THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1962

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 25th June, 1963.

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 12.00 o'clock (noon) today.

PRESENT

His Honour J. E. T. BRANCKER, Q.C., *(Speaker);* Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P.; Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY, C.B.E., *(Leader of the Opposition);* Mr. E. St.A. HOLDER, J.P.; Mr. J. W. CORBIN; Mr. S. E. SEALEY; Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON, *(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, J.P., *(Deputy Speaker)* and Mr. J. B. YEARWOOD.

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: I beg to inform the House that the Minutes are not ready, as on several previous meetings, but the Acting Clerk has assured me that at the next meeting all the Minutes of the previous meetings up to the end of last week should be completed and ready for confirmation.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICES

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. junior member for St. Joseph can proceed by giving notice of his Resolution:

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, it reads as follows:-

WHEREAS the people living in districts like Branchbury, Surinam Village, St. Silvan's Village in the parish of St. Joseph, and Martin's Bay in St. John, are urgently in need of the service of the Barbados Light and Power Company, Limited,

AND WHEREAS such service is often less than a half mile away from these areas, and similar areas in the Island

BE IT RESOLVED that this House invite the Government to approach the Barbados Light and Power Company, Limited, with a view to investigate and implement the extension of the service immediately into those districts aforementioned, and to such districts in the Island where the service is less than half of a mile away.

QUESTIONS

Mr. SPEAKER: There is a question by the hon. senior member for St. James, but he is not in his place.

The First Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Leader of the House, but it will be borne in mind that last Friday the Hon. Leader of the House intimated to hon. members that he proposed to deal with the debate on Federation today. I think we should resume the debate.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD and Mr. BATSON entered the House and took their seats.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: This is Order No. 9 under Government Business, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: You will recall, however, that there was no change made on the Order Paper, when we adjourned last Friday. Therefore, it is my duty to call No. 1 of the Orders of the Day standing in the name of the Hon. Leader of the House.
12.25 p.m.

I think it is clear to hon. members, despite the assurance given by the Hon Leader of the House last Friday, because we have not changed the Order Paper and the items on the Order Paper remain as they are, that I must call them in order, that is (1), (2), (3) and so on.

Mr. SPEAKER: Before the Orders of the day have been proceeded with, it has been intimated to me by the Hon. Leader of the House that there are two Replies to Questions to be given notice of and he has asked me to allow him to lay them. I gather there is no objection.

NOTICE OF REPLIES TO QUESTIONS

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: As Your Honour has been informed, there is no document to be laid, but there are two Replies to Questions to be laid. The first is the Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 76 asked by the hon. junior member for St. Joseph on the 9th October, 1962. The second is Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 120 asked by the hon. senior member for St. Joseph on the 23rd April last.

LEAVE TO TAKE ORDER NO. 9

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: With regard to Government Business for today, Your Honour will recall that at the last meeting, on the 21st June, the Government gave the undertaking that at the beginning of Government Business today the first item which would be dealt with was the question of Federation. I therefore beg to move in accordance with that undertaking that Order No. 9 be the first Order of the day.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 9 is to resume the debate on the Resolution to support the proposals contained in the statement made by the Hon. Premier in the Hon. House on 11th June, 1963, on the character of proposed Federation of the Seven British Caribbean Territories and particularly to approve, amend and endorse the proposal that the new Federation should be independent from the establishment of the first elected Federal Government.

On the adjournment of the debate the hon. senior member for the City, seconded by the hon. senior member for St. Joseph, moved that further consideration should be postponed. If the honourable member cares he can now proceed.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I did not think that I would have been called upon in less than a year to again give approval to a Resolution dealing with the Report of the Eastern Caribbean Conference of 1962 when I had expressed on the floor of this House that members of my Party and those whose views I represent in this House were all in favour of a closer association or, in other words, a federated West Indies of the Eight which has now turned out to be the Seven. To the laymen it seems rather confusing that the hon. gentlemen who are the leaders of these areas should have had to change so soon after agreeing in the several Legislatures in each territory to what had been discussed in England.

You will recall, Sir, that on the motion before this House which was brought by the Government on the last occasion that I then offered an amendment which was defeated and in that amendment I said that provided of course this House reserved the right to reconsider the position of Barbados in a Federation of the Eastern Caribbean if the Fiscal Commissioner revealed that the cost of such would involve a further financial burden on this Island to the detriment of the present standards of living of the inhabitants of the Island.

Today I still feel so and those are still the views of those whom I represent. We are asked today to agree to the following Resolution after the presentation of a statement by the Hon. Premier. There were many who became rather alarmed until he came here last week and cleared up what some of us thought to be a daring departure from what I consider to be constitutional propriety in that the statement issued by him and which was not issued simultaneously as that issued in London, gave us and the general public some cause for alarm. When I say us I mean those of us who do not have the opportunity of sitting around the Conference Table.

The statement reads thus: "In preparation for this Conference, Mr. Nigel Fisher, M.P., Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies, had discussions in Barbados with the Chief Ministers of the Seven territories on 24th May to 31st May. These discussions revealed a significant divergence of opinion between the Governments concerned. Some of the differences arose from further reflection upon the original proposals while others arose from consideration of recent expert studies of the administrative, fiscal and to reservations by three of them."

Mr. Speaker, anyone studying the 1962 Report and then reading that would be alarmed and would begin to wonder what was operating in the minds of the leaders of these territories but we have since listened to the Hon. Minister of Finance, the Hon. Leader of the House, and other members of this Chamber who represented the Island at that Conference, and the Hon. Premier has dogmatically declared on the floor of this House that this particular paragraph is a misrepresentation of the facts as they actually appeared and happened at the Conference.

The Hon. Premier has actually read out the cable which was sent to the Secretary of State condemning the insertion of this phrase in this paragraph in this White Paper which gives a report of this Conference. It is a result of the postponement of the further Conference which was to be held in London in June.
12.35 p.m.

It has resulted in the postponement of a further Conference which was to be held in London in June. Before I go any further on this matter we are hoping – and I believe that every hon. member of this House is hoping that – as to this condemnation of inserting into this Document what has been described and what would cause much alarm as a misrepresentation of fact, when a reply is received by this Government we will be treated with the courtesy and, in fact, the people of this island who listened to the Premier's Speech, of seeing what the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies would have to say. At a Conference of such high level with men of the calibre of the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies, the Hon. Premier and two Hon. Members of the Other Place – two very distinguished legal luminaries – with His Excellency the Governor presiding and with a very competent officer, I understand, acting as Secretary, we are in some doubt and we are groping in the dark as to what, in actual fact, had transpired; and how did that paragraph get into this Report which was presented to the House? I say no more of that, but I do say this; we do hope that the reply to the cable which was sent condemning this matter will be brought to the House and the public for us to see and to learn the truth of the matter.

Mr. Speaker, to deal more closely with and to scrutinise this White Paper as presented to this Honourable Chamber we are asked now for the second time to agree to this matter. I may set the minds of hon. members at rest when I say that we do agree that there should be a form of Federation and we agree that, as soon as possible, you should have this form of Federation. Now the proposed Resolution with which we are asked to agree reads as follows:-

"WHEREAS the people of seven British Eastern Caribbean territories through their several Legislatures, have agreed to establish, and enter into, a Federation of their territories....."

That is nothing new because it has been agreed upon before. That has been brought before this Legislature and the several Legislatures of this territory have agreed upon it apparently with one exception. You will notice that on the last occasion my Party offered an amendment to the Resolution and we still stand by that amendment; I am more than confident that the Government will have to come around to that amendment. This Resolution goes on as follows:-

"WHEREAS they possess the untrammelled right to act freely and responsibly in determining the nature, purposes and functions of such a Federation, and

WHEREAS the Regional Council of Ministers, composed as it is of the Heads of Democratically elected Governments of the area, has at its recent meeting with the Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies in the United Kingdom Government, outlined its views on the character of the Federation to be established, and

WHEREAS these views are embodied in a Statement made before this Honourable House by the Honourable Premier on Tuesday 11th June, 1963, and are set out as Appendix "A" of the said Statement.

BE IT RESOLVED that this House supports the proposals contained in that document, and particularly approves commends and endorses the proposal that the new Federation should be independent from the establishment of the first elected Federal Government."

As a matter of fact, this last paragraph has completely disarmed a number of us who had prepared and made our case for coming in here, after reading the White Paper, and offering tremendous criticism. However, Sir, let us take the Statement as brought before us by the Premier which would result in our agreeing or disagreeing with the Statement. As I said before, less than a year ago after a Conference in England held by the same leaders they got back to their territories and they all agreed that we should have a Federation on the conditions as set out in this White Paper. At the outset, I am saying that I am again offering an amendment to this Resolution because I do not agree, as I am asked to do, with this Resolution as a whole. I shall not tire the House with reading the entire White Paper but I will select sections of the White Paper which leave many of us in doubt because we really do not follow quite clearly what is wanted. Let me make the position quite clear. I believe myself that in this matter we are to give and take. In this matter Barbados must learn that she has to give up something and the other islands will also have to give up something, if we want to come together for the benefit of

nationhood, for the benefit of independence and for the benefit of our children's children, which coming together will bring prosperity of some sort in the distant or not distant future.

Mr. Speaker, paragraph 2 of Appendix "A" to this Statement reads as follows:-

"The Federal Government when established and the Unit Governments accept the arrangement that the United Governments will continue to administer the departments responsible for the collection of Income Tax, the provision of Postal Services and the Local Police Forces for a period of five years from the inception of the Federation at the end of which period the position will be reviewed by the Federal and Unit Governments, subject to the proviso by the Government of Antigua that any Unit Government not agreeing to transfer any of these services to the Federal Government should have the right to continue to administer such services."

Mark well, at the end of this period of five years from the inception of the Federation, the position will be reviewed by the Federal and Unit Governments subject to this Proviso.
12.45 p.m.

When I came in here on the last occasion, I said that the country should reserve the right to review the matter from time to time because Federation was going to cost Barbados so much money that it would affect the people. Today, they have returned here and told us:

"The Federal Government when established and the Unit Governments accept the arrangement that the Unit Governments will continue to administer the departments responsible for the collection of Income Tax, the provision of Postal Services and the Local Police Forces for a period of five years from the inception of the Federation at the end of which period the position will be reviewed by the Federal and Unit Governments, subject to the proviso by the Government of Antigua that any Unit Government not agreeing to transfer any of these services to the Federal Government should have the right to continue to administer such services."

I ask what every Barbadian would ask. Let us reserve the right to reconsider our position regarding the question of taxation.

Since then, Sir, hon. members are aware that a Commission was set up by a very distinguished lady, Mrs. Hicks, I do not think anybody at all in Barbados agrees with her pronouncement, within three days in the area, when she said that the position as she saw it indicated that those areas could be made economically viable. I can understand her position because she would have seen all the economic data regarding the areas before leaving England and, brilliant lady as she is, would be able to come to that conclusion. She came to that conclusion, I suppose, because, realising that Barbados as an area in the territory has never been grant-aided while the other territories were grant-aided, she felt that the areas could be made economically viable. Possibly she did not like our method of accounting, and she may have thought that some of the money should go towards capital works, etc., etc. As an economist, she came to the conclusion that if she separated certain things she could find money for running the Administration. That is why she, possibly, used the words "economically viable."

Those of us who have read the Report know that she said it would take something like $13 million to run the Federation. That is a lot of money to spend on administration. It must be remembered that 750,000 people in a poverty-stricken area are involved. If I recall rightly the Premier predicted that it would cost $4 million. We realise that it will cost us more than the other Islands. I observe that the Regional Council of Ministers have, religiously, not touched upon this point, nor have they told us anything about certain matters.

Those of us who must think in terms of federating with the other Islands must first think in terms of economics. We are not saying that, if it is going to cost us more money than we are spending now, we will not join the Federation because that would be nonsense. We cannot afford to stand alone, and we agree to join the others. We are not prepared to say Federation at any price and to give them a blank cheque. That is why we thought it best to rely on the fiscal survey, which report we now have in hand. We cannot say that we are happy about the Report, because some of the salaries recommended in it will make us afraid to do anything. The salaries for expatriates and so on. I will deal with later. I am sure that the people who have their buckets let down in Barbados must be very worried as to where they stand in a Federation which will be operated at a cost of $13 million.

However, I believe that the mistakes which have been made in the old Federation will be of great benefit to those who are now clamouring for a new Federation, especially those who have not been in the old Federation. I sincerely feel that the mistakes will be of great benefit to all concerned. We now have to deal with paragraph 2 of Appendix "A"

At the outset, let me say that I am not agreeing with this paragraph at all. Hon. members know that less than a year ago we agreed to certain things. The Regional Council of Ministers are saying that Antigua can pull out if it wants to, and it can keep income tax and so on. What will be left to run the Federal Government, if we agree to that? In my view, the first thing we have to decide on is the question of customs union. When the customs union starts working, we will then realise what our economic position is. If you read carefully, you will see what they want to do. It states:

"The Federal Government when established and the Unit Governments accept the arrangements that the Unit Governments will continue to administer the departments responsible for the collection of Income Tax, the provision of Postal Services and the Local Police Forces for a period of five years from the inception of the Federation at the end of which period the position will be reviewed by the Federal and Unit Governments, subject to the proviso by the Government of Antigua that any Unit Government not agreeing to transfer any of these services to the Federal Government should have the right to continue to administer such services."

You will agree that they can do that, but anybody with any sense of business will realise what that means. In England, I said that there should be a unified form of taxation for income tax. When I sit and listen to the agreement regarding the question of allowances, I am a bit surprised. I am not going to hide these things from the public. Certain things will still be left in the hands of the Ministers of Government of the territories. In Barbados Companies are to pay 40%. If you agree that this should be the rate of tax within the area, but you leave the exemptions and the allowances to the unit territory, what is to prevent a territory from reducing it to 15% in the dollar and to make a change in the allowances? The allowances will be left in the hands of territorial Governments, and if changes are made, they would deplete the amount of money which the Fiscal Department and the Income Tax Department of the Federal Government would expect to raise.
12.55 p.m.

This is a political matter and if for instance it is felt that within the territory although there are these fixed rates of income tax for the entire area — Barbados allowances are so much for a married man, so much per child, so much for sickness and so much for a doctor — if we say $1,200 for a married man and they can turn and say $2,000 for a married man, you can see how it can be depleted. I am not agreeing with this part of the debate and later on I am going to offer an amendment.

We go further. In paragraph 7 of Appendix "A" it is stated, "That the terms of the financial assistance to be

given to the Federal Government and Unit Governments by Her Majesty's Government during the ten year period 1963-1973 be settled at the Conference to be held in June 1963 or later as the Secretary of State may decide, and should provide for open grants for administrative purposes, grants for administrative purposes, grants for establishing the Federation, Development Grants and Development Loans."

Now, how can I disagree with this? This is only a question of playing with words. I am bound to agree with this paragraph, and it seems so sensible that there is nothing I can add than to say that it is just different words, different phraseology, but it is no different because legally trained men have drawn it up. It goes back to the same thing we want to know and we want to be able to know, that is, what are we going to get? We are not to be cast off just like that. Everybody will agree to the appointment of Interim Federal Ministers to carry on Federal business. That is what happened in the last Federal Government. We agree with that but what I am worried about is sub-paragraph 4 of paragraph 7 with reference to the appointment of a Governor-General and creation of a Federal Council of Ministers into a body corporate with power to legislate by regulations made by the Governor-General on the advice of the Federal Council limited to a number of subjects.

Honourable members should not take these Papers home and do not look at them and say that because legal men have drafted them that I am not good at that. This says "limited to a number of subjects, such steps as are necessary for the launching of a Federation."

I am going to confess, Mr. Speaker, I cannot see that the power for the enactment of legislation by the Governor-General even on the advice of the Council of Ministers should just be given to the legislation enacted and nothing more done. In other words, what I am asking and what I would like the Hon. Premier or the Minister in charge to let me know is this. Should it not be that immediately after the elections which it sets out here, within six months or a given period that such legislation as has been passed on the recommendation of the Council of Ministers under Regulations made by the Governor General should come before the Federal Legislature for ratification or otherwise? In other words I take it, Sir, that although the Resolution says that whereas they possess the untrammelled right to act freely and responsibly in determining the nature, purposes and functions of such a Federation, there is no mandate giving them.

Let us take the present Government. While you have a mandate to act for the people of this country and while you did say that you would go into Federation, there is no mandate to say that you should enact legislation. The most that you can say is that you have in your Manifesto a paragraph that you would pilot us in a Federation, but who is to tell, human nature being what it is!

(A VOICE: The West Indies have just drawn the Test.)

Mr. MOTTLEY: That is very good news.

Mr. SPEAKER: We are dealing with Federation.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I was speaking on sub-paragraph 4 of paragraph 7 of Appendix "A" which says that the Federal Council of Ministers into a body corporate will have power to legislate by regulations made by the Governor General on a limited number of subjects. I suppose that is the way of doing it. What I am afraid of and what you must be guaranteed is the limited number of subjects with which this Federal Council of Ministers would deal with. In his reply to this Chamber, the Hon. Premier must tell us what is the limited number of subjects.

I do not object that you should have this corporate body, this Federal Council of Ministers to advise, but if this is the scientific way of bringing into being the Federation then the legislation which they have the right to pass must at some time when the Federal Chamber is elected be brought before the Federal Chamber, as I repeat, to be ratified or otherwise dealt with and we should know the number of subjects with which they would have the power to deal. You cannot merely come to us in this House of Assembly and say that they have the power to legislate for a number of subjects. We appreciate that you have to recommend for appointments to the Federal Civil Service because you have here that the Civil Service Commission will make these appointments, but human nature being what it is, who is to tell what will happen between now and 1965 if the leaders of the various territories including Barbados under the appointment of a Governor General have the power to pass legislation without coming back to the Federal Government for approval. Human nature being what it is, let us say there is a different political party, with different views being given the seats in the Federal Government, what will happen? Who can tell that the same thing which happened in Jamaica and Trinidad would not happen in these territories when certain political views of the local Legislature and people of different ideology were elected to the Federal Legislature. What would be the position?

