to prolong this debate but I want to give the Minister the facts.
(ASIDES).

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, quite honestly there was one legitimate question asked here this afternoon and it was asked by the hon. junior member for St. Joseph. That question was answered, Sir, you have given hon. members a considerable amount of latitude in dealing with the Barbados General Hospital. I do not think that we will get through with the people's business if hon. members want to say what wonderful work they have been carrying out and what nodding acquaintance they have of the machinery of the Hospital. I would ask you, Mr. Chairman, to see that hon. members stick to the Resolution. I do not see why this matter should have been extended to say that one has seen somebody drinking tea at 3 o'clock in the morning. I do not see what relevance that has to Mrs. Parris' injuries. The question which has been raised by the hon. senior member for St. Peter is what we consider an analogous experience which he was expressing and we hope that that was not anything developing there; but the excursions into the Casualty of the Hospital are not really germane to the issue.

Mr. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, if that is a point of order, I am going to make one too. There are some people in this House who seem to think that they have a legitimate right to go through the atmosphere and then come back through the stratosphere while we must remain in the atmosphere. I am a representative of the people in here just as well as anybody else. I was elected to a seat in here. I have got up on a point of elucidation. (*Cheers!*) I do not know where some people get the idea that some of us are taking up the time of this House while others are doing something else. I did not come in here through any accident; I was elected in here. The Hon. Minister has said that if you had asked the nurse to call the doctor, she would have called the doctor.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order. What I said, Mr. Chairman, is that it was the duty of the nurse to call the doctor when someone goes into the Casualty after the doctor leaves an empty Casualty. It was the nurse whom one would have to blame, not the doctor.

Mr. BOXILL: I am saying that the nurse was intimidated by the doctor. If she had not been afraid to call the doctor, then she would have called him. I am saying that the nurse said that she would not call the doctor because she did not know if he would have come.

The question that Head 22 stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 36 — MINISTRY OF EDUCATION (5) SCHOOLS

Head 36 — Ministry of Education (5) Schools — was called.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 36 stand part of the Schedule.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I beg to second the motion. In doing so, I should just like to draw the attention of hon. members to the significance of the figures which appear in the note to this item. Note 3 reads as follows:—

"The roll of the Primary and Secondary Modern Schools has risen during the period August 1961 — August 1962 by 3,624, an extraordinary increase when compared

with the increase of 1,593 in the previous year and the average annual increase of 1,463 during the period 1958 — 1961. It has therefore been necessary to employ a larger force of Relief Teachers than could be foreseen at an additional cost of \$16,305."

Hon. members would also like to know that the number of Relief Teachers employed by the Ministry at the moment is 350, and of that 350, we employed 80 since September, 1962. In addition to that, there are 220 Supernumerary teachers. There was a proposal in the Jacobs' Report to increase the Establishment and to increase the number of supernumeraries by appointing them to established posts. That proposal is still under consideration. I have reason to believe that we will soon be able to announce something about that.

6.20 p.m.

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make an appeal to the Minister to see whether it could be arranged that these teachers who are not on the established staff could be paid at more regular intervals. It has come to my knowledge that the last time these teachers were paid was on 19th December; it is today 5th February. I was wondering whether something could not be done about that. I know I will be told that they are not paid during the vacations, but certainly, Sir, it should be possible for them to receive some pay at the end of the particular month in which the new term began. Very many of them have been considerably embarrassed having to go hat in hand to the village shopkeeper to ask that credit be extended to them, having got into the habit of eating regularly, and I would like to ask the Minister if something could be done to remedy that perilous situation.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. member has got his facts a little askew. Presumably he is referring to Relief Teachers, because supernumeraries are paid like established people.

The point about Relief Teachers is this: their pay is calculated on a daily basis; therefore they must go to the end of the month before their pay sheets can be made up, and we try as hard as we can to let them have their money in the first week of the subsequent month. I would also like him to know this because this is something that should be known. Relief Teachers fought a battle with the former Government to get recognition of a principle which has only been recognised by this Government. They have asked that in computing their salaries, holidays and Sundays of a particular month should be taken into account. That plea fell on deaf ears in the last regime, but happily for them, we have considered that there is justice in what they have asked and we are doing it; so now Relief Teachers get paid a little more than they were accustomed to being paid under the last regime, and we try our best to let them have their money within the first week of the following month. They cannot have their money when the others do, because as I said, the wages are paid on a daily basis and they must come to the end of the month for it to be known how many days they have put in. The situation is therefore not as bad as the hon. member thinks it is.

With respect to those paid on 19th December, that came about again, happily for them, because we decided that if the primary schools closed in the first week of December and we had only six or seven days' pay for them, it was unnecessary to make them wait until after Christmas to receive the six or seven days' pay, but to give it to them a week before Christmas — which we did. That explains why they were paid on 19th December. With the schools opening on the 6th January and today being the 5th February, it is some time this week that they will receive the January salary.

Mr. COWARD: Mr. Chairman, before you put the question, I have heard the explanation given by the Minister of Education, but I would like to point out that the supernumerary and Relief Teachers are very dissatisfied. We as Barbadians should know the attitude of our people, and as you know, Mr. Chairman, a man will take a job regardless of what conditions there may be; but as soon as he starts to operate and sees the facilities that are given to other

people doing a similar job, he eventually generates dissatisfaction, and that is what is happening with these teachers now. These teachers are very dissatisfied that when the schools are out of session they receive no pay. I am asking the Hon. Minister if it is not possible to work out some scheme whereby these teachers could be paid when the school is out of session. As you know, Mr. Chairman, the education of children is very important and we should do everything to make the teachers a satisfied lot.

While speaking on education, Mr. Chairman, I brought to the notice of the Minister of Education some time now the existing conditions of the St. Elizabeth's Schools where one school is out of order altogether, and the other is operating in such a way that children can only go to school half of the day. The parents of these children are very dissatisfied, and as a result, some of the children had to leave the school and go far distances to St. Joseph's School where they can spend the whole day in school. Now from day to day as I look into some of the newspapers, Sir, I can see where a wing has been put on to this school and to that school, but these are schools where children are comfortable and spend the whole day, while these poor children in St. Joseph can only go to school half of the day and nothing has been done to that school up to now. I would like to know from the Hon. Minister what is Government's intention with regard to the St. Elizabeth's Schools. I want the Hon. Minister to realise that he is not a representative of the parish of St. Joseph, but a representative of the parish of St. Lucy. A few years ago when the drought hit St. Lucy, quite a number of people from St. Lucy came to St. Joseph and are living there now. These people's children are being educated at the St. Elizabeth's School and I want the Minister to understand that they still have relatives in St. Lucy. United we stand and divided we fall. Some of the people who came to live in St. Joseph came from Checker Hall, some from Bromefield, some from Pie Corner and some from Lowlands. I know these cases and I know the people, and I know that they have their relatives in St. Lucy. I do not know, Sir, what is the position where St. Joseph is concerned, and whether it is exempted, but I am warning the Minister that some of these children who suffer in St. Joseph are the descendants of the people in St. Lucy, and that is all I have to say for now.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I must tell the hon. member that I do not conduct public affairs on that basis, although I would say that quite recently I had to sanction the transfer of two children from St. Joseph to St. Clement's which is a school meals centre. If some of us are moving this way, then some of us are moving that way. I should like to say this with respect to the St. Elizabeth's School. The facts are as follows: there are two school buildings on that bit of land. One of the buildings is entirely unsuitable, but in order not to put the children out of the school altogether, we introduced the shift system there as a temporary measure.

6.30 p.m.

The land on which both schools are built is the property of an Established Church and it is only last week that I concluded arrangements with the Lord Bishop for handing over in perpetuity of the land so that we can erect a new school for both boys and girls.

Mr. COWARD: Sir, I would like to point out to the hon. member that those schools are out of existence. I am saying that they should be put somewhere proper. You should look for somewhere where you can get proper playing fields to site those schools.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Sir, I heard, just as I was coming in, somebody saying to me not to get into this. Someone referred to the fact of paying these teachers during the holidays.

Now, Sir, I have always advocated, from the time you departed from the elementary school system and you had to resort to this method of taking on assistant teachers and the teachers whom you have as supernumeraries, that you should change your system of paying them. I would like the Hon. Minister of Education to tell me this: Are these teachers entitled, though not paid when the schools are on

vacation, to holidays with pay in accordance with the Holidays With Pay Act? You do not pay the supernumeraries during the holidays: so that is a matter of thirteen weeks without pay a year; but if they have put in 150 days a year, they are entitled to a vacation with pay. Can the Hon. Minister tell me whether this is done? If it is not done, then the teachers who were working with you over the past few years have a right to see the Labour Department.

I agree that it is very difficult to say that they are not on the staff and yet to make arrangements to have them paid during the holidays. If you do that the teachers who are on the staff will not have any advantage. I am not talking about the acting staff. The acting staff can only be in the place of some established post. If you do not have a post established, you cannot have anybody acting in it. A supernumerary is a teacher who is called upon where you find yourself in difficulty some morning at a school and the headmistress or headmaster is allowed to call in from a given list so many teachers as she needs to come in and supplement the staff. When you have to take on a teacher in the place of somebody, that is different. That is an acting appointment.

I want to know if supernumeraries are given, according to the laws of this country, holidays with pay. I have been asked by some of these teachers this. Are we entitled, just as a domestic or anybody else employed in the country, not withstanding that we are working for the Government, to holidays with pay?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, that is a fine point into which I have not gone but there seems to be some confusion in the hon. member's mind as regards the distinction between a supernumerary and a Relief Teacher. A Relief Teacher is generally a young person 18 years or 19 years old who has just left school.

Mr. MOTTLEY: There is no confusion in my mind. I am not talking of a Relief Teacher at all. I was only dealing with acting staff and supernumeraries. I know there is some difference between a supernumerary and somebody acting.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: The matter is one which I have to go into more carefully and I will deal with it on another occasion.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Thank you very much. I know what I have said is going to make these teachers ask you for that money. If they put in 150 days, they are entitled to holidays with pay, and I am surprised that the hon. senior member for St. Peter has not raised it. They are entitled to their vacation. I make bold to say to you to look for the money and look for it early. Now that you can sue the Government, he or she is entitled to that payment.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Sir, I am more than convinced now about whom the hon. member is speaking. Supernumeraries are the teachers from whom appointments are made to the Establishment; so as I have said, the only difference between a supernumerary and one on the Establishment is that the supernumerary is not yet appointed. I suspect that the hon. member is making a point with respect to Relief Teachers, but I would tell him that supernumeraries are already paid in the holidays.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The hon. member did not reply to that. I am happy to think that the policy has been changed and that supernumeraries are paid in the holidays.