Throughout the West Indies, with the exception of Jamaica and Trinidad today, people are still individualistic and you have not built up that party system like that in England and Jamaica. You still have individuals. In Barbados people are still individualistic. Mr. Speaker, you know that better than any member of the House because it has been demonstrated to you that it does not matter, this party or that party, if a particular person is liked, if their views are appreciated, that person would be returned to the House. What happened in Jamaica? We had another Party from the one which was running the Government at the time being given the majority of seats in the Federal Legislature. We had a similar thing happening in Trinidad, therefore that would be the position if we agreed lock, stock and barrel to this section, in which it is stated that the Council of Ministers can advise the Governor General what to do on the recommendation to certain key posts. We agree to that, but suppose in keeping with Mrs. Hicks' recommendations we appoint these key posts at these salaries and these people who are elected to the Federal Legislature eventually say that these salaries are too high for the Federal Government to pay.

1.05 p.m.

What is going to be the position? Another golden handshake to remove people? Would it not be better to say that this Council of Ministers should recommend for key positions persons now holding offices in the seven territories until the setting up, or the election of, the Federal Government? I think that that would come with better grace and better taste for us all. The Premier must tell us what are these subjects that we can legislate for. A number of subjects can be from one to a million. It might be all right for the back-benchers who have been taken into confidence but how can we say that we can legislate for a number of subjects? We know nothing of the subjects for which they intend to legislate. While I agree in principle that you must have some machinery for bringing about and setting up your pre-Federal Organization, I cannot agree that you must leave it blank like this, that these Ministers can legislate for these subjects. You are going to deal with this matter immediately; you are going to legislate for these subjects and I am wondering if it is not better to say that at a given period after the election this thing will happen. Nobody knows who will win the Election; I say that it is better to say that this will take place after such legislation as is passed on the advice of this Council of Ministers by the Legislature.

On the question of the experience of the last Federal Government, I am sure that hon. members will appreciate what actually happened with the first West Indian Fedration which lasted for just around four years. We then became the laughing-stock of our brothers in Africa whom we argued are less advanced politically, intellectually and educationally than we; yet they have been all held together much better than we have been able to hold together. I believe that what is running through this entire structure for the development of the new Federation will have to be far removed if it must succeed. One wonders why was it that on the last occasion there was an amendment that you should

give dual responsibility or opportunity to members of the various territories to serve in the Federal and in the territorial Legislatures, but they could only draw a salary from one Legislature and that they should not serve administratively in both. Some people thought that that was nonsense. There are two things which are operating in the minds of the Leaders of this area. One is the question of power and the other is the question of finance. I am a realist and I say that nobody will expect the Leader of Antigua or the Leader of St. Kitts or the Leader even of Montserrat to give up his position which carries with it a handsome stipend comparatively speaking — nobody will expect that any of them would leave his area and run for the Federal Government unless that would be more beneficial to him. Some people who are in politics like power and others like economic power. Relative to the experience which we have had from the last Federation, I believe that everybody in this House knows well what has happened, that is to say that the Federal Labour Party got a number of seats and Dr. Eric Williams proclaimed from the housetop that he was not of the Socialist Party. However, immediately for power that Party came together and made an amendment so as to be able to capture the Government; they made a way where people who were not socialists could come in. They got some sort of hotch-potch incompatibility and called themselves a Party with a result that there was always a bickering and rowing. It was like a pavement without cement; you had one set saying that they are socialists and another set saying that they are not socialists. I cannot say like the socialists that I am not a personal friend of Mr. Nigel Fisher nor am I going to say that Mr. Fisher would stay in the way of anything or that he would like to see West Indians go to England and the like. I am not so foolish or gullible; I have not got to that age yet where I could make such a statement and expect that people would believe me. Therefore, Sir, the amendment which I am making to this Resolution would be in paragraph 4. We are asked to agree to this paragraph which states:

"WHEREAS these views are embodied in a Statement made before this Honourable House by the Hon. Premier on Tuesday 11th June, 1963 and are set out as Appendix "A" of the same statement....."

We are asked to agree with this.

Mr. SPEAKER: Has the Hon. Leader of the Opposition got a copy of his amendment or otherwise will he read it at dictation speed?

Mr. MOTTLEY: Whereas these views are embodied in a Statement made before this Hon. House.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is hardly dictation speed.

Mr. MOTTLEY: That is in the Resolution. The amendment which I am moving is the insertion of the following words at the end of paragraph 4:-

"with the exception of those contained in paragraphs 2 and 7 (4) of Appendix "A"."

In paragraph 7 (4) of Appendix "A" it says that this Federal Council of Ministers will be able to legislate for a number of subjects but the Hon. Premier has not told us what those subjects are. Even with this amendment after this legislation is passed after a certain period of the election, would the Federal Government at the end come before the Chamber?
1.15 p.m.

As I said, the political parties in the West Indies who are now in power and whose leaders will form this Regional Council of Ministers with the Governor-General may be kicked out at the next elections. There is that possibility, and we all know what is happening in some of these West Indian Islands. If the political leaders are kicked out and replaced by other people, we do not know whether they will be satisfied to carry on in the same manner. I hope that the Acting Clerk has made a note of my amendment.

One wonders, Mr Speaker, after sitting here and listening to the Ministers in this House, whether they have taken the trouble to discuss these matters. Let us take the White Paper, for instance. There is no consistency or dignity in this matter. You sit around a table and argue for days and days on a matter and then abandon it in this manner.

I happen to have been the only conservative at this particular meeting with the exception of the English representatives. It leads me to think that sometimes the Socialists are given double talk. How can they abandon this matter and then come here with paragraph 2 in Appendix "A"? I hope that the answer to the cable which the Hon. Premier has sent off condemning a part of the statement which he produced in this House and which stated that there was such a divergence of opinion that they had to put off the Conference and so on will be brought here.

It is not a question of the people in the West Indies wanting Federation; it is a question of the United Kingdom wanting to have them federated. I cannot see, for the life of me, how it could be argued after agreeing in London on certain things, why leaders of the territories should come back here and abandon all that they have said. Is it merely a question of holding political offices? Is it in the interest of bringing people together? Nobody should really feel so. They must have been a difference of opinion somewhere and some time during the last conference.

I am supporting Government in the point of view that if the statement was not made and it was written in this paper, then I consider it rank, stark dishonesty. If the Premier said that he had checked with the members of the Board and with the Secretary and nobody recalled any such statement, then it was wrong to have included such a statement. In the circumstances, I feel that the Premier must show us the cable in reply to his cable.

I agree that we should have Federation, but I cannot agree with the two paragraphs that have been put in here. We cannot agree with them because we want to know something more about these matters. As I said, Mrs. Hicks' Report has been studiously avoided. We know that Federation is going to cost us more money, and we must get worried. I suppose that the economists will tell us on the one side what it will cost us, and on the other side, what we will get from Federation.

I look forward to Federation because in these days we cannot go it alone, although there is a feeling that some of the territories with fewer people than in Barbados can do it alone. I feel that Barbados should join the Federation, but I am not supporting the Resolution as it stands.

Therefore, I beg to move that my amendment be inserted.

Mr. SEALEY: I beg to second that.
1.25 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: Has the hon. senior member for St. Michael any intention of speaking on the motion other than seconding it?

Mr. SEALEY: Yes.

Mr. SPEAKER: Therefore is the hon. member reserving the right to speak?

Mr. SEALEY: Yes.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, after hearing the speeches from the various members of this House and hearing from people outside, it has left a lot of doubt in my mind in respect of the formation of this new Federation, and since hearing the statement by the Hon. Premier and reading it and then hearing his explanation last Tuesday, that has created more doubt in my mind, so to speak.

Now, Sir, the Hon. Minister of Education introduced the Resolution asking this Honourable House to approve of it. In asking this House to approve of anything, one would feel that everything is all well with the matter that is involved. When the Hon. Minister of Education was introducing

the Resolution, he did not let us know that something was wrong with the statement which was laid by the Hon. Premier. He never said one word about it and if the Hon. Premier did not attend the last meeting, we would have approved of this Resolution without knowing that it was wrong.

Now, Sir, I would take it that something is wrong. The Minister, I am sure, should know what happened and what transpired at the Conference. He might have seen the despatch or cable from the British Government before asking us to approve of the Resolution. Something is wrong there, I do not know what it is, but this is what I am thinking. I think that the Ministers either do not know what is happening higher up or that they are trying to hide something from the people and the House because the Hon. Premier was in possession of the release since the eleventh of this month, I think. He laid it on the Table or, in other words, he read it out to us and never told us then that something was wrong. That means that from that Tuesday to last Tuesday he could only have found time to send a cable to the Secretary of State informing him that something was wrong with the statement. Bear in mind, that is a whole week. That is something, as the old saying goes, which sounds fishy.

The Hon. Premier is different from me because he has accused me of undertaking things which I cannot manage, but I believe he can manage everything which he undertakes. In my view he has not read it or is hiding something from the people of this country. It could only be a matter of minutes before we met last Tuesday that the Hon. Premier sent off his cable without giving the people at the other side or Mr. Nigel Fisher even time to despatch a cable stating one way or the other that this was a misprint or a misunderstanding. The Hon. Premier did not even give the people time enough to state their position, because there is the possibility that it could be a misprint or something of that sort, but he came on the floor of this House and instead of letting us know the real set-up of this new Federation, instead of letting us know what is likely to happen and instead of letting the people of this country know what really is the true position, all he did last Tuesday was to shower a lot of abuse on Mr. Nigel Fisher and the Imperial Government. We are in no way wiser than before. The Hon. Premier has not told us anything relative to really what transpired at Sherbourne because judging from the Resolution which the Hon. Minister of Education has placed before us and then from the statement which the Hon. Premier has explained to us, I can see that up at Sherbourne, when the Regional Council of Ministers met, must have been only a battle-ground. I can clearly see that we did not have any co-operation up there. It seems to me that it was only chaos up there judging from what I have heard and read.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I purposely refrained for quite sometime from rising on a point of order to challenge some of the numerous mis-statements made by the hon. junior member for St. Joseph. In time of course we will reply to that in detail, but his last statement is the one which has brought me to my feet. The hon. member said that judging from the text of the Resolution by the hon. junior member for St. Lucy, the Minister of Education, and from the cable read out from the House, he can see that there was chaos up at Sherbourne and that Sherbourne was a battle-ground. I will ask him to disclose one single statement from the text of the cable or the proposed Resolution to justify that statement.

Mr. SPEAKER: May I point out that this is a point of order? A point of order is a matter to which the attention of the member is directed and which is submitted to the Speaker for a decision. There is nothing in the point of order by the Hon. Minister for which I can give a decision. May I suggest to the Hon. Leader of the House who has not spoken yet in this debate that the time when he is going to reply to the other points which he thinks worthy of replying is the time when he can reply to this point too.
1.35 p.m.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I just cannot sit here and allow these misstatements to be uttered every other moment by the hon. junior member for St. Joseph. Neither the text of the Resolution nor of the cable would justify that position.

Mr. SPEAKER: The difficulty is that the Standing Order does not permit an interruption except it is a point of order or a point of elucidation. Knowing the ability of the Hon. Leader of the House, I have no doubt that when he replies he will have no difficulty in dealing with those statements which have been made by the hon. junior member for St. Joseph.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I am deeply flattered by Your Honour's Statement but it is difficult to contain one's self in the face of these distortions.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have been practising it for some time and I think I have, to a certain extent, succeeded in that.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: The hon. member should not bring facts or deductions which are not there.

Mr. SPEAKER: Any hon. member is entitled to speak and make deductions even if they are wrong; but those who speak after can reply. As to a point of order, you can only rise on that or on a point of elucidation; not a point on which we disagree or disapprove. Of course, it is entirely up to the House to review our Standing Orders and make them in such a way as to be able to deal with such occasions as are arising now, so that a point may be taken when an hon. member is addressing the House even if it is not a point of order or a point of elucidation. It is not difficult for Counsel to do that because we are accustomed to listening to Counsel on the opposite side, making our notes of points and then replying.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I believe that some apparatus has been installed below there so that when an hon. member is speaking, something flies into the ear drums of those hon. members and makes them hear something different from what the speaker has said. I believe that that apparatus is under the Premier's box. Last Tuesday the Premier said that Mr. Nigel Fisher tried to confuse the minds of some of the Ministers up there relative to these proposals, and when the Premier says that, what must I think? Must I not think that confusion was flying about and that the only person who was not confused was the Hon. Premier? It makes me think that there was a battle ground at "Sherbourne". They have decided on certain things up there but we do not know anything about them; they have left it to the gentleman to release his despatch. A cable was returned to the Governor or the Government and the Premier discovered that it was wrong. I believe that something was wrong but I also believe that the behaviour of the Ministers up there was such that Mr. Nigel Fisher tried to put in something so as to make it appear as if something was done. If the Hon. Leader of the House wants to cut off my head for putting it in that way, well, let him do so.

Mr. SPEAKER: But he cannot do that in here. *(Laughter).*

Mr. SMITH: It was not only the Premier of Barbados but all the territories selected their Premiers to guide them and every one of us is relying on the decision of those Ministers. When those Ministers meet in the conference room everything is being done except what the electors expect of the Leaders. What I am wondering now is if it is power that these people want or if they want to represent the people of these countries. That is what I would like to know. As far as I can see, these leaders only want power and if they do not get what they want, there will not be any Federation at all. They want power and that is why I say that when the Leader of any country makes these blundering mistakes, just causing him to lose his seat is not sufficient punishment for him. I repeat that it is not sufficient punishment for a leader who misleads the country, just to lose his seat.

We had an example with the last Federation and it is time enough that these leaders should get together and

formulate their own plans and present them to the people of the territories. They should do that so that when they come together with the officials from the British Government, they will be in a position to say: "This is what the people want." It is not for the British Government to tell us what we should give to the people; that is not good enough. I read that the British Government wants you to fix everything; they want you to go into the gully, pick up the wood, cook the food and then look aroud for people to say how the table must be laid. You must form everything for them. I wonder if that was what caused the Premier to let go as he did last Tuesday because he was studying this matter for too long. I am wondering if the Hon. Leader of the Opposition did not tell him that he would blow off the top of this House of Assembly if he had allowed the matter to remain from Tuesday to Tuesday. It was just a matter of minutes before the House met that the Premier despatched a cable to the Secretary of State for the Colonies. Something is wrong; I believe that the Premier waited too long in this matter.
1.45 p.m.

As the saying goes "Too late Jimmy too late; too late to contemplate." I want to know what has happened. What forced the Hon. Premier to make such a statement. He came here about three or four o'clock and in the middle of the debate he laid the statement when he knew that everything was not well with the statement.

The hon. Minister of Education brought in a Resolution asking us to confirm it as o.k. He did not say that certain irregularities were in it. The manner in which the hon. Minister presented the Resolution was so good that, if the hon. Premier did not get up and make the statement, I am sure that most of us, at least his backbenchers, would have supported it without knowing that something was wrong.

I believe something must have worried the hon. Premier and caused him at that very late stage to send off that telegram. I do not know whether his Ministers advised him to do that. I do not know who reminded him that it was a hot brick and he should throw water on it. The Premier is not a pooh-pooh man when it comes to the legal aspect of this matter. He is a man who can do whatever he undertakes. He has not even given the people in England a chance to reply to his telegram. It may have been a misprint. Perhaps things were so hot at "Sherbourne" that he did not know what to do.

I know that two men were sent somewhere to represent a particular place, and after the meeting had concluded one asked the other what had taken place at the meeting. However, both of them returned with a report. I am wondering whether the Premier is in the same position. At the last moment he comes here and tries to fool the people in this country by encouraging them to join the Federation. We have to pay for Federation, and anything that you have to pay for is not a gift.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am not sure whether the word "fool" in that context is parliamentary. I would like the hon. member to subsititute another word for the word "fool".

Mr. SMITH: Mislead.

Mr. SPEAKER: I suggest the word "coax."

Mr. SMITH: I will use the words "leads us into", because one can lead another into a ditch where he can break his neck and the leader can remain on top of the ditch. So long as one has to pay for something one is buying it. This Government is going to sell us Federation, and I do not understand the way in which it is going about this business. When one is going to buy anything the seller and the purchaser have a chance to bargain for the price of the item. One may say that the price is too high and the other may say that the price is too low. They can then barter until they arrive at an amicable settlement, and the article which was priced at $120 may be sold for 40 cents.

In this case, we have no alternative than to pay out this money when the Hon. Premier says that we have to pay this amount towards the administration of the Federation. Some members in this House and the general public will talk about it, but there is nothing we can do in the matter. When the Premier tell us how much we have to pay, he will make no apology about it either. Is it fair to the people of Barbados? Is it fair for the Hon. Premier to lead the people of Barbados into Federation without telling them what to expect?

I understand that the Premier has a degree in Economics, but some of the leaders in the other territories do not have an economist in their Governments. The Premier should be able to economise and work out things for us. If the Premier does not want to work out things in the interest of the others, he should work out things in our interest because it is his duty to do so.

You have had so many conferences with people going all over the place and spending money on air flights, hotel expenses and so on, but we have not got anywhere yet. I have to say that even the last Conference was a bogus one, judging from the remarks I have heard from the Hon. Premier. That is not good enough because the taxpayers of this country have to bear the burden of the Federation. Whether the members of this Government are right or wrong, we have to take the time from them. When they inflict taxes on us the people will have to pay it or go to jail. They have not paid the taxpayers and the people of this country the courtesy of telling them anything about what they are being led into.

I am sure that doubts have been created in the minds of the people in this country. We make promises to people and tell them things in such a way that we can twist them whenever we want to. Everyone of us, apart from the person who spoke, believed that the free school meals would have been free. Not a word was said about having to pay for these free school meals. The people were not told that they had to pay for them.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us consider the matter before the House.

Mr. SMITH: One has to be very careful, and I think I am giving the Government sufficient chance to think of these things so that they will be able to make matters quite clear when they are replying to the points I have raised. You are leading us into Federation, and you are not telling us what it is likely to cost us.
1.55 p.m.