Mr. COWARD: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. I think the hon. senior member for the City of Bridgetown has not heard me correctly because I mentioned Relief Teachers.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The hon. member must not do that. Members of the Government Party when they were in the Opposition and members of my Party both fought the previous Government on the principle that a supernumerary, acting or Relief Teacher should be given some consideration during the time the schools were on holiday. I am happy to see that the Government has given that consideration and that supernumeraries are actually paid during the holidays before they are selected to the staff.

As regards Relief Teachers, if they are not paid during the holidays, they are entitled to be paid holidays with pay according to the laws of the country, if they work for over 150 days. That is all I am saying: although I do appreciate the difference which is being made and that it is the supernumerary from whom you select your staff, I am saying that the acting teachers who put in seven or eight months in the year are entitled to holidays with pay; therefore you will have to look to pay them holidays with pay.
6.40 p.m.

The question that Head 36 stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 45 - LABOUR

Head 45 - Labour - was called.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to move, Mr. Chairman, that Head 45 stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, this is a very important matter, and I am very glad to see that the Government has acquired the services of an expert to deal with this matter of training within industry. I would like to say here and now that it is extremely important to the economy and efficiency of this island that we have something like this; but I think I should point out that the emphasis for training within industry should be put where it should be, that is, in its rightful place. I consider that employers in this island - it is true that they are not big establishments - themselves do not do enough training within their own industries in order to promote the efficiency which is required, and then they expect institutions to be set up by the nation to provide that training. I have readily coming to my mind that this island is going in for a lot of building construction, and I find that the contractors do not even attempt to have means in respect of carpenters, masons and those whom they require as skilled people, to offer assistance to these people or to appeal for training. In Barbados there are labour potentialities, but enough is not being done to promote them. I think that the Government should undertake within its departments, instead of complaining about work in the Government service, to train some of its own people. You have a Department like the Highways and Transport, and you have the Public Works Department which are two large Departments where you could have some training being carried out within their organization. I think that the time has come when the Government should embark on training schools for their own purposes. As regards the Highways and Transport Department and the Public Works Department, we should know the quality of workmen they require, and we should train people so that they would know how to work quickly and efficiently.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think that you could get very high productivity with untrained people. I know that the hotel people are talking about this matter, but in all sectors there is room for this kind of training. If we had this type of training, then there would not be any question of cheap snobbery, because no matter what the job is, a person will not feel that he is inferior because of the training he has to go through and it creates understanding about his work. I feel that a broad discussion or conference on the whole basis of training within industry should take place. The Government itself is embarking on a programme of development, but it is essential in relation to any Government programme that you make sure that the work which people have to perform should be performed efficiently. I look forward to employers in this island being told, and they must be told, and encouraged to spend some money on the training of people. It is true that you have to pay people more when they are trained, but at the same time you will get more from them. You want to teach employees how to approach people on the basis of realising that you will sell more when you have a staff which understands these things. Waiters and people who work in restaurants would get more money out of the pockets of customers when the customers find that the employees can smile readily. You want to teach people the rudiments of these things.

There is a lot of criticism about the men who work in the street. If you have raw material which you have not

trained, well, it is going to be raw material; and as long as you are looking for a man to pay him \$18 or \$20 a week and leave him to drift, all you will get is a drifter. Those rugged days are gone and they have to be substituted by something else. I hope that the Government will set this example within its own departments and you will get people who will understand why they work; you will get people who are not afraid of being efficient and who are not afraid that efficiency will make them redundant. You have to get employers and the Government willing to train people for the jobs which they have to undertake.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to hear the remarks of the last speaker. I support this sort of training most wholeheartedly. This expert, who has been here for six months, has incidentally gone back; I think he left about a month ago. Although I was invited to attend some of the courses which were being conducted, I did not have the time to do so. Those who are in industry and who did attend those courses said that they have learnt quite a lot. With the exception of three or four groups like the "Big Six", it is unlikely that any one business would be able to employ an expert and pay him the price which that business will have to pay a qualified man in their confines. Mr. Chairman, this is a good move. I know that on some occasions this expert had with him Mr. Gay from the Labour Department who will take over his duties. I understand that Mr. Gay will be going out for training, and he will be the officer who will train people both in Government and in private enterprise. We welcome that very much indeed. We would like to see established here schools in different fields like the Hotel Training School Service of which we have been talking for years. If the Government were to give a lead through the Education Department, I am quite sure that the hotels would be only too willing to subscribe towards the assistance of training people in their fields.
6.50 p.m.

On occasions youngsters come to me and say they want a job in a hotel, and I ask them where they have worked before and whether they have worked in a hotel yet.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member is going to be long, we will have to ask to report progress and ask for leave to sit again, because we are approaching the hour of 7 o'clock.

Mr. GODDARD: I shall not be long.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I do not want to curtail the hon. member's speech in any way, but we have only two minutes left before 7 o'clock.

Mr. GODDARD: We from the private sector welcome this very much indeed and will give every co-operation possible.

The question that Head 45 - Labour - stand part, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

On the motion of Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, the Resolution was passed.