We are going to approve of these things, but not as far as I am concerned. This Resolution is going to pass because the Government has the numbers, they have the strength and the power, so they can do most things. But, Sir, it is time now even if you do not want to lay it on the Table that we should be circularised with a statement as to what is expected to happen, how we are going about with the administration, because, as I see it, the administrative costs are going to be costly. This Federation should never cost as much as the last Federation. Taking into consideration what the Ministers had to do in the last Federation even from the point of view of travelling in their constituency, I wonder if any of them ever returned to their constituency, but they were drawing an allowance for it. According to what I remember, they were given an allowance for travelling to their constituency once every three months.

The expenses of the proposed Federation would have to be gone into thoroughly and cut down to a minimum. You should let us know how many Governor Generals we must expect because a lot of people are angling for those posts-not one. You would have to let us know about that although I feel that there should be only one. Again, almost every leader wants to be the Prime Minister and unless you fix a salary not too big to attract a certain class, you never would know what would happen. I am talking on this now, so that when the time comes, when you are going to tax us again, you would be aware of it. Of course, I do not see any thing more on which you can tax, as far as Barbados is concerned. We should know from now, how far the British Government is prepared to help the proposed Federation

financially. We should know what they are going to do with us because after we have gone into the Federation, it looks to me as if everybody is only getting anxious about getting independence. As I see it, as soon as you are elected, you want independence.

I want to know how much we are going to get and how much each island is going to contribute. All this is hard-headed business tactics. It seems to me as if you are going to build a house and the last thing you are thinking about is the money to build the house. You have already got your contractor and workmen, and you have even talked about who is going to live in that house, how many bedrooms and everything it should contain but you have not yet looked for one cent to finance it. Of course, a Government is a different thing because with a private matter you can talk whatever you like. A Government can find the money by levying a tax. However, Sir, we should know how far the British Government is going to help us. We must also bear in mind that we have got out here and cursed them up and down and have made people to believe that they are the worse things on earth, so they will not be pleased.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. SPEAKER: It now being after 2 o'clock p.m., this Sitting stands suspended until 2.30 o'clock p.m.

On re-assembling

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, there being no quorum, I ask that the Bell be rung.

Mr. SPEAKER: I thank you for drawing it to my attention.

The bell was rung and a quorum obtained.

QUESTION TIME

Mr. SPEAKER: It is now Question Time and answers have been laid this morning to Questions Nos. 76 and 120 which stand respectively in the names of the hon. junior member for St. Joseph and the hon. senior member for St Michael.

Question No. 76.

JUKE-BOXES

Mr. SMITH: To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:

Has Government's attention been drawn to the use of jukeboxes, radiograms and steel bands in residential areas, especially in the city, up to and after midnight?

2. Will Government try to curb this practice, so as to safeguard the peaceful rest of the island's inhabitants?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Sir, the Reply to the hon. member's questions is as follows:-

"The Government is aware that juke boxes, radiograms and steel bands are used, sometimes in residential areas, up to and after midnight.

2. The Government is examining means of controlling their use, where such use is likely to be a disturbance to public rest.

POLICE WOMEN

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 120:

Mr. SEALEY: To enquire of the Hon. Premier:

Is the Minister aware that female members of the Police Force are being assigned to the duty of Van Orderly which is unsuitable to them and more suitable to male members of the said Force?

2. Is the Minister aware that such an assignment creates a hardship upon such female members?

3. Will the Minister investigate the matter as soon as possible?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, the answer to Question No. 120 is as follows:-

"Female members of the Police Force act as escorts for female and juvenile prisoners on police vans. They also serve on ambulances where their knowledge of first aid is often useful in the treatment of females. Those duties are not considered unsuitable to them.

2. No, Sir.

3. No further investigation is considered necessary.

Mr. SEALEY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to know how the Hon. Minister arrived at that conclusion.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: May I ask the hon. member what conclusion he refers to.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid that you cannot ask the hon. member a question.

Mr. SEALEY: If the Hon. Leader of the House is a man, does he feel that answer is appropriate?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Any feeling I have is as a man. The position is the female police only act as escorts for female prisoners and juveniles. There is nothing wrong in that. They are not asked to escort male prisoners; they are asked to escort members of their own sex.

Mr. SPEAKER: Perhaps I should not have allowed the Supplementary Question as to the Hon. Minister's feelings as a man.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Well, Sir, I have no feeling as a woman.

Mr. COWARD: Mr. Speaker, if I may be allowed to put a supplementary question, would it surprise the Hon. Minister to know that these same policewomen also have to convey drunken men from throughout the length and breadth of this country.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I am not aware of a single instance in which police women have been asked to convey drunken men. The investigation directed by the Government as a result of the question disclosed that policewomen only escort female prisoners and juveniles.

Mr. SEALEY: Would the Hon. Minister have that matter investigated again because I have seen with my own eyes policewomen escorting drunken men.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Would the hon. member prove that?

Mr. SEALEY: I am sure about that and the man of whom I am speaking boasted that he put his hand under the policewoman.

Mr. SPEAKER: Of course a man cannot really boast of doing anything if he is drunk.

2.50 p.m.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I do not know the circumstances in which this policewoman attempted to make an arrest of a drunken man in Carrington's Village, but the question is this:

"Is the Minister aware that female members of the Police are being assigned to the duty of Van Orderly which is unsuitable to them and more suitable to male members of the said Force?"

The Reply is that no female member of the Police Force is being assigned to this duty. It may have been that a policewoman saw a drunken man and entirely off her own back without any assignment, attempted to assist in his arrest. Therefore what she did she did purely on her own.

There has been no assignment of any policewoman in such cases except it is a case dealing with juveniles and females. If the policewoman purely gratuitously happened to be in Carrington's Village and attempted to make this arrest she did it all of her own volition.

Mr. SEALEY: In my opinion this matter has never been investigated. This was a case of a telephone message being sent asking for assistance with a certain drunken man. This was not a sick man.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Am I to understand the hon. member to say that this telephone message was received?

Mr. SPEAKER: Perhaps the Hon. Leader of the House may put it in this way; assuming that so and so.....

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: The hon. member seems to be assuming that a telephone message was received at Police Headquarters and a policewoman was sent to arrest this man. I have no information on that score.

Mr. SMITH: Will the Hon. Minister have an investigation made into this question relative to this policewoman and make a report back to this House?

Mr. SPEAKER: Would the hon. member slightly reframe his question?

Mr. SMITH: Will the Hon. Minister cause an investigation to be made relative to the duties of these policewomen, what they have to encounter with men and make a report back to this House?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I have already said that policewomen have never been asked to enter any encounter with men; therefore the investigation is unnecessary.

Mr. SPEAKER: There are no more answers to questions ready and the House will proceed with the consideration of Private Members' Business.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS ORDERS POSTPONED

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day under Private Members' Business is to resume debate on the passing of a Resolution to approve the Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals of the Minister of Finance. When this matter was last under discussion, the Hon. Minister of Education was speaking at 4.30 p.m , when Government Business was called.

I know that the Hon. Minister of Education is not now in the island. As the position stands now, he will either lose his right to continue his speech or, in view of the fact that he was speaking on the last occasion and hon. members might want to hear the conclusion of his address a motion may be made that the matter be deferred. I am not trying to bias the House in one way or the other.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I think that the House may give the Hon. Minister permission to speak again. If there is no other hon. member who would like to speak on this Resolution today, I am going to move that the debate on this Resolution be deferred.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is there any hon. member who wants to speak on this Resolution today? *(After a pause).* Apparently no hon. member wants to speak on this Resolution today and the Hon. Leader of the House may move that the consideration of this matter be postponed.

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

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Andrew:- To move the passing of a Resolution *re* the Report of the Advisory Committee on Hospital Administration.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to postpone this Resolution.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is asking leave that this matter which stands in his name be postponed. If there is no objection, leave will be granted. *(After a pause).* There being no objection, leave is granted the hon. member for that matter to be postponed.
3.00 p.m.

RESOLUTION *re* THE COMPOSITION OF THE MEMBERSHIP OF THE BOUNDARIES COMMISSION

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day under Private Members' Business, stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Peter: To move the passing of a Resolution re the composition of the membership of the Boundaries Commission.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution reads as follows:-

WHEREAS the composition of the membership of the Boundaries Commission is drawn from the House of Assembly.

AND WHEREAS the announcement of the appointment of the Boundaries Commission does not truly reflect the present membership of the House of Assembly.

BE IT RESOLVED that the House of Assembly deplore the composition of the Boundaries Commission which does not reflect the membership of the House of Assembly.

You will remember that this House passed a Bill for the purpose of setting up a Boundaries Commission, and during that debate, I expressed my view that I was in agreement and I am still in agreement with the philosophy of a single-member constituency for Barbados. It is one of the things I indicated in my statements to the electorate during the last elections. You will remember when Your Honour was not in the position you now hold, you too, were a supporter of the concept of single-member constituencies. Now that you have been elevated and exalted to the dignified position of Speaker of the House of Assembly, you have been elected as a member to serve on this Boundaries Commission.

During the debate on the Bill, it was indicated that the membership would have been drawn from the House of Assembly substantially. Your Honour will be a member; there will be a deputy Chairman to be appointed from inside or outside of this Chamber; three other members would have been drawn from the House based on the recommendations of the Premier, and one person from the Opposition.

I am not particularly wedded to the idea that a Commission of this character should be a parliamentary or a political Commission. I would say that it would have been okay with me.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the hon. member explain what he means by "okay"?

Mr. WALCOTT: I prefer not, because it is one of these universal colloquialisms. I did not object to the Commission being an independent Commission outside of Parliament. I felt that you could find persons suitably qualified to work on the Boundaries Commission, because in the final analysis the report would have to come before this Chamber for final approval. The Government in power decided that there should be a Boundaries Commission. When we debated this question with all intents and purposes as to what should go into the Bill, it was agreed that the membership should be drawn from the membership of the House.

I am taking serious objection to what has been the eventual outcome of this matter. Coming from Government House on the 7th May, 1963, there was a statement from the Head of the Administration which read as follows:

"Your Honour,

I have the honour to advise you that in accordance with the provisions of Section 4 (b) of the Boundaries Commission Act, 1962-41, I have appointed Sir Frank Holder, C.M.G., Q.C., to be Deputy Chairman of the Commission in accordance with the advice of the Premier.

In accordance with the provisions of Section 4 (c) of the same Act, I have appointed The Honourable W. A. Crawford, M.C.P., Senior Member for St. Philip, and Mr. Russell Lowe, M.C.P., Senior Member for St. George as the two members of the General Assembly on the Commission, in accordance with the advice of the Premier.

In accordance with the provisions of Section 4 (d) of the same Act, I have appointed Mr. E. D. Mottley C.B.E., M.C.P., as the Member of the General Assembly on the Commission, in accordance with the advice of the Leader of the Opposition.

I have the honour to be,
Your Honour,
Your Honour's obedient servant.
JOHN STOW
Governor."

I want to make myself very clear, because in a small community it is very easy to find confusion of thought. At the outset, I wish to say that what I am going to say is no reflection on any particular person. Let me say at the beginning that if an impartial Commission was to be appointed from outside of this Chamber, I would have absolutely no objection to Sir Frank Holder being appointed as a member. He was a former Chief Justice in British Guiana, he was also a member of this Chamber, he has a considerable amount of experience regarding Barbados and he and others like himself may have made a very excellent and impartial body to work on that Commission. What surprises me is that the Premier, in an elected Chamber of 24 members, can so soon after an election support the denial of democracy by making such a recommendation to the Head of the Administration after a Bill had been passed in this House. Those of us who know something about this matter will understand that when the Premier made his recommendations he was ignoring positively what the electorate wanted.

Your Honour is a member of this Commission, and we agree with that. You are a member of the Party in power — let us be frank about that. When you sit on this Commission you are there not only as Speaker of the House of Assembly but you will be sitting there because you will be having certain views about this matter. You are the oldest member of this Chamber.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am the longest serving member, I believe.

Mr. WALCOTT: I am speaking in terms of the longest sitting member and not terms of age. The hon. senior member for St. Philip comes next in order of seniority. There is no objection to the hon senior member for St. George or the hon. member for St. Philip being on the Commission. My objection is: how can you reasonably say that this Commission is representative of the House in the manner in which it is constituted. You have 14 seats out of 24, and there are 10 seats other than the members of the Government. How can the Government be so barefaced in an age like this to retain 3 seats for its members. I want to say that the Leader of the Opposition together with his numerical strength in this House is not as great as the other members of the House.
3.10 p.m.

Unless you want to go to school at night and learn to count at night instead of the day. (A VOICE: What does that mean?) That means that you are too busy to go to school in the day.

Sir, when you have the position where the Hon. Leader of the Opposition represents a membership of four members of the Opposition in the House itself and there are six members in the Chamber other than the four members of the Opposition Party and you call on the Leader of the Opposition to sit on the Commission and you go out of the House completely and choose someone outside of the House to sit on the Commission, one is bound to ask why did you not choose someone from those six other members who are in the House? When you go outside of the House and choose a member, it does not necessarily reflect the Party in power, because the Party in power is going to be the Party who is going to introduce this Bill. By no stretch of the imagination can you work out a mathematical formula that the ten members on this side only deserve representation as compared with the fourteen members on the other side on the basis of one to three, and worse than that, one to four.

The Hon. Leader of the Opposition is not in his place, but even although there are only four members of his Party, I would still agree with his having a seat on this Boundaries Commission on the grounds that the hon. member and his three colleagues represent large constituencies. He has a colleague with a seat in St. Michael. He and his colleague represent two seats in the constituency of the City of Bridgetown, therefore within the metropolitan area he would deserve a seat on the Boundaries Commission. In addition to those three seats, he has another member representing the constituency of Christ Church which is another large populated area. However the official Opposition has a membership of four as against six other members who are in the Opposition, therefore, I do not think if you are going to have a Parliamentary Commission that it should be so one-sided as not only to misrepresent the present membership of the House, but also a complete denial of a large number of people who voted at the last General Elections. You are having this Boundaries Commission to regularise the anachronisms which existed in Barbados, therefore, it should bear relationship to the population which you represent if you are thinking in terms of changing that and not thinking of having an impartial Commission. It is to us who are at present the fortunate ones in this House to determine the boundaries and not necessarily a Boundaries Commission, but you want to narrow it down and so you decide to put three members of your Party and the Leader of the Opposition and a member from outside on the Commission. I have nothing against the member from outside, Sir Frank Holder, but if the Government wanted to show impartiality by giving a seat to someone outside, they should do so at the expense of one of their own Party. I am not speaking for myself being a member of the Commission, because I am a very busy man and I do not like to do these things, but when you are in politics you have to look at things as they happen.

Sir, with ten members over on this side, six of whom are not members of the Official Opposition or members of the Government, you have the Hon. Premier making a recommendation that none of these other six members should be members of the Commission.

Sometimes we will have to make it clear that just as the Government can form a Government of a coalition, the Opposition can form a Government of a coalition which are not members of the same political views. When you get this outrageous attitude in which you deny the majority of people in the Opposition membership on the Commission which is ostensibly a Parliamentary Commission and before you do that, you cast your net in the future, what I would say to the people is that they should not worry to send members to this Chamber as members of the Opposition because the Government prefers to have members from outside.

There is a tendency in this Chamber by some peculiar demand to reject the intention of the people and I am going to be in the vanguard of those speaking against this because there is no point in asking an electorate to return people to this Assembly when some of the people who are returned to this House of Assembly turn around and suborn the will of the electorate. I see that this is going on and it is going on in other forms too. It is showing itself very blatantly in

here because in this case you find the Hon. Premier making representation to the Governor for the appointment of a Boundaries Commission in which he is appointing a person from outside to be a member of that Commission.

This may be a convenient arrangement for people who are looking for plums. Fortunately for me, I am not in the fortunate or unfortunate position of asking the Premier or any Minister for anything other than asking for legislation. I have been in Parliament too long and I have been fighting elections for the last ten years unaided by any political party, so you can very well see if I am able to do so or not. It has been said that some members would suffer any indignity to be returned here, I happen not to be one of those persons. There are many people in this community who pay their price for parliamentary office. The low may want a job, and the high may want office. I am not contributing this to Sir Frank Holder because I have the greatest respect for that gentleman in public life. I am not saying that he was associated with this, but I do say that when you go outside of Parliament, taking into consideration the way how the House is presently constituted, and take three members for yourself — the hon. senior member for St. George, the hon. senior member for St. Philip and Your Honour and then from the Opposition you take only the official Leader of the Opposition and you go outside and bring in another member — it is not truly representative of members of this Chamber.

My view at the beginning was when Your Honour was made the Chairman of this Commission and you were going to have a Deputy Chairman, I thought as night follows day that the Deputy Chairman would have been the Deputy Speaker. I am not a member of any Party so I cannot tell members of parties how to behave, but when it comes to Parliament, in normal circumstances, if you had a party which has respect for its own members and you appoint the Speaker to be Chairman of a Boundaries Commission, it would be easier to have the Deputy Speaker as Deputy Chairman.
3.20 p.m.

Here you have Sir Frank Holder as Deputy Chairman of the Commission. I can see through some of this nonsense and I am a frank speaking man. It may be that the Deputy Speaker is *non persona grata* with the Premier and the party he is leading. It shows how far this spite and stupidity can go. Pressures will make facades come down. These facades are put up to make you believe that they are real, but they are not real. You have this bunch of hypocrisy on both sides but you try to put up a front. They are like two people who live badly in a home and they try to put up a good front as soon as somebody knocks at the door. The Deputy Speaker can object to what I am saying. I do not care for anybody's politics; when I fight an election anybody can be my foe or my enemy. I am on this side, you are on that side and therefore you must take what you get.