On the motion of Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Resolution in Committee, and asked for leave to sit again, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

LEAVE TO SUSPEND STANDING ORDER No. 5

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to move the Suspension of Standing Order No. 5 in order that the Session may be prolonged for at least another half an hour in order to complete one or two small items on the Order Paper.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the House is asking leave to move the suspension of Standing Order No. 5 so that the Sitting may be prolonged for at least half an hour. If there is no objection, leave will be granted. I hear no objection, and accordingly leave is granted the Hon. Minister.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDER No. 5

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Standing Order No. 5 be suspended for the remainder of today's Sitting.

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

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

HOUSE RESUMES 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, and that it be an instruction to the Committee to deal with the money Resolution for \$15,000 of which I gave notice earlier today, and in respect of which I signified my intention to ask for leave to deal with it in all its stages.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: 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.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE, 1962 - 63 No. 35

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Chairman, this is a Resolution for the sum of \$15,000 to supplement the provision in the current Estimates under Head 32 - Highways and Transport, item 32, re pay to casual employees. The increase is due to an increase in the number of casual employees who are entitled to vacation and sick leave.

Mr. Chairman, the number of casual employees employed by Highways and Transport Department has risen from an average of 1,200 persons per week in April, 1962 to over 1,900 persons per week at the end of January. These employees worked steadily over a period of time and have qualified for both vacation and sick leave, and as a result the funds already provided have proved inadequate.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, this question of leave for these persons is something I would like to draw to the attention of the Government. For too many years now people in Barbados have been living in an atmosphere of mediaeval work practices, but we might as well think in terms of a modern society. It is absolutely no point in continuing this wasteful use of human energy by making some of these people come out on Saturdays and actually producing work that is infinitesimal. You could as well face the broad concept of modern communities that a person produces more on a straight line basis than on these continuous stupid breaks to which tradition has you wedded. The number of occasions on which a man takes up the pick-axe and pushes around a wheel-barrow on Saturday mornings does not warrant the time spent before midday. If you are still paying for the four hours, you could as well come to the sensible approach and have the man work on a five-day week basis on which you gear his wages based on the forty-five hours. That is, if you are paying him \$10 a week, do not be afraid to pay him the same \$10 a week if you want that \$10 a week paid to everybody.
7.00 p.m.

Do not be of the idea that it will be four hours less, because with proper supervision and the proper attitude you can get more work from the person. The idea that you want Broad Street to open late on nights and that the worker has the whole of Saturday to go in town - you must change your concept. The idea of making a man work every day is part

of mediaeval practice. I have found out that the people who produce the most in the community are not the people with the longest hours. Some of us do not have long hours of work as such, but we produce a lot of work in the time we have to do something.

I think the Government should take the lead because there is too much crass ignorance in this country with the employers holding back and the workers holding back. You have some people who know that they have to produce, but they want to see how much they can get out of a job. I do not make any apology for saying that because I have made this a study, not for myself but for the community. I have had cause to investigate some of the Government workers because I had to deal with a contractor who was working for the Government, and I found in some sectors that some of the people were still holding back.

Go out on a Saturday morning and see some of those people who have to work on the road. Can you make an analysis of what work you are getting done during the four hours which they have to work that day? From what I have seen of them I prefer not to let a man work on a Saturday. As a matter of fact, the supervision is not so good because the men whom you have as supervisors are not trained supervisors. You do not pay them to be good supervisors: you pay them a few shillings more and call them supervisors, but they themselves have an interest in the worker not doing his amount of work because if he does not do the amount of work the longer the supervisor himself would be on the job. The more he would get out of it.

I hope the Government will re-examine the whole of the Public Works and change the whole system of work. Be prepared to pay \$50 or \$60 a week to men who are prepared to do a good job of supervision, men who are not looking for any bag of cement to send home to somebody or to get some sort of perquisite. It is a matter of changing a man's outlook, and you can only change it by changing the very atmosphere. If I had to deal with the Government directly as a Trade Unionist, I would deal with the Government as an impersonal organisation and you would get better relationship and better productivity.

This loose unconnected affair is no good for this community. Do not spread it all over to Saturday, and before he begins to work on Monday he wants to see Saturday's work in the job. These are the people who voted for you and they will soon find that they are voting themselves out of existence because you will not have the money to do all of this crash employment at a slow basis. You could as well begin to tell them that.

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

On motion of Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, seconded by Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Resolution in Committee of Supply.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, seconded by Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, in each case, the Resolution was read a first and second time and agreed to.

RESOLUTION re \$500,000 FOR HOTEL SITES

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Resolution of which notice was given today with regard to the use of funds provided under Head 9 - Miscellaneous, Item 7, Land Acquisition, copies of which have been circulated to hon. members, be the next Order of the Day.

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

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

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, under the Capital Estimates for 1962-63, Head 9 - Miscellaneous, Item 7, Land Acquisition, the sum of \$500,000 is provided for the purchase of land for hotel sites.

Now, Sir, the purpose of this Resolution is to amend the provision and to permit this sum to be used for other development projects. That is all. In the Note to the Capital Estimates, it is stated that this amount of \$500,000 is for the purchase of land for hotel sites and the Government is prepared to amend the existing note so that it will now read along with that "and for other development projects". 7.10 p.m.

The Government is now seeking permission to amend the existing note so that it will now read as follows:-

"For the purchase of land for hotel sites and for other development projects".