The Deputy Speaker can get up and say whatever he likes, neither do I care whether he agrees with me or not. In this matter you have ignored the composition of this House. You have fourteen members out of twenty-four members; you are deserving of three members, the Opposition is deserving of one member and the other six members are deserving of no membership on the Commission at all. You have arrived at a formula and you have selected a member from outside. We have the peculiar spectacle that the Leader of the Opposition is the Leader of the minority Party and even the Leader of the Opposition in England collectively represents more members than what the other members represent. You are putting members on a Commission to decide how the Boundaries will be made up for those of us who are now members of the House and they are going to say "This is how St. Peter must be cut up." The present Government has not got any members in St. Peter. I have all sorts of intrigues; cannons to the right and cannons to the left. This single member Boundaries Commission is a joke; what they want to do is to divide the parishes in two and that is a joke. You have a population of 240,000 people and because they give the Bahamas 30 seats, are you going to give Barbados 60 seats? Trinidad has a House of 30 members and we have a House of Assembly of 24 members with a population of 250,000 people. There is nothing wrong in the representation of people here. There was a time in our history when we had the jack-ass cart and the buggy; that was all right in those days because the voting strength of the people was not as great as it is now. I do not believe in anybody looking for half a dozen people to get into the House of Assembly; when that is so, when you have that state of affairs obtaining, you cannot get proper laws passed. You cannot get any proper legislation enacted in this way because people get into the House of Assembly too easily. You want to canvass a whole lot of people. I am not one of those who would be looking for a small area to represent. There are those who would like to go down to St. Andrew and cut that parish in half and have St. Andrew in the north and St. Andrew in the south. There are those who would like to go down to St. Lucy and cut up that parish. You have a double constituency in the parish of St. Lucy now; and that population includes sick people, and mad people and you have a voting strength of less than 4,000 people. I want to ask this question: are you going to make two constituencies with 2,000 people each. Is that what you are going to do in a country with 240,000 people?
3.30 p.m.

In order to get a lot of people back into the House of Assembly and keep things safe, you are creating a situation to suit yourselves. By popular acclaim the Leader of the Opposition is the "big man" for St. Michael. If you cut up the constituency of St. Michael you will be making sure that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition will romp home at the next elections, so in order to neutralise his position you have to secure some of the other constituencies in the country. You must meet the challenge by positive and straightforward work.

I feel that the appointment of certain members to serve on the Boundaries Commission is positively unfair to the membership of this House. I feel that it is also unfair to the 6 other members of this Chamber other than the members of the Opposition. Even if the other members of the Opposition were not accorded the distinction of the Official Opposition, the areas that they represent would demand a seat on the Boundaries Commission. Why was a seat not given to one of the four other members? They represent the metropolitian area of St. Michael and the City of Bridgetown with a population of about 80,000 to 90,000 people.

In Christ Church you have the junior member as one of their members. They have members in an area in which they have a population of nearly half the total population of the Island. It would afford them a seat on the Boundaries Commission. On the basis of a 5-member Commission, I see nothing wrong with one member from the Official Opposition — one member from the Opposition and two members from the Government. The Government has taken three members for itself. Can the Government then go outside of this Chamber and bring in somebody else? Are you suggesting that Sir Frank Holder can speak for the other members of the Opposition? It must be remembered that he is not a politician. The Government is holding on to all of these people and depriving members of this Parliament of the right to sit on the Commission.

I never thought that the Premier, a Cabinet, or a body of men in 1963 would sit down and allow one man to do something like this. If the Premier made this recommendation to the Governor without consulting his colleagues, then I say that his colleagues would be a bunch of idiots and would have no regard for parliamentary decency. Each member of the Cabinet had to be elected to this House. Sooner or later the time will come when they will have to face the electorate again. Both sides will be able to talk to the people, and it might not be easy to erase certain things from their memories. I am sure that if you took a plebiscite on this question tomorrow, the people would deny certain members of the Opposition a seat on the Boundaries Commission. You have chosen five members to serve on this Commission. Everybody would expect that the Government would have more members on the Commission than the members of the Opposition. The Government has 14 members out of 24 members and, therefore, it has a small

majority. But when you compare 14 members with 10 members, you cannot call it a landslide. It cannot be said that the Government has three-quarters of the membership of this House. It has a bare majority — a majority is twelve, and the Government has fourteen.

If the party is as unfortunate as the other party to have two defections, the Government would have a bare majority. The Government came in with twelve members and it had to spar about to get a Speaker for the Assembly. The majority is not so big as to permit the Government to adopt a high and mighty attitude. If it comes to the question of voting in here, the Official Opposition can barely muster four votes. Regardless of the size of the constituency, one man will only have one vote. You do not now accord the Legislature, as it is constituted, the right to be fully represented on the Commission.

Perhaps someone may say that I am now speaking in order to obtain membership on the Commission. Even if that is said, I would not worry about it because I have been a member of this House for a long time. I feel that I have enough parliamentary experience, and I know a lot about this Island. Without casting any reflection on the hon. member, do you expect that the hon. senior member for St. George has any more right on a parliamentary commission than any of his colleagues who have been serving in this House for a long time? I do not think that he can say that he has more parliamentary experience than anybody else. The hon. member is on the Commission as a party member, or he would not have been accorded a seat. You have put the hon. senior member for St. George on that Commission. It must be remembered that the members from the Government side are going to the meeting with biased minds. They are going to the meeting with the policy the Government has in mind.

I agree with a single-member constituency; I mentioned that in my manifesto when I spoke to the electorate, and they sent me back to this House. I was returned here with a mandate from the people to support a single-member constituency. The people in St. Peter were told all about it, and I was sent back here. I have been representing St. Peter for the last ten years in the teeth of total opposition from all sides. I have the satisfaction of knowing that, when you have the courage of your conviction, you cannot fail. A coward will die a thousand times, but a brave man faces death but once.
3.40 p.m.

The cowards were afraid to identify themselves with their own convictions and they are the ones who have made it easier for these rapacious attitudes to continue. The hon. junior member for St. George, the hon. junior member for St. Joseph and the hon. junior member for St James, through their own ignorance sat silent and allowed such things to go on and now they are paying the penalty. They are paying for their own stupidity for allowing the same sort of thing and for which members on that side may pay the price later. Hon. members are aware of my classical joke about the boy who told his mother when he sat an examination that when he was about to pass, the examiners said to stop work. Some people unfortunately do not know when work is stopped.

I do not know if this is a reprisal against the hon. members here whose party after they had agreed to single-member constituencies in their manifesto said that they did not agree to it. They wrote a manifesto one year and put it in and then they completely forgot what they had written and when the matter came up for discussion in this House and they were objecting against it and you showed them what they had written, they said that they did not know. If it is a reprisal for not supporting the idea of single-member constituencies, I say that it is not a good method. It is just like telling a man that no member has ever been returned to the House of Assembly. I do not know, unless what is happening here is like what happens in a dictatorship; unless Barbados is becoming like some parts of the world where the electoral system is different from ours, in which voting is compulsory and a man is able to know who voted against him. However, there is no question about that happening here, so it is not a question of your using this as a reprisal against members on the other side because they are now members of Parliament.

Let us be quite frank. Suppose the members of the Barbados Labour Party at present in this House had been the Official Opposition, I would have to conclude that you would not have put in the Boundaries Commission Act that you agreed to the Leader of the Opposition having any representation on the Commission. The Opposition sometimes hold views diametrically opposite to yours; and sometimes the views of the Opposition may not be too far out of variance to the Government's. There was a time in Great Britain when there were the Whigs and the Tories, when the views between the Government and the Opposition were not much different. The Socialist view did not gain root yet. I do not regard a political difference in view is necessary to create parliamentary juggling, that is to say, if we have a parliamentary delegation here to send anywhere and it is going to be representative of Parliament, you do not look to see if a member is a member of the Government or a member of the Opposition. Therefore it seems somewhat strange to me that this composition of the Boundaries Commission can be made in the House of Assembly at this time after the election which has taken place, unless it is through a statement made by the last Government. Members of the last Government were such idiots that they allowed people who were not running for Parliament to tell them that they should not agree to single-member constituencies, purely on this stupid, naked outlook that anything which you think would cause you to lose an election, you should not agree to. I said then that that statement was used in the same context to Adult Suffrage.

There were some people in here who were opposed to the idea of Adult Suffrage. There were some people who wanted to deny you of your right. I remember there was a time when the hon. senior member for St. Philip who seemed then to be more a socialist than he is now and it may be due to the heavy reins of office which he is holding now, was a stark protagonist for complete Adult Suffrage and at one stage, he was pressing for that in this Chamber and it is amusing to know that those who have been accorded the right first were those who were afraid of doing it. That is why it is a strange commentary that Barbados did not have Adult Suffrage before Trinidad and Tobago, Jamaica or British Guiana. These were three, so to speak, Crown Colonies and they got Adult Suffrage before Barbados and that was a time when the people of Barbados had been voting into this Chamber labour members and people of labour sympathies. For that same reason they said that if you bring in another change, you would make members of this Government too powerful.

Sir, I think that there is too much of following the approach of the last Government. The last Government was spiteful. Every possible thing which they felt would help somebody, they were against. Up to today, St. Peter is the only parish which does not have a playing field. They felt that they were taking something out of my pocket when they did not worry to get a playing field for St. Peter. From 1947 until now, and this is 1963, they have not got around to getting a playing field for St. Peter. What I would say is that the Government did not act like men; they have a spiteful attitude in their dealing with people. All that they have said cannot redeem themselves in the eyes of the people because people do not forget so easily. Of course, you must have some yard fowls; we do not mind that. As soon as you get in power, you get all these satellites coming up. I am not vexed with any political party for using their satellites. You must have them and you must give them some sort of reward. That is understandable.

However, Sir, to be quite serious, you do not have to come in this spiteful way.
3.50 p.m.

You do not have to act in this spiteful way in dealing with this matter. The Hon. Premier, in making his recommendation to the Governor, recommended the hon. senior member for St. Philip and the hon. senior member for St. George as the members from the Government Party

and the hon. senior member for the City as the member from the Opposition and Sir Frank Holder as the Deputy Chairman of the Commission. The other six members in this House are not represented; they are ignored and I would say that that is outrageous. It makes me feel that you will deny Parliament what it is. When the Boundaries Commission Bill was passed, it was expected that you would have members from in here and somebody from outside to counterbalance the situation; but you should not have this outrageous position where you leave six members representing six constituencies without any right whatever. But we must go and give evidence to the Commission. The Government was quite free to set up a Boundaries Commission and to name the members of the Commission; you could bring them from anywhere and we would give evidence and say how the boundaries should be made; but you have acted in this outrageous way. If the Commission makes recommendations must I go cap in hand and say what I want done? Am I a beggar? It would not be expected of me to go to the Hon. Leader of the House, the hon. senior member for St. Philip, and to the hon. senior member for St. George and say: "I do not want to cut up the parish of St. Peter; give me Speightstown or Boscobelle or Four Hills". Would you expect me to go to those hon. members and say something like that? If you give members the right as the Opposition they will have their views; they will have their views in respect of the constituencies of the whole island.

When you make a report and the matter comes back here, what chances do you think we will have in the matter other than taking part in the debate? Mr. Speaker, I have lived long enough to see things passed in this House, which should not have been passed but some of these things you did not change; you preferred to let the Other Place change them. I understand that some hon. members are in favour of increasing the membership of this House from 24 members to 35 members so as to accommodate the situation. It may suit the Government to do so; it may suit them to make St. Lucy a single member constituency. If you have to divide St. Andrew or if it suits them to make that parish one constituency, one of the things which you will have to question is this: "Who will leave his constituency and go to another? In other words: Who is going to leave his home base? You cannot talk of taking all the members from the rural areas and putting them in St. Michael. If you are batting and your stumps are knocked out, out goes you. If you are batting and you have no runner you cannot run back to your own stumps. Some hon. members cannot leave the rural areas and run in St. Michael; in fact, they will run but they will run back home. Apart from the parishes of Christ Church, St. Philip, St. George and St. James, when you are finished with them you do not have any big parishes to divide. The parish of St. Philip is bigger than that of Christ Church but the population of Christ Church is greater than that of St. Philip. You will have things like that. How are you going to set up a Boundaries Commission and ignore people who have been in Parliament for some time? Members of this House who have any sense of their own rights and privileges and dignity, the question of Party apart, should not take this matter easily. Because you are blinded to your party can you not see darkness from light?

This Resolution reads as follows:-

"WHEREAS the composition of the membership of the Boundaries Commission is drawn from the House of Assembly....."

That is a plain, bald statement of fact. I am a working parliamentarian and I do not become disillusioned in public life. Anything which happens in here is my business and I regard this matter as a very important matter in a democracy. If you are ignoring these six members in this House then you are ignoring the composition of the House. You can have any representation but you have come out with this facade that you are bringing in these impartial persons. The question may be asked: which of the six persons would you elect to membership on this Commission if you were going to elect one of them? Three of the six members belong to the Barbados Labour Party. I may say that I am not one of those persons for whom the holding of any office would be of any great attraction. If there is anything I have to do, I do it with my ability but I do consider that the recommendation for the appointment of this Boundaries Commission is an affront to this House. I do not mind who has done this; I say that it should not have been done in this way. I say that irrespective of whoever has done it, whether he be the general or the Governor-General.
4.00 p.m.

If you have two from one side, you must have two from this side also. The Government need not have gone outside to appoint members. The Government could have appointed the Deputy Speaker and another member. Out of 24 members the Government has 14 members, but it has given one section of the Opposition the right to have representation on the Commission and has deprived the other section of the Opposition the right to have representation. What kind of school did these people attend? In the elementary school we are taught something about unitary method in third standard, and a school boy would be able to do better than that. I cannot be a member to that school of thought. I am opposed to it, and I feel that it is an insult to members on this side of the House.

Therefore, I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass. It is a reflection on the administration of the Government, and we cannot have this undemocratic procedure in these days.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I rise to second this Resolution. In doing so, I want to agree with some of the remarks made by the hon. senior member for St. Peter. He says that the Government has three members on this Commission, but I am saying that the Government has four members. You do not want anyone to tell you that the Hon. Premier, or whoever is responsible for nominating the outside member, would not nominate one of his political enemies to serve on the Commission. He would nominate one of his own people. I am saying that this is not fair to the electorate. I do not mind myself because I do not care what they do or whom they appoint. I am sure that regardless of what they do, I will return here at the next election. *(Cheers).*

I can afford to sit back and let them take out St. Joseph and bring it down to St. Michael, if they want to do so. They are showing fear because, to make sure that they can keep things in their favour, they have nominated practically all of the members of this Commission and ignored six members of this Chamber. They are ignoring the electorate, because the electorate is responsible for electing them to power. If they were thinking about the electorate, they would bury all wickedness, vindictiveness and spite and endeavour to be fair in all their deliberations.

I have nothing against the senior member for St. George. The Hon. Leader of the House is the hon. senior member for St. Philip, but the Hon. Premier also nominates the hon. senior member for St. George as a member of the Commission. What about the other parishes? When they took it upon themselves to nominate the hon. senior member for St. George, why did they not nominate the hon. junior member for St. George and give the Barbados Labour Party some sort of representation? They could have left out an outsider, and, if they wanted somebody from St. George, they could have given the seat to the hon. junior member for St. George. What about the people in St. Andrew? Why did they not nominate the hon. junior member for St. Andrew? One can see how the wind is blowing and the respect that is being paid to some of the backbenchers over there. One can see that at some times too much power can cause a lot of unnecessary trouble. As far as I see it, the power that has been given to the Hon. Premier entitled him to okay everything.

Knowing the Hon. Leader of the House as I do, as a politician for many years, I know what he would do if he were not a member of the Government. I would like to know whether the hon. member knew anything about the allocation of the seats on the Boundaries Commission. Knowing him as I do, I think he would have said that one seat should have been given to the other side.
4.10 p.m.

Sir, imagine the five members who are appointed to do something for this country! In other words, you want to give the electorate a fair chance, not so much the members of this House because they are only 24 of us out of a poulation of 240,000 to say how this country should be run through their representatives, but out of the five members, the Government is taking four. One can see that the Government is playing safe. It is a fact that all of the members of this House do not belong to the Barbados Labour Party, but at least we are a party of three. If you give the Official Opposition which is just a party of four, one representative, what about the Barbados Labour Party? You do not have all D.L.P. supporters in this country; you have B.L.P. supporters too, therefore you are ignoring them by trying to keep out representation by members of the B.L.P. and the Independents.

I would not have said one word on this Resolution. I do not care but, after all, there are other members who are younger who like to work. Of course I like to work too. As I have said, I do not think the hon. member was in his seat, but it is known that as regards the parish of St. Joseph, part of it borders St. Andrew, part of it borders St. Thomas and part borders St. John. If you are going to divide the parish into constituencies, you should make sure what part should be given to the northern area and what part to the southern area.

Suppose you were to say that you have one member on the Boundaries Commission representing no particular party, that would be all right, but it is not so. You have an outsider. That outsider does not have to look at any person; he can afford to do as he likes because he does not have to answer any voter. He does not have anybody to please apart from whom has nominated him, so he is going to make sure that he pleases those who nominated him. It is a dangerous thing to put outsiders to do things which the people's representatives should be in a position to do because outsiders do not have to care.

Sir, here it is that members from this side of the House are denied the right of representation, because one can say that he does not want *H* or *R* or *B*, but it is not good enough to be placing power in the hands of one man and more especially when that man is not prepared to listen to anybody.

I doubt very much that the hon. senior member for St. Philip had anything to do with this Boundaries Commission knowing him as I do. I dare suppose he only knew about it just as I, that is, when it was circulated. What makes me believe so? I would never forget it. Last year, when the Hon. Premier was presenting his Budget he said that his Ministers only knew about it a matter of moments before he presented it. I have to believe him because not one Minister got up and denied it. That is why I believe the hon. senior member for St. Philip knew nothing about this Boundaries Commission because it is an unfair one, it is a wicked one, it is a worthless one when you think of the twenty-four members in this Assembly who are representing the people.