The Government has found this step necessary in order that it may proceed with the acquisition of certain lands which it requires for development purposes and which it intends to pay for out of this vote. However, according to the provisions attached to the Resolution, the money cannot now be expended except for the acquisition of land for hotel purposes only. The permission of the Legislature is now being sought to amend the note in order that the Government may utilise some of the moneys from this vote, to acquire land which it regards as being in the public interest and for the purposes already classified. With those remarks, Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I think that this is a very desirable amendment to this note, but I would like to plead with the Government that with this broad release which we are giving, we are more or less giving *carte blanche* for the purchase of any area which they are free to buy. In this matter of other development projects I think that this is something which is worth while. When it comes to the question of acquiring land in Barbados, I would like to say that there is very little crown land, or there are very little crown lands available for development purposes, and I do hope that the Hon. Minister and the Government would not regard it as being improper that whenever they have these projects they would have some progress report to submit on these matters. I have been reading and hearing about a hotel to be constructed here - the Hilton Hotel - and I do not know where it is going to be now. The reason why I am in agreement with this Resolution is that the Government would be permitted or be able to negotiate for the acquisition of land rather than having to come to the Legislature on each and every occasion; we know that when the Government goes into the open market and they have to negotiate for the price of land, the price is skyrocketed. On the other hand, if we can negotiate and have the money to pay for the land, it makes it an easy matter to get that land. It has been drawn to the attention of this House by the hon. senior member for St. James that there is the question of land being available, and in a country like this with so little Crown lands we should endeavour wherever possible to acquire land. Then there is the question of the land at Colleton. Sometimes the Government refuses to accept a request to do certain things and then we are faced with the problem of housing people; then everybody comes forward with a Resolution asking the Government to buy land at exorbitant prices.

I do not know how favourable the land at Sandy Lane has been to the owners, but you will find that some portion of the land would pay for the total expenditure on the other lands. I feel that what is being done now is something which is very worth while and I do hope that the Government will go about it as expeditiously and in as businesslike a manner as possible. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition has complimented the Government on the purchase of "Sherbourne," but I would like to say that when you analyse what some of these lands can be acquired for, there can be excellent values. There are some big houses in Barbados which only the Government would buy because private people do not want them. I think it would be a good thing for the Government to utilise these things with businesslike acumen and we would get desirable development for people. You cannot allow people to wait until some big Canadian comes and buys out their houses on the seashore and makes improvements. The time for that is over. I think that the Gov-

ernment should acquire more land from the point of view of land which is desirable. When you go from Thornbury Hill, there is a complete development there all down the coast to Half Moon Fort; all down the south coast into Bridgetown until you get down to Half Moon Fort you have a built-up area and that is a development which went on for the last twenty years. On the windward side of the island that sort of development will also take place. If private people can buy plantations and cut them up, then we could as well say it now that the production of sugar is not the only thing which we can carry on because a crop of 175,000 tons of sugar is not what we can rely on, and we can manufacture that amount of sugar on less land than that on which it is now being manufactured. The population is growing and you have to put the population on land. You cannot make people believe that each man can have his own back yard and that he can live in the environs of the City. You have to go up into the air and you have to erect buildings and acquire the technique of living in modern times.

7.20 p.m.

I think the Government is wise in trying to utilise this, but I do say that the Legislature today is giving the Government an extremely wide berth in utilising this money for other development projects. (Mr. MOTTLEY: Such as what?) They do not say 'such as what'. You have a wide berth, and I hope the wide berth given to the Government today will not be abused or misused, and therefore when we come back we will see what you have done with it. I will not say anything more. For example, everybody has his own idea, and I hope that you do not have too many experiments in these projects, but will analyse them, look at the feasibility of all of them and treat them with the seriousness that the community deserves.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I think I have.....

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. junior member for St. Joseph caught my eye first.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I am not against an amendment of this sort, but the amendment merely says "for other development projects." Now, Sir, this is very wide, and I would like to know from the Minister if he will explain to this House any of the projects he has in mind, because no sooner than we pass this tonight, it will be left for the Government to do whatever they like, because they did not commit themselves. They have merely said "for other development projects," but surely the Minister could have told us some of the projects he has in mind. I believe the Minister has something in mind which caused him to ask leave of this House to make this amendment. I believe they have come up against something and would like to pass freely, and surely the Minister could let us know something because I am very unhappy at this moment although I intend to vote for it. As long as we pass this, we cannot say anything more, and I am sure that if I have to say anything about it at a later stage, the Minister will rise on a point of order and say that I agreed to it. It may be something I cannot see eye to eye with, or it may be something for which I may give him the O.K., but surely he could tell us what he has in mind, whether he does not have the money to pay for something, and since we have some funds lying down at the moment he wants to make the change over. I hope the Minister will explain this before it is put to the vote.

Now, Sir, the hon. senior member for St. Peter spoke about the development of built up areas. There are a lot of people in this country who have land which they would like to develop, but there are no means of getting into this land, and under the Tenantry Owners Scheme the Government cannot buy land from a particular owner to make this road. If the owner says he is not giving you this road, the matter ends there; but there are a lot of people behind this land who would like to develop the land, and they cannot pass through because A has forbidden them from passing unless they are going to buy the land, and the Government's hands are tied at the moment. In other words, I may have land and a road to it, but there are some people behind my land with whom I do not agree, and I do not want them to share in the same privilege that I have; so I prevent the authorities from passing through my land to give it to these other persons.