What has happened is that these leaders have got the belief that after they are elected to power, the people do not have any more power. The people still have the power, but the only thing is that they will have to await their opportunity to use it and that is every three or four years. I am sure if the electors of the Island had it in their power just as any leader of the Government, that Government would have gone long ago because every time they did something wrong or something which was against the wishes of the majority of this country, they would have put them out. I am sure if a referendum were to be taken and put to the people and they were given the opporunity to vote for the Government and its set-up or to vote otherwise, they would vote otherwise. They would not have voted for four members out of five for the Government to serve on this Boundaries Commission. Therefore, this Boundaries Commission is against the wishes of the people and any Government and its leaders must remember that they are only there for a time, but may be they are saying to themselves that we are only here for a time, therefore let us do as we like for the time so that if we are not returned, we have done as we liked. That is the only conclusion I can come to, but if they wanted to be re-elected to this Chamber and to the Government, they would be more than careful and they would not be doing these unfair things to the people. The members in opposition whom you are doing these things against have a mouth and brains to talk and to tell their constituents and your constituents the wrongs which have been meted out to them through the inaccuracies of their Government. How on earth can one say that it is fair for the Government or the Premier to take four out of five. You could just as well add on the one and have five because when you take four out of five you could as well have taken over the other one because the other one is of no use — none at all. If it should happen tomorrow that there is any kind of mis-representation and the Hon. Leader of the Opposition opposes it, all he can do is to oppose it, because if anything has to go to the vote, where does he get off? In my opinion, he could as well stay home. This Government and past Governments are doing the people's business as if it is their own private business at home.

4.20 p.m.

These Governments carry on the people's business as if it is their private business which they are carrying on at home; they act as if they are saying: "You can write as many cheques as you like, but they are not valid until I sign them." They are doing this work privately and that is not fair. How on earth could that be fair? How can you have one man sitting down and twisting and turning around the others? Do you mean to say that the Ministers cannot get up and say something? I do not believe that this matter was taken to them or, if it was taken to them, they have to keep their mouths closed. The Premier has the food and his Ministers are hungry; but if I had to speak my mind and that would deprive me of my bread then it is better for me to keep my mouth shut. There is no point in a man suffering himself unnecessarily; this matter does not have any good appearance.

Mr. SPEAKER: Of course, I will remind the hon. member that we have passed a Bill whereby certain powers were placed in the hands of the Hon. Premier. the hon. member should therefore be careful that he does not criticise any action of this House.

Mr. SMITH: I would be more criticising the action of the House. That is not to say that this particular House gave this power to one man; that is how I take it.

Mr. SPEAKER: This Act which gave birth to the Boundaries Commission gave power to the Hon. Premier to make certain nominations and he has acted in accordance with the power given to him by an Act which was passed in this Chamber during this session.

Mr. SMITH: Yes, Sir, and it will make hon. members on this side of the House much more careful now to make a close scrutiny of Bills of this sort. When we think that we are granting powers to be carried out by persons in the interest of the people and we find that the matter is just the opposite, that is a sad affair. Every time that we pass legislation here we feel that it is for the betterment of the country. I believe that the Hon. Premier may have slipped up on this occasion. He is an economic expert but, as the hon. senior member for St. Peter has said, one who did not go to school would have done much better in this connection. If you are going to make a division out of five and you have 24, you could have done a better job; but you are an expert in economics. You can turn an eight into a four or you can turn one into six and make your own figures. It looks to me that as soon as you leave school, you can make your own figures. If you are dead and they say that you are living, you will have to believe that you are living, when it comes to figures and economists.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know how the Hon. Premier could have arrived at this answer; out of 24 members you have this selection. I am sorry that the Hon. Premier is not now in his seat because he would tell me that I am undertaking to do what I cannot manage and he will give me the answer. However, in this case it is the reverse with the Hon. Premier because, when the matter puzzled him, he decided that he would take the most of it. I know that there are some people who would say that I am talking

trash, but I will say that I think I have as much experience as to know what is right from what is wrong. Regardless of the consequences, what has been done here is wrong; at least another member should have been selected for membership on this Commission, another member from this side of the Table, so as to represent the people. I am quite sure that if there had been another member appointed on the Commission from this side of the House, the hon. senior member for St. Peter would not have pointed out to the public the type of Government which we have in power today.

This matter does not merely concern hon. members in this House; it concerns the public as a whole. We have to be very careful on the next occasion when we are dealing with a matter of this sort, because it will be more than what we expect. We do have trouble and we will have to shun it.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: It is now 4.30 p.m. of the clock, the time when the consideration of Private Members' Business automatically comes to an end. It is now time to revert to the consideration of Government Business.
4.30 p.m.

RESUMPTION OF GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, on the last occasion when the House was adjourned, we were discussing Order No. 3, Government Business.

I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon Leader of the House is asking for leave to proceed with Order No. 3 under Government Business. He is asking for leave to make Order No. 3 the First Order of the Day. If there is no objection, he will be granted leave. *(Pause).*

I hear no objection, and leave is therefore granted to the Hon. Minister to proceed with Order No. 3 as the First Order of the Day.

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

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

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

THE INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT (EXPORT INDUSTRIES) BILL

Mr. SPEAKER: When the debate on this matter was adjourned on the 21st June, the hon. senior member for St. Peter, who was speaking, moved that further debate be postponed. That motion was seconded by the hon. senior member for the City of Bridgetown. Does the hon. senior member for St. Peter propose to resume now?

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I consider that legislation of this nature together with the other items that follow on the Order Paper immediately after this first Bill are of a similar character. What I have asked the Hon. Premier in my speech to do is to bear in mind that we are all in favour of industrial expansion. We would like to see our community developed as quickly and as rapidly as possible, but we have to be watchful and careful in examining some of these *entrepreneurs* who are sending applications to make sure that they do not come here for the purpose of exploiting us. We must scrutinise them to make sure that the reason why they have come here is not to use Barbados as a cheap labour market. We must see to it that these people respect trade unions.

There is nothing in this Bill to indicate how these people should treat industrial organizations, but the Hon. Minister has the authority under certain Acts to ensure that the industrial organisations are given proper treatment. We know from experience that some of these people have worked in low-wage income areas, and they want to reinstitute what have been instituted in Britain at the turning of the last century in the industrial revolution. We have to be very watchful that in our desire and enthusiasm to welcome development — speaking for myself I know that my organisation will do its best to help industrial advancement and development in this country — we do not allow them to cut wages because a good standard of living is one of the prerequisites of any business. Any business that cannot afford to pay these norms will mean nothing to us. I would like the Hon. Minister to bear these things in mind, because the industrial climate is not created by the Government only; the union and the workers as well as the employers have to play a very important role in this matter.

There is nothing in this Bill to which I object. I will now have to rely on the Minister to see to it that labour is not exploited. I hope that you will get Government's co-operation in this matter, because some of these new industries do not like organised labour; they like labour that is unorganised, but unorganised labour is not always cheap labour. Nevertheless, unorganised labour is liable to exploitation. We are living in an area where exploitation cannot be countenanced. I have to sound the note of warning so that the Ministers must look after these safeguards.

It must be remembered that these people will not be paying income tax during the seven-year period. There is nothing to compel them to remain after that period, and we have to make sure that they distribute income among the people in so far as wages are concerned thereby enhancing the running of the community. We should endeavour to increase the gross domestic product in order to raise the general standard of living of the people in Barbados. Although certain things are not written into the Bill like the other safeguards, the human element is of great importance in any territory.

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

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, my party supports this Bill because it encourages industries to come to Barbados. We are not going back on what we have always said. For years we have been saying that the Government has been too slow and has allowed other Governments in the Caribbean area to keep a couple of steps in front of us. As a matter of fact, we are still behind them. We are behind Jamaica, but there is no reason why we should not be able to attract industries to Barbados. We are now attempting to attract industries mainly or solely for the re-exportation of their products. We are giving them a tax holiday for ten years, and at the end of that period they will pay company tax at 12 1/2%. We are exempting them, Sir, from Local Government tax which is another form of income tax or company tax. In order to get them to come here, we are bending backwards, but we are doing no more than what other countries are doing. I have to compliment the members of the Government for what they are doing in this matter.

We cannot depend on sugar alone to support the economy of this Island. We have made a start with a few industries. We realise that industrialisation can only take the form of light industries. No heavy industries can come to Barbados because we do not have the fuel and raw materials. On the other hand, we are not big enough to entertain heavy industries. If we can get light industries to come here and establish themselves successfully, then they would be the examples we want.

I know that the Government will have to move very speedily, and that is why it should have this power to deal with these matters expeditiously. However, in doing so, it should not fall into any trap by failing to examine most carefully the applications made to it. It would have been better if investigations could have been made by the Development Board, so that the Board would be able to investigate the background of these applicants and then pass them on to the Governor-in-Executive Committee. If the Government attempts to deal with these applications too early, then the Government may get caught in a trap and we may take

in the wrong type of people. Of course, we have nothing to lose but a good name. Our record will be such that we may be able to show a series of failures only in investors who may desire to come here.

My party commends what the Government is doing. We are going so far as to subsidise these people by giving them certain facilities in the Island. We are doing that to them despite the fact that people in other businesses have to pay for them. We will be giving them all sorts of inducements. I trust that you will examine the applicants thoroughly and expeditiously. Do not let them feel that you are dilly-dallying with them.

I commend the Government for this Bill, and I hope that in the very near future we will be able to see the results. I hope to see industries set up here for re-export, and I hope that markets will be found for them. I am looking forward to people coming here and establishing industries the products of which could be sent back to the United States. Maybe, the new fisheries industry is akin to this. The market for shrimps in the Caribbean is infinitesimal. Enquiries have already been made in the American market, and it is quite possible that the shrimp industry will be the first to benefit from this legislation. If that happens, it will have my blessing, because I know that as a result of such activities, some of the profits will have to be left in the Island.
4.40 p.m.

We have made a start and an effort to industrialise the country, and when we say that, we realise that it can only be made in the form of light industries, not heavy industries because no heavy industries can come to Barbados owing to the fact that we lack fuel and raw materials and we are not big enough, but if we continue to hold out to investors as far as that the climate is right here to receive them, eventually some will drop in.

What I want the Government to be sure of is that the people to whom you are granting these things are the right people. Do not try to get everyone. Examine the background of every one of them and make sure that they have a chance to succeed. If after a couple of years we find that we have been only able to attract industries which have lack of finance and will probably fall down, it will do us more harm than good because when others come to look and find out what is happening in Barbados and find out that there are a series of failures by investors they are not going to look any further, they will come and go back. If through our efforts we can get them coming here and making good and making money, that is the attraction which we want so as to attract others.

In this effort, I know that Government has to move speedily and that is why they have given themselves the power to deal with these matters, but in doing so, do not fall into the trap of not examining each applicant thoroughly. It would be better if the investigations were to be made by the Development Board. They should be geared to investigate the background of these applicants and then pass them on to the Executive Committee. Let the Board deal with these applicants in the first instance, but if Government deals with them too early we may not get the right type of industries. We may get some whose record would be such that they would only be able to show a series of failures in Barbados and that would not lead to other investors coming here.

I go on to say that this is only another subject and another effort on the part of Government and our Party commends it because we are also contributing to it. We are going to subsidise them in the form of using the facilities of the Island to attract them because other businesses have to pay so that they may come in. You not only have to examine the applicants thoroughly but expeditiously. Do not let them feel that you are dilly-dallying. I commend the Government for this Bill and I do hope that in the near future we will see the results from this Bill and that businesses will be set up here for re-export. They will have to find other markets. I am looking forward to people who would come in and ship back things to the United States. Maybe, the Fisheries Department is thinking of something in this line because the market for shrimps is for this purpose. Maybe, that may be the first which may benefit as a result of these concessions. If this is so, they will leave some of their profits here in some form or the other, either direct or indirect.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Sir, before you put the question, I am sorry that the hon. senior member for St. Peter is not in his place because he spoke at length on this Bill and made a point which may have demanded some rejoinder. The hon. member was at pains to emphasise that the Government should not underwrite low wages directly or indirectly in legislation of this sort and that we pay proper attention to the labour outlook of manufacturers coming into the country.

I merely want to assure the hon. senior member for St. Peter that we are concerned as much as he, if not more, in ensuring adequate wage standards and that we have gone as far as giving the Union the right to participate at every possible stage in the early discussions surrounding the entry of these industries into the Island. On both the Development Board which deals with applications for industrial expansion and the Tourist Board which deals with tourist expansion, sit a representative appointed by the Union itself so that when applications for pioneer industries are discussed or applications for assisting the hotel industry, the Union is there through its representative to know what is going on and to assist in the conditions under which these applications are granted.

Apart from that, as Minister of Labour, he can rest assured that at no time would I countenance any depression in the labour question. I remember, three or four months ago there were some people who wanted to transfer a particular industry from Jamaica here. One of the first questions I asked was concerning the wages which they wanted to pay and one of them actually threatened to go to the Premier and state that I was not interested in getting industries to come here, because I was asking all sort of fancy questions. I knew the wages which he said he wanted to pay was such that nobody would be interested in them at all. We want wage standards to be kept at a proper level and the people to live up to a standard which bears relationship to the standards in other parts of the world.

What we have to bear in mind is that on this question relating to concession to industries, we are almost two hundred years behind other countries. We are starting off in 1963 when countries like Great Britain have started off giving concessions to industries over two hundred years ago. We have, of course, to blame the last Government for the economic morass in which the country now finds itself. Since 1946 they were urged on the floor of this House to begin to do something to attract industries and it took them ten years before they started to operate. It was only in 1956 that the first manager of the Development Board was appointed and the Board got down to business.

We are trying to bring this country in a similar line of conditions as that of other countries and we are trying to arrange the industrial climate in such a way that it would attract manufacturers from other developed areas. I do not think there is anything more which needs to be replied to at this stage except to say that I am not quite sure that I share the view of the hon. junior member for Christ Church with regard to the unlikelihood of what he called heavy industries coming here.
4.50 p.m.

It is true that we cannot expect to have here basic industries requiring iron and steel to any great extent, but there is still the possibility, even with our limited resources and lack of opportunities, of having one or two industries which would be regarded as basic industries. In this island we consume a lot of wrought iron for the construction trade and with several housing schemes getting underway both private and public, there is bound to be an extension in the importation of wrought iron. Exports of scrap iron from this island and the surrounding islands are considerable. I know one man who made a lot of money in this island from buying scrap iron in the West Indies.

I really do believe that this area could support an industry for manufacturing wrought iron by converting the available scrap iron into goods which could be utilised for our requirements in this area. There is no such operation anywhere in the area except in Puerto Rico. I have seen one such operation in Puerto Rico myself but certainly there is no such operation in this island and I am sure that the imports of wrought iron even in this area would ensure the successful operation of a factory for the manufacture of wrought iron.

When we come to the matter of materials for roofing, the position is the same. It seems to me that the time is ripe when some manufacturer should start the manufacture of tiles for roofing and thereby put an end to the large importation of galvanize and asbestos. I have only mentioned that because the hon. junior member for Christ Church has expressed the idea that this sort of thing was remote in these parts.

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

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that you do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee on this Bill.

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

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

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

Clauses 1 to 30 inclusive were called and passed.

The two Schedules were called and passed.

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

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

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

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

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

5.00 p.m.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, Order No. 4 is in the same category as the preceding Bill to some extent. Section 13 of the Pioneer Industries Act, 1958, enables a pioneer manufacturer to choose either a seven-year tax holiday or a four-year tax holiday followed by gradual transition to full liability for income tax. The point is that only a pioneer manufacturer who, at the date of his application for pioneer status, was not engaged in the manufacture of the relevant pioneer product in marketable quantities is entitled to exercise this option.

In actual experience, there have been some cases from time to time in which pioneer manufacturers have lost their right to exercise the option, because the Order declaring them as pioneer manufacturers did not come into operation until after the dates specified in the Order as the production date. There are quite a few cases like that, and this Bill seeks to regularise the position to allow a pioneer manufacturer to be entitled to exercise the option if he has failed to do so within the prescribed time, that is, one year before the production date, by amending the relevant sections to the Pioneer Industries Act, 1958.

The Bill seeks, therefore, to amend Section 13 to enable pioneer manufacturers, who may have lost their right to exercise the option, to retain the right to choose which income tax benefits they want, either the seven-year option or the four-year option.

These amendments will also extend, for a period of six months from the commencement of the amending Act, the time within which the pioneer manufacturers and others who fail to exercise their option within the prescribed time.

This is a very simple Bill with just two amendments, and I beg to move that the Bill be read a second time.

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

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

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and that the House go into Committee on the Bill.

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. BATSON in the Chair.

Clauses 1 & 2 were called separately and passed.

Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

THE INDUSTRIAL INCENTIVES BILL

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Leader of the House: Second reading of a Bill to provide incentives for the establishment and development of industries in this Island by the grant of relief from income tax, trade tax, interim trader's licence fees, and custom duties and for other matters incidental thereto or connected therewith.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, Order No. 5 is the final Bill of the package, so to speak, which deals with additional incentives to industrial expansion. This is designed like the first one to assist in the development of industries produced solely for export and to provide special incentives. This Bill is divided into five parts. Part I deals with matters of a general nature. The Governor-in-Executive Committee will declare that the product of a manufacturer shall be an approved export product for the purpose of the Bill, and it outlines the way in which the products should be declared.

It is also proposed that companies who have already been declared as pioneer manufacturers under Pioneer Industries legislation should be disqualified from acquiring the status of an export manufacturer. If they are receiving benefits already as a pioneer manufacturer, they cannot now get the benefits of a pioneer manufacturer for export, too.

5.10 p.m.

Part II of the Bill provides basically the same concessions by way of exemptions from income tax and otherwise as are provided in Part II of the Pioneer Industries Act, 1958. The main difference is that with a view to providing better fiscal inducements to the establishment of industries the seven year tax holiday, and the four year tax holiday followed by gradual transition to full liability to income tax provided for in the 1958 Act have been increased to a ten year tax holiday and a seven year tax holiday followed by gradual transition to full income tax liability in the next three years. Another difference is that whilst under the 1958 Act certain losses could be carried forward and set off against profits for the purpose of computing the assessable income of a pioneer manufacturer in the period of five years following the end of the tax holiday, the Bill

by clauses 13 (7) and 14 (8) stipulates that the losses to be carried forward must be net losses; in other words, if during some years of the tax holiday a company makes profits then only those losses in excess of such profits may be carried forward and set off. Yet another difference is that, as regards exemption from income tax, this Bill unlike the 1958 Act, treats debenture interest in the same way as dividends. Thus Clause 18 (2) imposes in respect of debenture interest the same limit on the exemption from income tax as applied to dividends by virtue of the provisio to section 19 (2) (c) of the 1958 Act. Dividends and debenture interest will therefore only be exempt from income tax in the hands of shareholders or stock holders to an extent not exceeding the extent to which the profits or gains out of which they are paid by an approved enterprise would have been subject to income tax.