I am asking the Minister, as this money is for other development projects, to bear in mind what I have just drawn to his attention and to change the Act or the Agreement so that he will be able to buy over the bit of land from the particular owner who does not want you to pass through to give other facilities to the people. You should buy the land from them so that you can build a road for the entire set of people in that area. I am agreeing to this, but I would like you to take into consideration what I have said. I know you represent an agricultural area, but there may be some people in your constituency who have come up against the same snag where A has a road and because he does not like B in the back of him, he refuses to let the authorities pass through to make a road. There are a lot of people who cannot develop the land only because people have prevented them passing through, and now that you are getting this Act amended and getting permission to spend this money for developing areas, wherever anything as I have just raised occurs, I am asking the present Government to make the law such that the particular owner will be paid for the bit of land so as to allow the authorities to go through with a road and build up the area and develop it also.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member in charge of this Resolution should give us a little information. I do not want to pin any hon. Minister down in pin-pointing any particular property or properties or anything of the sort, since I do not think it would be fair. If you take Head 9 — Miscellaneous, Item 7 — Land Acquisition, it is stated in the explanatory note that the provision should be applied to the purchase of land for hotel sites. When we passed the Estimates and passed \$500,000, we were aware that the Government asked for \$500,000 for the purpose of acquiring land compulsorily or otherwise for hotel sites; therefore that was settled and no change could be made in that without the approval of the Legislature, if we believe in the democratic form of Assembly. Now we are asked, and rightly so, in view of the fact that this pins Government down only to hotel sites and they could hardly take the money to put into anything else, to add "for other development projects." I do not want the Minister to think that I am trying to let out any Cabinet secret, but surely he could give us some explanation on "other development projects." I would not say like the last speaker that it is a wide berth, but I would say it is a rather wide scope.

7.30 p.m.

To ask us to say that you have \$500,000 which we approved of in the Capital Estimates under the particular Head and the Item "Land Acquisition" which was provided for hotel sites to be used also for buying land for other projects, let us say, to be used for building a market or anything like that, not set out, now that you have changed what it was set out for to give you such wide scope, I think it is necessary for us to know more; otherwise we are giving you a blank cheque. Any member on this side of the Chamber would certainly ask for what other development projects do you want this to provide.

As we know, some of us do not agree with the idea of buying land to provide hotel sites: some of us do not agree with the idea of Government financing hotels; but when you are in authority and that is the view of Government and you do things which you conscientiously think should be done, that is all well and good.

Mr. Speaker, you will recall that I am not getting on the band wagon of a Government who attempts to sponsor hotels or hotel development. I say this to all those who do not believe in Government-sponsoring hotel sites. I belong to the Party which pioneered the idea of the tourist or hotel industry and I was accused of voicing sentiments for the purpose of only trying to put more money into certain people's pockets and thus encouraging race prejudice and all sorts of things.

On the question of buying land for hotel sites, we definitely voted for that. Now you have come back because you want to have a wider scope to say, if you do not use this \$500,000 for hotel development you want to use it for something else. I do not think that is quite fair to us. May I put it this way? If rumour is not a lying jade, we know of one business in Barbados which has not shown a prosperous

balance sheet and it is a business which quite possibly the quick thinking men of the Government would say: "Let us acquire this." I did not want to mention on the floor of this House this particular business; may be, members of the Government know about it already. Let us take this instance. The land on which the Blackwood Dock is sited belongs to the Government of this country. By saying this, perhaps, I may be revealing something to babes and sucklings of this House if I may so call it. This dock belongs to a public company, but it has not been looking quite prosperous in recent times. We are not the largest country in the area of the Eastern Caribbean, but the most progressive of the Eight. Lest that business goes out of existence, I would be one to say that the Government will be very well advised because of our inter-colonial trade and what it means between here and the other islands to acquire that business. This is the only place in the Eight with a dock and it might be well that we acquire that business. I do not know if that is what the Government has in mind. Perhaps, that is what the Government has in mind when it says "for other development projects."

It is well that the Government let us know something. We agree with the principle of acquiring land for hotel development; but as we share the same responsibility as you when we were sent here, it is very well that we know what these other development projects are. You have asked us to give you a wider scope and I think it is absolutely necessary for the Hon. Minister to tell us something of what the Government has in mind when it says "for other development projects". There are so many other development projects. Have you got in mind the idea of acquiring land for low cost housing? Have you got in mind the idea, instead of having big large hotels, to acquire land for those who are already in possession to run? Tell us what you have in mind. "Other development projects" may mean something pertaining to hotels or not to hotels. As the hon. junior member for St. Joseph has said, when we hear further you may have invested this money in schooners or motor vessels or something which we might say that we did not agree with. And as he further said, the people may say: "Look at the Resolution which was passed in the House of Assembly for \$500,000 for land acquisition and set out to be applied for the acquisition of land for hotel sites, and now we are asked to add further to that note so that it would apply for other development projects as well."

It is quite obvious that this Government has discussed among themselves collectively what are the other development projects which they have in mind, and it is your duty and in keeping with the constitution of this country to come here to get approval for the spending of the money for other development projects as well; but you must tell us what the other development projects are. You may not mention any particular thing, but it is absolutely necessary that you give us a rough idea. Any member who takes his responsibility seriously could not view this matter lightly.

I see the Hon. Minister of Agriculture nodding his head to suggest that I sit down and let him explain. The other seven of these Islands and us depend on the intercolonial trade. We are the most progressive place of these Islands. We are the only place which has a dock and it would be madness to let it go out of business, not to say anything of the employees who would be put out of work; and if we let this dock go out of business and the schooners and so on would have to go to a foreign country like Trinidad or Puerto Rico, owing to your not being able to dock them here, we know what it would mean. Do not take advantage of your position and your numbers. Tell us what 'other development projects' mean.
7.40 p.m.

Do not let the hon. member take advantage of his position and of his numbers and of the numerical strength in this House; but let him tell us of other development projects and we will be satisfied. My colleague and I will be able to tell our constituents about them and when my opponents get up and say that I said so and so, I will say: "I stand by what I say." If I say I agree with anything, then I agree with it and if I say "No", then I do not agree with it.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the hon. member will take what I have said in good faith. (A MEMBER: Question.) Do

not let the hon. member call "Question" because we are entitled to know whatever development projects are being undertaken. If during the consideration of the Estimates you put in here the item "Development Projects, \$500,000" under Head 9 "Miscellaneous" Item 7, not one member of this House who is worth his salt could honestly say that he could give you a vote like that. If you had just put in that item, none of us would pass it without asking about these development projects.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the House is more than eager to supply the necessary information which is being sought, provided that he is given an opportunity to do so.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am quite willing to give the hon. member the opportunity, but the Hon. Premier has said that he cannot understand why I have to say things 27 times. Sometimes I have to say things over and over again in order to catch the ear of the Government.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the Hon. Leader of the Opposition were to give way, the Hon. Leader of the House would supply the necessary information.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I hope that Your Honour will not be mistaken. If that is so, I will bow to Your Honour and I will sit, but it must be remembered that we are not now in Committee.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, while I agree with some of the submissions made by the hon. member, I cannot agree with all of them. In my opinion, when the Government was granted the authority to expend this \$500,000 for the purpose of purchasing hotel sites, it was given just as much a blank cheque then as is now being asked for by the amendment to this note. The hon. senior member for the City of Bridgetown must realise that the Government has a sense of responsibility and if it is given a mandate from the House or rather from the Legislature to utilise this sum for the purposes asked for, then the Government must discharge its responsibility with the full sense that it has to give some account not only to the Legislature but also to the public. The hon. senior member for St. Peter has made mention of a progress report. By that I assume he means that from time to time the Government would inform the Legislature and the public how this vote is being expended and for what purpose.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order. I have to take every opportunity of saying what I want to say. Is the hon. member saying that, in respect of other development projects, before they embark on them, they will give this House the information? That is all I wanted to know. I will sit down by saying that the hon. member is saying that the Government will be prepared, having asked for this money in respect of hotels and now they are asking for it in respect of other development projects, they will come to this House and say that they will embark on these other development projects.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member knows that that is not what I mean. The hon. senior member for St. Peter has suggested that we submit to the House a progress report as regards the expenditure of the money in relation to these projects, and with that I am in complete agreement. I see no reason why the Government should not inform the Legislature from time to time as to the manner in which the money is being expended. It is impossible for any member of the Government to say in detail how this money will be spent. This money is earmarked for the acquisition of land for hotel sites now. The hon. senior member for St. Peter talked about the Hilton Hotel; I think it is public knowledge that this money is not for the Hilton Hotel. We propose to utilise the land which we already own; we were negotiating for land at Dover, but the negotiations broke down because the money asked for was more than we could afford to pay. We have to utilise land which is already owned by the Government; the Hilton authorities were very pleased with this area when they saw it and they were only too willing to utilise it for their purposes.

What the Government has in mind is that there are numbers of projects which are developmental projects which might be acquired from this vote, but under the terms

of the Resolution as they originally were, we cannot utilise this money except for hotel sites. We have one item in mind at the moment which we think should be acquired under this vote, that is, the acquisition of land at Silver Sands for Workers' resort houses. (Cheers!) We also have in mind facilities for fishermen which the hon. senior member for Christ Church, the Hon. Minister of Agriculture will explain, for playing fields and other things in the area. The Government has already committed itself to the acquisition of this area and we thought that the money might appropriately be taken from this Head. We were not empowered to use this money as the Resolution originally stood, but as to the expenditure of this money, none of us knows how it will be expended. The House can rest assured, however, that every single cent of the money will be spent with a full appreciation of our responsibility to the public, and we will not embark at any time on any project which we cannot justify as being in the interest of the community.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I hardly think that there is any necessity for me to elaborate on this matter. It is a question of the acquisition of 15 1/2 acres of beach land with one house already standing on the land, and this is property for which the Government has been negotiating for some time.
7.50 p.m.

The price is considered reasonable at \$96,000 for 15 1/2 acres of land and a house, and the Government did not lose the opportunity of securing what would be considered a bargain and has already accepted the offer. This is really the first development plan in this lump sum of \$1/2 million which has been earmarked for hotel sites and hotel development. It is for that reason that we have to have the note in the Estimates amended so as to include "other development projects" to enable Government to acquire this land at Silver Sands for other purposes, for resort houses, for improving the facilities for the fishing industry and fishermen, for a playing fields, a park and other public purposes. I think the hon. member is satisfied, and I will not waste any more time.