Part III of the Bill provides for the same exceptions from trade tax and Interim Traders Licence Fees as is provided at present in Part III of the 1958 Act.

Except for one important difference Part IV provides for the grant of the same customs duty concessions as were granted by Part IV of the 1958 Act. The difference is that whilst customs duty concessions were not granted under the 1958 Act in respect of articles imported for the purpose of effecting repairs to a factory or the equipment therein, under this Bill customs duty concessions can be granted for articles imported for such a purpose during the tax holiday period.

As in Part V of the 1958 Act provision is made in Part V of the Bill for the exemption from registration fees under the Companies Act, 1910 of companies applying for approved status, the duties of the Commissioner of Inland Revenue are also set out in this Part with respect to notifying the Treasurers of the Local Government Councils of the income tax benefits chosen by approved enterprises to clause 11; and section 33 empowers the Governor-in-Executive Committee to make regulations for any matter required by the Bill to be prescribed and generally for the purpose of carrying into effect the provisions of the Bill.

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

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

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

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

Clauses 1 to 33 inclusively were called separately and passed.

The First Schedule was called and passed.

The Second Schedule was called and passed.

5.20 p.m.

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

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

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

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

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

LAND ACQUISITION (AMENDMENT) BILL

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 8 be taken as the next Order of the day.

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

The question that Order No. 8 be taken as the next Order of the Day, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works:- To move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Town and Country Development Planning (Interim Control) Act, 1959 to extend its duration for a further period of one year from the 9th July, 1963.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, this Bill seeks to amend the Town and Country Development Planning (Interim Control) Act, 1959 in order to continue it in force for another year from the 9th July, 1963. The Town and Country Development Planning (Interim Control) Act, 1959 was passed and brought into operation on the 9th July, 1959. It was due to expire on the 8th July, 1962, and it was extended for another year with effect from 9th July, 1962, by the Town and Country Development Planning (Interim Control) Act, 1962. Proposed permanent legislation is at present being drafted and on account of that, Mr. Speaker, we are asking to extend the provisions of this Bill for a further year so that it will be in force until permanent legislation has been drafted. I beg to move that that Bill be now read a second time.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I have no general opposition to offer to this Bill but I would like to draw to the hon. member's attention something in connection with this Act. I have been watching some development which is going on in this island and I feel that the policy of the Government on town and country development planning should be that wherever road construction is going on and buildings are there, you should push back some of these buildings without having to make any payment for doing that. That may sound rather strange; but you take that long stretch of wall at Dalkeith and Deighton Roads by DaCosta's house; I say that the time has come when you must tell people that you are fixing the road and you will push back these buildings. When you come to the smaller people they want to know how much money they will get for pushing back their palings. However, if you were to make an example of the big people you will not have much trouble when you come to deal with the small people in these matters.

On the general level of road development, when you are coming down Hastings road it would be a good thing if the Hon. Minister would see that the Barbadian road-makers get accustomed to building pavements and stop people from walking in the street. It would be a good thing if something like that could be done. When we come to the City, the time has come when the Government has to do something about this Assembly and its environments; this is right in the heart of the City and we are doing nothing about it. As to the road along the Chamberlain Bridge going into the City, if something is not done about that, something is going to happen. Lastly, but not in any way the least, is the Government going to wait until a whole bus load of people go into the Careenage before they stop this danger? The place is too narrow and it is a positive danger to the community to have a wharf as it is in that area. Of course, something will be done when a whole bus load of people will have been drowned. There is a dangerous curve around this place; two motor cars have gone down there already and it seems to me that it was madness from the beginning to have this place like that. If a person wanted to commit suicide, well, that person could have a cool one. There are no rails or guards along there and I think that the time has come when we should go in for some traffic diversion and try and have some other appropriate area connected with the Deep Water Harbour so that we can stop this suicidal situation as I see is taking place down there. I know that one of these days one of these large buses will run into the Careenage and nobody will be able to effect any escape.

5.30 p.m.

It is known that there are no lifebelts in buses, and if a bus laden with passengers goes overboard the people will lose their lives. It is a danger to the lives of people, and we should remove it as early as possible. Although we have a redundant population, we do not want to get rid of people in that unceremonious manner.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, I agree with the last speaker when he said that the question of road-widening needs attention. As far as I know all road-widening has been done so far by the Highways and Transport Department, and land has been given voluntarily by responsible people who desire to improve their premises.

If a sum of money could be provided by the Government for the further expansion of some of these roads, I am sure that there will be many voluntary offers of frontages to the Government on the understanding that the Government will put back the wall 10ft. or 8ft. as the case may be together with the necessary sidewalks. Mr. Charlie Taylor, the owner of Hotel Royal, gave up a portion of land in an effort to show what improvement could be done to the front of a building.

As a matter of fact, five years ago our firm offered the Government a strip of land at Windsor — about 8ft. or 10ft. — in order to make the area much wider. Provided the Government would put back the wall and fix the pavement, the land will be theirs. I have spoken to several people and they will be prepared to do the same.

I would like to see the Government paying attention at an early date to the entrance to the market in Fontabelle. When you reach St. Mary's wall you will find houses jutting out. When you reach Cheapside at a place known as "Kissing Pride", you will find it to be a great traffic hazard. There are two houses in that area which the Government should acquire.

We are told that this Town and Country Planning Bill should be extended for another year. The reason given is that they are making plans to make it more permanent. The overall plan of Bridgetown had been promised three years ago. The people who own land in and around the City and outside of the City want to know Government's policy.

Let us take Christ Church, Hastings and so on. These places should be earmarked as tourist development areas. If you want to attract tourists here you must provide the necessary facilities not only by way of hotels, but you must have suitable residences and apartments near the beaches. That has been done in Jamaica very successfully. It is for the Town Planning Department to say when the Government designates these areas as tourist resorts, and then the residents will know what to expect. They will either have to move out or reconstruct their residences in a manner to attract higher rentals, or sell them to visitors.

Fontabelle has been declared to be a semi-commercial area, but that has not been put into the Act. However, residences are still going up. When applications are made for industrial development or to build an hotel, one is told that it is not suitable for that area. Government should let the people know what is required in the various areas. If the Government feels that only light industries or certain houses should be built on Fontabelle, it should say so. There should be some overall plan drawn up by the Town Planner which should be considered by the Government,, so that when people want to proceed with any kind of development they will know to whom they should go when in search of an industrial area, the construction of a factory and so on. Let the people know the position.

I have known of applications for houses that have been hanging fire for over six months before the Town Planner could make up his mind as to what should be done. That is what is holding up development in this country, and that is what a lot of our artisans are complaining about. They are complaining about the length of time the Town Planner takes to process these matters. Let us get on with the job. I know that there is a lot of work to be done in that Department; it is a lot of detailed work, and they should leave some of it to other departments and pay more attention to the question of working out a big plan. If you are saying that Sandy Lane should be developed for tourists, you must let everybody know that. If you put up a scheme it should be brought to the attention of everybody.

Mr. HUSBANDS: I would just like to draw to the attention of the Minister the existing disability of holders of land when they try to extend their homes. Under the existing regulations, they are required to submit copies of the area of land on a specifically requested scale. That scale of drawing which is requested under the existing regulations seems to be quite different from the scale which is found on the actual copy of the old plot, and many small holders of land who try to improve their properties find themselves in difficulties when trying to get new drawings on the required scale.

I can assure the Hon. Minister that I have had some experience in this matter, and I have been talking with people in my constituency who have found it very difficult to comply with the new requirements without undergoing some financial strain. I feel, Sir, that the requirements of the Town Planner should be made less severe from a financial point of view than what obtain at the moment.
5.30 p.m. — 5.40 p.m.

I can assure you and the House that small holders of land who intend to improve their property do find themselves in great difficulty in complying with these requirements in the existing legislation. It means that these holders have to get a new and complete drawing. Hon. members may not realise how difficult it is for small holders of properties to get these new drawings. Although you have a plot in your possession, and you take it to the Town Planner and show where you want to make the extension, because that extension is not drawn to the same scale as that which is required by the Town and Country Planner, you will have to supply a new drawing according to the scale demanded. I think some relief should be granted to these small holders in order that this requirement may be more flexible in order to accommodate those small holders who want to make these improvements.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to speak on this Bill, but after listening to the hon. junior member for St. Peter, it gives me a desire to speak. The Town and Country Planning Officer has laid down rules and regulations and before anyone who wants to erect or improve buildings, he has to comply with the rules and regulations of the Town and Country Planning Officer. There are some people who before they go to the Town and Country Planning Officer have drawn their own plans and after they have gone to him, they have to make alterations.

The reason why I am speaking is because I am Chairman of the Northern District Council and I know that several plans come to us with respect to alterations to be made to buildings and in perusing them, they are found to be contrary to the requirements of the Town and Country Planning Officer.

People who want to improve their buildings should always acquaint the Town and Country Planning Officer before they start to do any kind of planning. They should find out how many feet they can erect the building from the road and how far they can go back. Some people go and build without even measuring how far they are building from the road. If people who want to erect a building work in accordance with the Town and Country Planning Officer, they would not have any trouble.

I think Government should put out a notice on Rediffusion drawing the attention of the people to this matter because certain people do not read newspapers. I would be glad if the Government would make its views heard over Rediffusion in order that the people would have better ideas about erecting buildings and that they would know before they draft their plans that they should get in contact with the Town and Country Planning Officer.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon senior member for St. Peter with reference to pavements and high walls being removed and set back and pavements put in place where roads have been widened, all over the island of Barbados, the Highways and Transport Department, in accordance with the Town and Country Planning Office is carrying out these improvements. Unfortunately there is only a specific amount of money for road development, but I would say that in more than half of the instances where road widening is taking place Government has acquired and purchased the land. There are certain instances

where people have generously given up their land for the improvement of the highway and the Government in turn would replace their walls or fences according to the Town and Country Planning (Control) Act.

However, Sir, we are prepared to carry out the recommendations which the hon. senior member has made in respect to railing around the Chamberlain Bridge. It is unfortunate that Barbados is one of the few exceptional places where the waterfront is a thoroughfare and it is still funny why it is that the few vehicles which have been unfortunately driven into the Careenage that nothing has happened to the drivers. That is a peculiar thing which has always worried me. I feel that I can swim and dive fairly good, but I would not like to be shut up in a vehicle when it is falling into the Careenage. It is peculiar that vehicles go over there and nothing happens to the drivers.

To fence in there would be a hindrance to shipping and it would be very difficult to place a fence or chain there to rope off that area, because it would be in the way of ships loading and off-loading their cargo. During my entire life of thirty-five years around the waterfront, whenever I have heard or seen any vehicles going over that part of the Wharf or where ships are loading or off-loading, there has never been a case resulting in death of the driver. My idea is that it is the ideal spot to dump your car in order to collect insurance. That is my honest belief about it. It would be very troublesome and an encumbrance to shipping if we had to fence it in.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I dislike the way in which you wish to fence it. A simple method could be used by the use of greenheart timber.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not a point of order; the hon. member should have asked the Minister to give way.

Mr. MILLER: If the Hon. Minister would give way, I just want to say that in spite of all the discussion which we have had on this matter, I still believe and understand that most of the ships which handle cargo on the waterfront are small vessels and greenheart timber probably twelve or eighteen inches high could be used for the purpose of fencing the Wharf and I do not think that would be an annoyance at all.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, the hon. junior member for St. George suggested putting a greenheart strip about twelve inches high along the edge of the Wharf, but I do not think that a twelve-inch strip would give sufficient protection to a vehicle coming around there at a very fast rate. It may give some protection to a vehicle coming at a very slow rate. However, it might be of some good and I would give some consideration to it providing it would not in any way affect shipping. As I mentioned just now, in all the accidents which have happened there, no life has been lost and I can only come to the conclusion that a lot of those accidents have been purposely carried out.

The hon. junior member for Christ Church made mention of legislation. He said that this legislation should be published so that people in every area would know the particular districts which would be set out. That is one of the reasons why this legislation has not been passed yet. It is very difficult. Barbados is an Island which has always been very heavily populated and although we would like this legislation to be passed as soon as possible, we yet have to give consideration to the trouble and expenses to which some people would be put, therefore we have to try and eliminate or make as less as possible any hardship to which some people may be put. We are prepared to acquire wherever possible land for highway improvements. We are also prepared to accept any freeness of any highway or land for improvement purposes that any person is willing to give to this Government.

5.50 p.m.

We are prepared to accept any free gifts of any highway or land for purposes of improvement, if any person is willing to give this land to the Government. We will put down walls and pavements as well as conveniences provided for highways and transport.

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

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that you do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee on this Bill.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: 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 on the Bill, Mr. BATSON in the Chair.

Clause 1 was called and passed.

Clause 2 was called.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: I beg to move that Clause 2 stand part of the Bill.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this opportunity of saying to the Minister that the point which I raised relative to the Careenage was not so much a question of railing off the area or making it difficult for ships to be unloaded, but it was a question of making the area safe for traffic. The Minister should remember that that part of the wharf was only used as a little diversion. It was not the main highway but now that you are going over the Chamberlain Bridge you have to go that way unless you are going up by the Cathedral having turned above this building. Now that the traffic is diverted you have a narrow stretch of road along which you are carrying on other things, and I was thinking that it is not safe to have these large buses diverted along that road. I know that the problem was how to circle the traffic in one way, but we have to look at these things and I say that this is a potential danger.

As regards what the hon. junior member for Christ Church has said, if I am in order, if I want to put up a building I must set it back six feet on my land. I do not see that there is any right which you are taking away from anybody. If you tell me that I must go back six feet on my land if I am to set out a building, what is wrong in telling a man that he has to go back six feet on his land because I am building a road. Where improvements are being carried out and where pushing back a person's property would not lower the value of any place, I feel that we should set up a Committee to study the legislation which should be enacted in this regard. I would not like any one to think that people's property must be given up and they do not get any compensation for it; but if you buy land in order to build a house you cannot build that house in the same manner in which the person who is next door had built his house.

Now that I am here at this point, I am saying that in my own area — I hope the Minister will go to Six Mens and see for himself — you will have to prohibit people from living on the west side of the road. We should tell them that we must have a boulevard instead of allowing people's out offices and other property to be washed out in the sea. The same thing applies along the Carlton-Weston area; you could make an improvement there. Did the people not tell you that they did not want their pig pens, out offices and so forth washed away? When I get a little older I want to feel that I am in one of these Latin American countries as I go along the highway. I am hoping that we will decide to acquire these lands by paying for them but where you are going to carry out a little road improvement in consonance with your country's spending, you will not have to pay. I believe that it was the last Government which encouraged people in these things, that when you are carrying out a little improvement people must be paid for their property. What would happen, I would like to ask, if you were to take down DaCosta's wall from the bend until you got around the corner? Mr. Chairman, if a dog were to start to run at you along this part of that premises, he is bound to bite you before you get to the end of the gate.

6.00 p.m.

I am thinking about Mr. Bowring's big wall. If I had to pass the laws in this Island, no one person could live in a house so big. In a small place like Barbados, why should a man be living in such a big house? It has as much wall as Harrison College. If you take away a piece of that wall, you will not be doing anything wrong.

Mr. MILLER: Picket.

Mr. WALCOTT: Fortunately, they are good employers and they do not give any trouble. I hope that certain people do not feel that we are not recognizing their common law rights. This is not a question of confiscating people's property. We are carrying out road-widening in such a manner that it would not cause injury to an owner of property. As the hon. junior member for Christ Church has said, there are a few people who would be willing to give up a small piece of land if the Government would put back the wall and so on.

Clause 2 was passed.

Clause 3 was called and passed.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that you report the passing of one Bill in Committee.

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

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

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

On motion of Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON seconded by Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS in each case, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE ACQUISITION OF LAND FOR A PLAYING FIELD

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 6 be the next Order of the Day.

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 6 stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Education: To move the passing of the following Resolution:-

Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition by the Governor-in-Executive Committee of the parcel of land described in the Schedule thereto for the purpose of extending the playing field at St. Silas School.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to ask for leave to take charge of the Order standing in the name of the Minister of Education.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister is craving leave to deal with the Order standing in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Lucy who is out of the Colony. If there is no objection, leave will be granted. *(Pause).* There being no objection, leave will be granted.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, the playing field at St. Silas School is inadequate, and the Hon. Minister of Education has recommended the acquisition of a parcel of land adjoining it in order to be able to extend the facilities to the children at the school. The Resolution therefore seeks the approval of this compulsory acquisition by the Government of a piece or parcel of land situated at Orange Hill containing by admeasurement Two Roods Eighteen and One half Perches or thereabouts (made up of three parcels of land containing respectively 40 Perches, 18 1/2 Perches and 40 Perches) abutting and bounding on lands of St. Silas School, the property of the Executive Committee; on Plum Tree Gully, on lands now or late of Oliver Payne, on lands now or late of Oliver Walcott or however else the same may abut and bound.

Negotiations have been completed with three of the four owners of the above area of land. The title is technically defective, although proof of ownership can be given, and it is considered necessary to use the Land Acquisition Act, 1949 in order to give Government an indefeasible title.

Within recent months the Hon. Minister of Education has been very active in drawing to the attention of the Government the inadequate area of schools throughout the Island for the purpose of providing playing facilities for the children. The Government, to the extent of its financial capacity, is endeavouring to provide additional areas wherever possible.
6.00 - 6.10 p.m.

We cannot of course provide playing fields to the extent laid down by regulations in the United Kingdom permitting a certain acreage for a specified number of children, but to the extent of our capacity we are trying wherever we can to see that an area of land is there to enable all children to play during hours when they are not in school and to give them the means of recreation facilities of which they are now deprived.