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

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask leave that the next Order of the Day be the amendments from the Other Place to the Bill to amend the Perjury Act.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is asking leave of the House to proceed with a matter which has been returned from the Other Place with certain amendments to the Bill intituled an Act to consolidate and simplify the law relating to perjury and kindred offences, and if there is no objection, leave will be granted. I hear no objection, and leave is granted.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, the amendments are very simple and appear on pages 6 and 7 of the Bill. In line 9 of section 6 on page 6, instead of the words "of conviction" it should read "on conviction", and in line 5 of subsection 2 of section 12 on page 9, instead of the words "or with attempting to suborn", it should read "or for attempting to suborn". Those are the only two amendments by the Other Place to this Bill; they are very simple and of no significance, and I beg to move that these amendments be now read a first time.

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

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

On separate motions of Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, seconded in each case by Hon. C. E. TALMA, the amendments were read a second time and agreed to.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, the other amendments are to the Bill to determine and regulate the powers, privileges and immunities of both Chambers of the Legislature and of the members thereof, and I am asking leave to take this as the next Order.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is asking leave to take the amendments to the Bill to determine and regulate

the powers, privileges and immunities of both Chambers of the Legislature and of the members thereof as the next Order, and if there is no objection, leave will be granted. Hearing no objection, leave is granted the hon. member.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, the first amendment to this Bill is on page 8 in section 11, subsection (1) where we are substituting after the word "Chamber" in line 3 the word "or" for the word "of". In line 7 of section 14 (2) (b) on page 12, instead of the words "no evidence shall", we are substituting the words "nor shall evidence".

I beg to move that these amendments be now read a first time.

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

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

On the separate motions of Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, seconded in each case by Hon. C. E. TALMA, the amendments were read a second time and agreed to.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I know that hon. members are anxious to get away because they are hungry and what not, but I want to crave their indulgence to do one item which is completely uncontroversial and stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Michael. This is Order No. 6 which is a Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of certain land at Kent, Christ Church.

I beg to move that Order No. 6 be the next Order of the Day.

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

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

RESOLUTION re COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT KENT, CHRIST CHURCH

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution seeks to approve the compulsory acquisition of all that certain piece or parcel of land part of the lands of a place called Kent situate in the parish of Christ Church and Island of Barbados containing by admeasurement 152 square feet or thereabouts abutting and bounding on lands formerly of Kent but now or late of Mrs. A. D. Crompton and other lands now or late of Kent and now or late of Mr. K. Murphy and on the public road known as Highway "R" or however else the same may abut and bound.

The Addendum sets out, Mr. Speaker, that negotiations with the owners of this parcel of land were successfully concluded, but in investigating the title, certain legal technicalities arose for which it is thought advisable to use the provisions of the Land Acquisition Act in order that the matter may be completed without any further delay.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, this is not controversial, but I really want a few questions answered, and I believe the Minister of Agriculture will be able to answer them.
8.00 p.m.

According to the Addendum, it is stated: "Negotiations with the owners of this parcel of land were successfully concluded, but in investigating the title certain legal technicalities arose for which it is thought advisable to use the provision of the Land Acquisition Act in order that the matter can be completed without any further delay."

What is the land wanted for?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: To widen the road.

Mr. SPEAKER: This question and answer I cannot allow to go on.

Mr. MOTTLEY: In the Schedule you say "All that certain piece or parcel of land part of the lands of a place called Kent situate in the parish of Christ Church and Island of Barbados containing by admeasurement 152 square feet or thereabouts."

Is this to widen the corner? What on earth would you want this for except for the purpose of paying somebody money? You talk of getting a title for it. This is a piece of land belonging to Kent and you say in the Addendum that negotiations with the owners of this land were successfully concluded. Are they giving you the piece of land or are they selling you?

I am serious about this matter. I believe, and you can put this down, that anybody in this Island who owns land — plantation or private individual — which bounds a corner should be made to give you the piece of land if the corner is a menace to the public. I say so if it is my land or anybody else's. I have always said so, so long as the corner becomes a menace to the public. I am no Communist, but I am saying that you should take it. That is how I feel about it. I am a real estate broker, and not once or twice I have advised my principals to give up a piece of land for such a purpose. I can name those whom I have advised in like manner. We went up by the corner of Wilkey, and I advised my principals to give that land away to the public.

This is parsimonious. I do not care if it is the owners of Kent or whoever it is. If the solicitors do not like what I say, it is a matter for them. This 152 square feet of land is not as much as the table which you have in here. You say in the Addendum that in investigating the title certain legal technicalities arose. What technicalities are they?

I see the Hon. Minister of Agriculture wants to get up. I will sit down.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: What I think the hon. senior member for the City of Bridgetown is losing sight of is that despite the fact that the negotiations were successfully concluded with the owners, if the title is not free from doubt, the question is to whom must this money be paid. The title of the land is defective and it is for that reason that the Land Acquisition Act is invoked.

The hon. member is also presuming that this land forms part of plantation land. This land forms part of a property and not the plantation as such.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Schedule says: "lands formerly of Kent but now or late of Mrs. A. D. Crompton".

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

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: That ends Government Business for the day.

THE ADJOURNMENT

The Order Paper having been fixed,

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until next Tuesday, 12th February, 1963, at 2.30 o'clock in the afternoon.

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

8.10 p.m.