There has been a number of instances in which we have recently acquired land for this purpose for which we did not have to come to the Legislature in a similar case because there was no necessity for acquiring the land under the Land Acquisition Act. Where it was possible to acquire it outright at a negotiable price acceptable to the Government and where the title was clear, we acquired it without coming to the Legislature, but where it is a case as the one under consideration, it becomes necessary to come to the House and seek legislative approval.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. CARMICHAEL: Mr. Speaker, it is not easy for me to resist speaking on a piece of legislation which is designed, as is always so, to benefit the whole Island and particularly a part of St. James.

There is one observation which I would like to make. Many people feel that the Government is doing something only when they hear that at the end of the week they would get two shillings more or at the end of the month they would get five dollars more, or if they hear that the price of a pound or a pint of a commodity is reduced a little, but little as they know, there are other pieces of legislation which although they do not take off or reduce the prices of a commodity or increase indirectly their particular wages, weekly or monthly, on the whole they yet are of great benefits to this community.

While I am not an authority on education, while I will not attempt to say what a playing field is to a school, I will say what I know about it and it is something which is regarded as a lung to a school. I am certain that the people of Orange Hill and those children who go to the Orange Hill School to benefit from that school will not always remain in the Orange Hill because the benefits which a child receives from a school has far reaching effects. One is a spirit of discipline. Even those children who do not take part actively can sit and see what is going on.

I have no doubt that this playground would be used and would be prepared in a proper way. While I am on my feet and speaking on this Resolution, I just want to say that I am quite aware that education is a very big problem which is actively engaging the attention of Government and I know it can only now be a question of priority. I am sure that while the Hon. Minister is on Orange Hill looking at that school that he will look down the hill and see the Paynes Bay School and the Good Shepherd School. I must admit that many of them are not Government Schools and many are controlled by the Church so that the question of having some adjustments made to them is not an easy one. It is clear that the Paynes Bay School is almost outdated, but I am hoping that the Government, especially the Hon. Minister of Education, even when they are compromising quotas along with the authorities of these two schools will do their best to get them on the priority list and that in the near future these two schools will be changed in proper schools with suitable playgrounds.

Mr. WALCOTT: Sir, on a matter like this you can take the opportunity to point out things, because it deals with a matter which is in process of change. This is not only a Resolution for the acquisition of land, but it is also a matter of getting this land for a playground for a school.

What I would like to point out to the Hon. Minister at this stage is that the Government should look at this elementary school programme in the light of 1963 and this is the reason why I say that. Barbados with 126 elementary schools cannot be an answerable matter in 1963 because the reason why you have 126 schools in Barbados is owing to the days when education was propagated by the Church and you had the horse and buggy concept, and the horse and buggy means of mobolity, such things restricted those schools to being sited near the Church. That concept is no longer in keeping with common sense and movement of times and it is creating an unnecessary high maintenance, and beyond the mark of what a school should be. I went to school where a playing field was a memory in that it was sited on nothing but hard coral stone. Probably, that is what has made me a man of my outlook — rugged — because I had no grass to play on.

However, Sir, it is no credit to our times that between 1928 and 1929 free education was given to elementary school children in Barbados, which is about 35 years ago, and from that time we have not yet reached the stage where we can make free education compulsory. There it is a challenge. When they gave free education 35 years ago, that was a credit, but I do not want the hon. senior member for the City to take any credit for that.
6.20 p.m.

Therefore it was a challenge 35 years ago to what is happening now. I say that the outlook of people 35 years ago —*(ASIDES)* I do not want the hon. member to think about conservatism being more progressive than we are, except within the context that the Conservatives gave free education in elementary schools and we are still battling with the idea that we cannot make this same free education compulsory because we believe in the snobbish idea of allowing children to come out of school when they reach the third or fourth standard, and then we tell them that they do not understand what is going on. My belief is that you should buy all the land for playing fields and the cookshops for feeding these children, but when they come out of school at the third or fourth standard they are not what the community requires.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Speaker, I agree with this Resolution for the extension of the playingfield at this school in St. James, because I know the value of games to the youth of the school. We have two schools in Speightstown and neither of them can boast of having a playingfield. My colleague, the hon. senior member for St. Peter, has just made reference to the St. Peter's Girls' School which is in a sandy area. I have, on more than one occasion, spoken on the condition of the yard at this school; it is also a public yard. The Speightstown Boys' School accommodates over 400 children; that school has been built on the road and there is nothing like a playing field there. The difficulty is that very soon from now the authorities may have to consider removing both of these schools to some other place where there is the sort of setting which is more conducive to the teaching of children.

Quite recently my hopes were dashed to the ground when I understood that the Government is no longer acquiring Forde's pasture, because there you would have a playing field for the accommodation of both the girls and the boys attending the schools in Speightstown for engaging in games. Other schools in St. Peter do not fare in any way better. Boscobelle is on a rocky site in so far as the boys' school is concerned and the girls' school fares very little better. As to Black Bess, that is in an isolated district. The provision of these playingfields is a matter which should be extended. Education is a sort of patch-work process and people cannot find the money with which to build proper schools, so that the policy is followed as was existing years ago. The population has increased but the school buildings remain the same. It is not an easy problem for the Government to think of building schools on the existing site. I do hope that in the very near future playing fields will be acquired in order to accommodate the boys and girls of the primary schools. I do welcome this decision to make some provision for the pupils of the St. Silas Boys' School. Nobody has to stress the advantages which will accrue from these amenities and we do hope that little by little similar facilities will be extended to schools all over the island.

Mr. HOLDER: Mr. Speaker, it is with very great pleasure that I listened to the Hon. Minister who is taking charge of this Bill in the absence of the Hon. Minister of Education. I was rather pleased when he said that the Minister is looking around for amenities for playingfields. I am also very pleased to see that the Minister of Education in respect of this particular school — the St. Silas Senior School — has taken up from where the last Minister of Education has left off. St. Silas is an old building and as the years rolled on, we had to build a school up there. I accompanied the Hon. Minister of Education and the Director of Education on the tour which they made when they were looking around for a spot where they might erect that school somewhere else.

The senior school always had a portion of land behind it and a little in front of it but when the new structure was put up, it had to be pushed back and it took up the whole area of land. The Education Department then had to turn their attention to the matter of providing a playingfield. I may say, Mr. Speaker, that this matter was hanging fire for a long time. Mr. Oliver Payne went to the United States of America for quite a long time and Mr. Oliver Walcott has now gone. The land which it is now sought to acquire for the purpose of extending the playing field at this school adjoins the property formerly owned by these people.

It is unfortunate that the provisions of the Land Acquisition Act had to be employed. There is a tenant on the land. This land was going into the market for sale anyhow and because of the want of this land for the extension of the playing field at this school, the Department of Education has taken advantage of this position. I repeat that this matter has been hanging fire for quite a long time, and I am exceedingly glad to see that it has come to an end.

As regards the Paynes Bay School and the St. Albans Infant School, they have got playing fields. I do not think that I can stress this matter any longer but I am very pleased to know that these negotiations have been concluded and that the playing field will be next to the school. I hope that the Education Department will erect a suitable fencing there. *(Cheers).*
6.30 p.m.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, the playing field of that school is rather small. If the area is enlarged, the children would be able to play cricket and the playing field would be able to accommodate sports for children from other schools. I am very glad to hear that this Resolution has reached the House at last. *(Cheers).*

Mr. SMITH: I am also appealing to the Hon. Minister in charge of this matter to draw to the attention of the Hon. Minister of Education the fact that other schools are in need of playing fields. I know that it is a question of funds, but there are two schools in St. Joseph and not one of them has a playing field because of the locality of the school.

I am asking the Hon. Minister to take up this matter with the Hon. Minister of Education. I do not know when the Government will be ready to erect a new St. Elizabeth School. I understand that the Government is about to acquire a site on which to build a new shcool, and I hope that sufficient land will be acquired to accommodate a proper playing field so that the school will be in a position to entertain other schools. There is no playing field at St. Bernard's; there is no playing field at St. Joseph's Boys' or St. Joseph's Girls' School; and there is no playing field at St. Anns. I feel that in erecting schools and acquiring sites, enough land should be obtained in order to accommodate proper playing fields.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: In reply to the hon. junior member for St. Joseph and the other hon. members who have

spoken about playing fields, I think I should inform hon. members that it is not the policy of the Government to build new schools anywhere in this Island unless the site has adequate facilities for a playing field. Before a school is constructed the Ministry of Education has to submit the plans for the school to a body which I have established. It is not a statutory one, but it meets once a week. It is called the Central Planning Committee, and it is constituted of all the heads of the Works Department, Engineers and Architects. The Minister of Finance is also connected with this Committee, and hon. members can be assured that every single penny of the taxpayers' money which has been spent on any scheme — even if the Cabinet approves it — does not go into operation until some twenty members of the Committee discuss the matter.

In St. Joseph, for instance, the hon junior member has outlined difficulties of getting a piece of land. We have negotiated the purchase of 93 acres of woodland which is natural forest. We were just attempting to build the new St. Elizabeth School when the Hon. Minister of Education brought the matter before the Committee. The members of the Committee are considering what part of the 93 acres will be good enough to provide facilities for playing fields. The expansion of schools has to be done in several cases. So far as new shcools are concerned, there is a minimum requirement by Government *per capita* to students depending on the number of students attending the school. The Government anticipates that a certain number of students will attend a certain school, and there is a minimum laid down regarding the playing field.

The next school will be erected in Deacons Road in a matter of weeks, and it will be provided with extensive playing facilities.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, the hon. senior member and the hon. junior member for St. Peter have drawn attention to the notorious inadequacy of playing fields for schools throughout the Island, but this is a legacy which this Government has inherited. It will take the Government some time to redress the situation in all cases.

There is one thing that the Hon. Minister of Edcation can pride himself on and it is the attention he has been giving both to the provision of playing fields, and to the expansion and erection of additional school accommodation.

The Hon. Premier has referred to the Planning Committee. I think about two weeks ago we approved not less than six applications either for the expansion of schools, or the erection of new shcools. I remember distinctly the proposed expansion of the Secondary Modern School in St. Joseph and Blackman's, plus the erection of the new school at Deacons Road to which the Hon. Premier has already referred.

Government has under consideration the area adjacent to Government House, but certain things need not be brought before the Legislature because provision has been made for them in the Estimates. The detailed scheme does not come here when financial provision has already been made. It is only in a case like this, when Government has to acquire the land compulsorily, that the matter is brought before the House.

I have no doubt that the Hon. Minister of Education will publish the full details concerning this matter in due course. This Government cannot hope to equal the United Kingdom provision for playing fields — 30 acres to every 1,000 children — with the limited amount of funds and land in Barbados, but the Government is certainly doing the best it can.

I am sure that in due course both the public and the hon. members of the House will be satisfied with what the Government has done both by way of providing proper playing fields and additional school accommodation.

6.40 p.m.

The hon. junior member for St. Peter referred to the advance in transportation saying that this is not the horse and buggy age, apparently, he wanted to infer that with more improved means of transportation we need not have all these schools sited in their present position. I do not agree with him. Though mobility is now recognised yet still we cannot think in terms of children in elementary schools paying bus fares to get to school, therefore we have to continue with having elementary schools built on their present sites because they are sited in populated areas where children can walk to them without having to pay bus fares.

Sir, I do not think I can finish my remarks without referring to the speech made by the hon. junior member for St. James. He himself has confessed that the lack of proper playing fields at St. Silas School had been a crying need for some years ago. My recollection is that that school was erected some six years ago. The hon. member knows that when this school was erected no playing field was attached to it. He went there with the Minister of Education from his Government and for these long years the children of this school have been denied a playing field. We have now to make good this inadequacy which has been prevailing for so long and it only serves to show that from playing fields to schools, free school meals to free secondary university education, the Government has to institute almost a new concept to educational matters and to adopt a more dynamic manner so as to provide for the children of this country and therefore it must be recognised, understood and admitted on all sides that if these things involve the expenditure of finance, you have to get the funds from somewhere and if the last Government found it impossible to do these things because of the lack of funds that if we undertake to do them, we cannot do them with straw, therefore Government has to find the money and to remedy all the defects of the last Government.

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

THE LAND ACQUISITION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1963.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 7 be the next Order of the Day.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think that such a motion is necessary because we have just completed No. 6, therefore automatically we go to No. 7.

This is a motion standing in the name of the Hon. Premier; second reading of a Bill to amend the Land Acquisition Act, 1946.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, this Bill which we have now before us to amend the Land Acquisition Act of 1949 is one which has been long overdue. There are eight sections of this Bill and although it is not very long, there are certain important changes which we are introducing into the law relating to the compulsory acquisition of land.

I should like to make it very clear at the outset that because we are introducing amendments of this nature, it does not mean that Government has any intention to buy out the land of Barbados by the machinery made available by the Land Acquisition Act. I heard sometime ago, a responsible member of this House when the last Government Party was going to nationalize the Sugar Industry say that they are going to buy out the land of the Island. I do not know if they had the money but they certainly did not leave it to us. We have no intention to buy out all the land of Barbados. Property is in the hands of a few people but for Government to come in as a large landlord and become merely a substitute for the plantation system is not the object of this party.

However, Government has from time to time, sometimes not because of lack of co-operation on the part of the owner but through defects in title and sometimes through ownership in title which cannot be traced, has to invoke the Land Acquisition Act in order to acquire land for some project. We have to recognise that in most of the occasions on which Government acquires land it does so by private treaty and agreement between the owners and representa-

tives of the Government which is the Legal Department. I do not know of the percentage of anticipated negotiations, of the amount in comparison with the total number of transactions which took place in this case, but it must be well over ninety per cent but for the ten per cent of cases for reasons which I have already mentioned, such as defects in title and ownership of land and title and not for offering at a reasonable price, Government has to come to the Legislature. We must remember that compulsory acquisition does not come before the Legislature. It is not something which the Executive Committee does or binds itself on its own behalf, therefore there are two stages at which this House intervenes in the acquisition of land, one is to get the finance and secondly to seek the approval of the Legislature, if I use that term in its widest sense. When it is there to be acquired the Government would negotiate with the owner of the land and if the owner agrees to sell the land, well then the Government itself then arranges the price and if the price to which we agree is agreed upon the land is acquired without further ado. When however the owner is reluctant or the title is defective, Government then comes to the Legislature for the necessary provisions to acquire the land. The owner, even at that stage, is not bound to dispose of the land at the price which the Government considers the land to be worth because even although the Legislature approves the procedure of compulsory acquisition, the Legislature has no authority to arrive at the price which should be paid for the land.
6.50 p.m.

They can tell you the maximum amount of money that we are supposed to spend on land acquisition but the Legislature is not urgent to offer the owner of the land the price which might be paid. The next step is that the party who is dissatisfied, who is usually the owner of the land, applies for arbitration and it is usual under the Act to have one arbitrator appointed by the Government and one by the vendor of the land. The two of them together agree upon an umpire whose decision is final, if there is any disagreement between the arbitrators when it comes to the fixing of the price. After reference has been made to the arbitrators and the umpire has been appointed, the arbitrators sit and the Government brings in its legal advisers; the vendor brings in his legal advisors and they call witnesses to give the value of the land. After listening to the evidence as to the value of the land and the special assets which the land has, the arbitrators come to a decision with the assistance of the umpire and the award is made. That award is binding on both parties.

That is one of the fundamental principles of arbitration. Then, of course, the costs are awarded on one side or on the other. It must not be forgotten that the land is vested in the Government as soon as the matter has been published. We have a case now of land being acquired under the machinery of compulsory arbitration against the advice of the Government's experts who thought of this land as being highly unsuitable. Hon. members will remember the land at Forde's Pasture. The Government was advised against it. I am not going to make any references to the people in the Government who made fulsome speeches as to what would be done with this land. The Government has acquired this land under a compulsory acquisition Order and nothing has been done since three years ago. After the Order was made, the Government discovered that the experts were right, that the land was unsuitable. *(ASIDES).* The person was the Minister of Social Services who insisted on the acquisition of this land and nothing has been done about it. The money has not been paid for the land up to now, which means that this Government will have to find money to pay for this land. Under the 1949 Act the Government has no authority to abandon the acquisition of that land which the Government may not want. I am not saying whether the Government wants Forde's Pasture or not because we have to confer with people as to this land. Under the Act, the Government Department has power, after they have paid for the land and they do not need all of it, to sell it back to the original owner of the land. Although the Government has not paid for the land, the owner cannot go on it because he would be a trespasser. The Government cannot say that we are not worrying about the land; we have to find about $100,000 or $200,000 and after the owner of the land has the money in his hands then the Government can ask him whether he will buy back the land. This is a rather fatuous situation; the owner of the land is not bound to buy it back because he has the money in his pocket. Coconuts are on this land and are not being reaped either by the Government or by the former owner of the land; they are being reaped by the public at large.

Mr. Speaker, I may give a practical illustration of this matter. Some person who acts as an overlord goes on the land but nobody who is recognised by the Government goes on that land. If the Government wants the owner to re-enter the land, the Government will have to pay him some money for it. We are working on many projects throughout the length and breadth of this island. We cannot hold up the construction of the East Coast Road; we need to negotiate with nobody, once the machines go there we talk business afterwards. Although people have generously given up their land we may not have other people who will act as generously as that. We need from a ten-foot to a twenty-foot road. We cannot proceed like that and then come back and talk about compensation and the machinery of arbitration and so forth.
7.00 p.m.

We have made some changes in the amending Bill which we now have before us. The important amendment which we are introducing is the one which I have just mentioned. This is to permit the abandonment of the land or any part of it even after compensation has been awarded, but before it has been paid. This is not now possible under the existing Act.

Secondly, Section 3 deals with the value of the land which is an amendment to Section 11. It indicates how arbitrators will arrive at a fair value of the land. I think that we have done justice to everyone, because under the old formula the rules for interpreting the compensation were done under Section 11. Section 11 states:

> (1) "The value of the land shall, subject as is hereinafter provided, be taken to be the amount which the land if sold in the open market by a willing seller might be expected to realise at the date of the first publication in the Official Gazette of a notification in accordance with section three of this Act.
>
> (2) The special suitability or adaptablity of the land for any purpose shall not be taken into account if that purpose is a purpose to which it could be applied only in pursuance of statutory powers or for which there is no market apart from the requirements of any Government Department or any local or public authority.
>
> (3) Where the value of the land is increased by reason of the use thereof or of any premises thereon in a manner which could be restrained by any court, or is contrary to law, or is detrimental to the health of the inmates of the premises or to the public health, the amount of the increase shall not be taken into account."

Then they go on to state:

> (5) No allowance shall be made on account of:-
>
> (a) the acquisition being compulsory or the degree of urgency or necessity which has led to the acquisition;
>
> (b) any disinclination of the person interested to part with the land acquired....."

Under the new amendment, Mr. Speaker, the value of the land shall be as set out in Section 3 (1) (b):

> "In ascertaining the value of such land regard shall be had to the net amount of any income derived from that land at the material time, and where no income is derived therefrom at that time, to the rent at which the land might, at the material time, reasonably be expected to be let from year to year for the purpose of being put to the same use to which it was being put at that time;"

Under Section 3 (1) (c):

> "land shall be deemed to be used for agricultural purposes unless the party claiming compensation proves to the satisfaction of the appropriate authority that at the material time such land was being used for a purpose other than agricultural purposes."

In other words, we are relating the value which the arbitrators are entitled to attribute to land to the annual rental value for the purpose of rates and taxes, so that it bears some relation to what contribution one is making towards the economy of the country. A man who is paying a large amount of taxes for land will normally expect to receive a reasonable price for it. The annual rental value of the land will also be taken into consideration.

Another innovation which is based on the 1947 English legislation is the fact that the present use of the land is important, and not what it may be possible to produce. Some land in Barbados fifty years from now may worth $100 per square foot. Some people have a way of putting forward some sort of hypothetical use for which land may be put, although the land has been lying fallow for a long time.

Unfortunately, in this country you will find people who leave acres of land lying fallow, and the moment Government comes along to acquire it the Government is told that millionaires and Canadians want to purchase the land. When the land is lying fallow for several years the owners do not pay much taxes on it.

The new amendment gives parties the right to appeal to the Supreme Court in case they are not satisfied. This is a principle for which the Government has always fought: whenever parties are not satisfied with the decision of the arbitrators, then they should have the right to appeal to the Court. The Government has therefore inserted it in the Lands Acquisition Act.

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

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

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. SPEAKER: It being 7.10 p.m. o'clock, the business of the House is now suspended until 7.45 p.m.
7.10 p.m.

On re-assembling,

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, I am asking that the bell be rung as there is no quorum.

Mr. SPEAKER: I thank you for drawing that to my attention.

The Bell was rung and a quorum obtained.

Mr. SPEAKER: On the suspension, it was moved and seconded that the Bill to amend the Land Acquisition Act, 1949, be read a second time.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I do not know if it is necessary to ask for latitude in this case because what I am really going to speak on is to some extent the same thing as contained in the clauses of this Bill. The Hon. Premier in his remarks made mention of Forde's Land, an area of land in Speightstown which was acquired by the last Government mainly for the use of a park rather than a playing field. The files with respect to this matter are residing in the Ministry on the desk of the Minister and they can be checked to make sure of my accuracy in these remarks. After we had checked on the site, and paid attention to the town itself which is not like one of the other rural areas to be just content with a playing field, we arrived at the decision that what we would have to do for Speightstown was to think in terms of a park rather than a playing field. We not only had to think of the children, but as hon. members know, there is a rich cultural middle class there to say nothing of the business people and I, as Minister of Social Services then, was convinced that a playing field would not suffice since we wanted to cater to all the people there, and for that reason I came to the conclusion that a park was the thing rather than a playing field.

The owner of the land, a Mr. Whitehead, called at the Ministry to discuss the matter and to give us some idea of the price of this land. He was willing to sell this land at the time at a reasonable price, but by the time Government was interested in purchasing it, the price was multiplied by something like ten times. We resisted for more than a year going to see the Crown Solicitor.

Now, as regards the site, that land is actually not below sea level but a sand bar has been built up over the years — all that information is on the files — and the removal of this sand bar would afford a drainage of the area and then it could be used as a playing field.

As hon. members know, the land attached to the St. Peter's school can hardly accommodate the children at that school and we took the decision then that a part of Forde's Land should be made available to this school for use as a playing field. Part of it was also to be used for housing but I think that we were willing to push that aside for housing and cater for its use as a park. We thought that it would provide a quiet spot to which the middle aged could go and sit to say nothing of the social amusements and entertainments for both young and old alike which could take place there. A park is in keeping with the requirements of the area of a township and all of these things were decided upon, but we were up against it. Hon. members will remember that soon after that, part of Heywoods was sold out for a hotel project. We were then advised by the engineers in the Government department to wait until this project had come about to see whether we could tie this land into a drainage scheme along with this hotel project. Subsequently, we found it impossible to buy that land and Mr. Whitehead himself was not in a position to sell it. I should add that it was marginal because there was no building on that land nor was there anything done to it for over ten years. I do not think it was even regarded as good grass land, there were no crops and the land was lying fallow for ten years.

I should say that at first the owner was particularly anxious to be relieved of it particularly realising that Government was interested in it. He probably thought that he could get ten times more for it than if he sold to a private buyer.

The whole idea about it was to tie in the drainage system of this area with the hotel scheme. I do not know, Sir, if there is anything wrong with this. As regards its use as a park for Speightstown, hon. members know only too well what Queen's Park means to the people of the City of Bridgetown. All of us know what a park means towards the attraction of a city. Of course, I do not know if Queen's Park is serving the original idea of how it should function, but on the question of Forde's Land in Speightstown, I think hon. members would appreciate my view on it. It is not like the Social Centre at Ellerton, St. George or the Social Centre in St. John.

I do not know if there is anything which anybody would want to say more on Forde's Land other than those unkind remarks by the Hon. Premier. I think the Hon. Minister of Social Services has discussed it and has all the information. He knows that a park must mean something to the people of that area. If you ask me as a boy to play cricket and you tell me that I would have to go somewhere in St. Michael over a mile away from where I lived, if there was no Queen's Park, I would rather play it on the sidewalk until a white helmeted police comes along. If you are living in the City you want a park so that there would be some place for your old folk to go and sit quietly and for mothers to take their children. Those are the things which mean much in a community and you must think of what is required. I think I have said all that is necessary on this matter.
8.05 p.m.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On the face of this Bill, there seems to be a sound equitable principle involved. I can appreciate the difficulties in acquiring land under the Compulsory Acquisi-

tion Act. This matter has been outlined by the Hon. Premier and it is part of my business to know all the ramifications surrounding the securing of land under the Compulsory Land Acquisition Act. I do not want to delay any time in dealing with this Bill but there are certain sections of the Bill which deal with agricultural land and when we come to those sections in Committee I will deal with them. I will make the suggestion that these sections should be gone into more carefully and it seems to me that this Bill should be referred to a Select Committee. This Bill, in some of its sections, deals with agricultural land, what it is used for, if the land is rented what it is bringing in and so forth. When it comes to the question of taking the valuation of the land into consideration together with the terrain of that land, none of that has been taken into account. You have a tremendous number of sites which cannot be used as agricultural land; there is not one inch of mould in the particular areas and therefore this land cannot be used for agricultural purposes. For the purposes of development, the owners of such land would never have the money, but money can come from outside for the purpose of this development.

What are we going to do about this land which is not designated as agricultural land? You may have land which is not used as agricultural land and with the houses which are erected on it, it may bring in some twenty dollars or thirty dollars a year. If somebody is going to buy that land, are you suggesting that you would discourage people from bringing money into the island and say that because this land is not agricultural land and because the taxes will be only $20 a year, that it is only worth a few dollars? In all of these matters I suggest that Barbadians should have the right to go to the Judiciary.....

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order. The hon. member is now talking about a hypothetical case where a foreigner comes in and a valuation will be placed on the present valuation of land. But that does not arise in this Bill; the provision in this Bill is where the Government wants to acquire the land so that the hon. member's hypothetical case would not arise.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I fully appreciate the hon. member's point. I can think of two sites now which you will acquire because they are adjacent to your land. I see you acquiring those sites now and those sites are not presently used for agricultural purposes because they cannot bear anything at all. They are not rented out in house spots and therefore they will be considered as rab land. You are going to say that this is not agricultural land and it has not got the value of land which is situated in the city. It is not worth £500 an acre, it is not rented out in tenantry, but for valuation purposes it is valued at so much per acre. According to this Bill, the arbitrators, the Judge, the Director of Public Works and so on, come in and that is where your difficulty will arise.

Mr. Speaker, there is another point which has to be taken into consideration. You have agricultural land and you have tenantry land. It is my business to review applications for places where people have to live. I do not want to call any names or to pick out any places, but in certain areas certain things will be carried out and this land cannot be used for agricultural land. If it cannot be used for agricultural purposes, it is therefore land for building purposes and you have not got anything in this Bill with respect to land for building purposes. You are taking this as agricultural land but the arbitrator says that it is not used for that purpose. You come along and say "What is it"? It is not tenantry land and therefore it is not making any $100 a year. In that case, you will take the value of the land and see how much you will get for land which is bringing in $100 a year.

8.15 p.m.

I hope the hon. member is following me carefully. Then you take the valuation of the land from the point of view of its assessment. All over this democratic world, you will find people following certain principles. Take Lodge Hill, for instance, everybody went ahead and bought the land at Lodge Hill at three cents or four cents a square foot. For the purpose of developing Barbados, people drew their money from the banks and started to develop the area. It was not agricultural land, and it had absolutely no agricultural value.

In Barbados at one time — I will give you the history of the West Coast — there were about 100 acres of land in St. James. There is someone in this Chamber who can bear testimony to what I am about to say. That particular area belongs to Porters. One man offered his father £10 an acre for the whole 100 acres. The father told him that he would be throwing away £1,000, if he bought the land. However, a man came from overseas and offered £500 an acre for the land. I am talking about the 100 acres connected with Porters. Eventually, the selling of that area resulted in Sandy Lane Hotel being erected there. When the people started to develop the land, other people came in and joined them because of the lovely beaches in the area.

One of the finest areas which is adjacent to your area, you are going to use the purpose of acquisition to get. You are giving consideration to agricultural land, annual rental of the land, and what the land is assessed at. You are now talking about what the land would reasonably bring at the time. If you had stopped there, it would have been all right. Some of that land would possibly bring 50 cents a square foot. According to the Government, if it is agricultural land that is what it is worth.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: You can always appeal.

Mr. MOTTLEY: This is what is stated in the Bill:

"'The Appropriate authority' means the Director, Public Works Department, or as the case may be any Judge, Court, tribunal, arbitrator or person authorised by this Act to determine the amount of compensation payable thereunder;"

"'The material time' is the date of the first publication in the *Official Gazette* of a notification under section 3 of this Act with respect to the land."

That is the true position, but there is a fourth principle. Members of this House know that what I am saying is true. I believe that there should be a more equitable distribution of land in this country. I do not believe in cutting up the land and giving it to peasants, but I believe in a strong peasantry in any community. In a country where you have more people having a stake in the community, you will have less chances of the evil of communism creeping in.

The definition of "agricultural purposes" is as follows: "includes all purposes directly connected with the use of land as arable, grazing, or pasture land, or for dairy farming, or for any other purpose of animal husbandry including the keeping or breeding of poultry or bees, or for the growth of fruit, vegetables or flowers."

But the Hon. Leader of the House and the Hon. Premier know that there are lots of land now being used for purposes other than purposes mentioned in this Bill. I think that the Government should never make laws so as to encourage people to go around them. What the Government is saying here is that the use of the land at the time should be taken into consideration. We should remember the Crane, the Airport and the land at the Pine. You must also remember the land at Silver Sands. A lot of land in this country is beach land and it can be used only for selling sand.

I feel that a Bill of this sort should be sent to a Select Committee. This is a very important matter, and I feel that a fourth principle should be included. I am sorry the Hon. Premier is not in his seat at the moment. If this Bill is sent to a Select Committee, the Committee should recommend to the Government the inclusion of a fourth principle.

I have had to work on a Board of Arbitration, and I believe that I know the value of every lot of land in this country. I am considered as one of the most conservative valuers in the entire Island. We have land that is not agricultural land. Suppose you wanted to buy a portion of

the Pine to do something? The land is not developed; it is not rented; it is not used for agricultural purposes and the people have to pay a very small tax. Can you come along and say that you are going to give $100 an acre for it? That would not be the value of the land. I wonder whether the Hon. Premier would object to this Bill going before a Select Committee.

Mr. Speaker, giving parties the right to appeal to a Court is a departure from the old custom, but what the Hon. Premier has said is not exactly the custom. The Government will appoint an arbitrator; the vendor will appoint one; the Government will suggest an umpire, and they will go into the matter. Sometimes the vendor is displeased and the matter has to be taken to Court. Sometimes the Judge is bound by laws.
8.25 p.m.

I am in a position to say that there are a lot of people who have inherited properties and who have told us that they do not feel like increasing rents, and so on, because they realise that they are making $2,000 a year or so. If you take 8% of $2,000, it is $160 a year.

According to this, do you know what you are going to do? You are going to make these people say, I am going to put the rent up to the full value. They are going to put up rents because they do not know the day when you will come down on them and say that you want the land. It is not merely to say "for agricultural purposes."

Now, Sir, if I represented St. Peter, I would not talk about putting a playing field at Forde's Pasture, which is behind God's back. I would say that Battaley's is a good place for a playing field. Sweet Home is also a good area but do not go behind a crab hole and put a playing field. Go to Battaleys, a little way aback of the front, and put a playing field I am serious about this. It is not land used for agricultural purposes so you cannot go down there and get anybody asking a big price for that land.

While I am on this, I want to draw your attention to the entrance to the Sandy Lane Beach by the hotel. I have been passing there every morning for the last two weeks and I want to know if this Government is not ashamed about the entrance there. I challenge every one of you to say that the people who have laboured hard in St. James can go down on the St. James' beach. I do not want anybody to go down there and walk about naked.

MOMENT OF INTERRUPTION

Mr. SPEAKER: It is 8.30 o'clock, p.m. the moment of interruption. Is this business controversial?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I do not have any other item of Government Business which I want to proceed with today. I do not know if you would allow us to proceed with this matter on the basis of its being non-controversial.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is there any member objecting to proceeding with this matter on the ground that it is controversial?

Mr. MOTTLEY: You cannot finish this by 9.00 o'clock.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have heard no objection and as long as I have heard no objection, it is non-controversial.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The only body who can say that it is controversial would be the Government.

Mr. SPEAKER: Any one member who says that he is opposing it would mean that it cannot be further proceeded with. As long as we have Standing Orders and I am in the Chair, they will be obeyed.

Is this matter controversial or non-controversial? Is any hon. member opposing it?

Mr. SMITH: I hear the hon. junior member for St. James saying that it is controversial.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. junior member for St. James. Are you saying that it is controversial?

Mr. HOLDER: I did say that it is controversial on the ground that I want a reply.

Mr. SPEAKER: Do you mean to say that you propose to speak on it or that you want to oppose it?

Mr. HOLDER: I will continue to say what I have said already. I did say that it was controversial because I thought that you were coming to a close but if you permit me, I would like to reply to what the hon. senior member for the City has said.

Mr. SPEAKER: Do you seek to oppose this Bill?

Mr. HOLDER: No, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Therefore, I do not consider this controversial; therefore, this matter can be proceeded with until 9.00 o'clock.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Sir, the Bill itself is non-controversial and it is not a matter of offering opposition to the second reading of the Bill but it is a matter of making suggestions to the Government whether the Government would accept them or not.

In a matter of this sort where land can be bought by compulsory acquisition, every now and then you see the price of land sky-rocketing, therefore, I was suggesting that the Bill should go to Select Committee so that the Government could give the undertaking to go into this matter or give some regard to what I was referring to.

I understand that the hon. junior member for St. James wants to reply to something which I was saying just now. I was saying that I was asking for a long time that the road leading to the beach by Sandy Lane which was guaranteed to us for the general public should be made available. That is something which the Hon. Minister of Communications should say that the matter is fixed already.
8.35 p.m.

This is something which I think the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works should see is done. I asked the Hon. Minister now if he could drive his car down to St. James by 8.30 o'clock a.m., tomorrow and we will exchange cars in coming back up, if he can show that this road at Sandy Lane is clear. You know that we have been asking that this particular road be made clear to the general public so that they can see where they are going to the beach without trespassing on people's private property. It was made clear to us when the Sandy Lane Hotel was being built, that we would have this road available to the general public so that they could have access to the beach without trespassing on anybody's private property.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: On a point of order. If the hon member will give way. (Mr. MOTTLEY: I am going to give way.) I would say that the entire place has been surveyed and I have given instructions that a sign be erected showing the public entry to the beach down there.

Mr. MOTTLEY: May I enquire of the Hon. Minister how long ago was that?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: That was about two weeks ago.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am very glad to hear that. I want to say that I have seen a whole tree having been put across the place where the public entrance to the beach is supposed to be. When the last Government gave permission for the erection of a hotel in that area, we were told that there would be provision made for a 20-foot right of way to the beach. I am submitting that that should be made clear otherwise we will find ourselves like Bermuda where the natives will no longer be able to go to the sea. I hope that the Hon. Leader of the House will take note of what I have said about the fourth possibility of the acquisition of land

and that he will take the opportunity of doing what I have suggested.

Mr. HOLDER and Mr. MILLER rose to speak.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. junior member for St. James caught my eye first moreover, according to my notes the hon. junior member for St. George has already spoken.

Mr. HOLDER: Mr. Speaker, relative to this matter which has been raised by the Opposition, I would like to ask the Hon. Minister to grant us the favour by looking up his files relative to the provision of this road at Sandy Lane. It was always understood that there would be a 20-foot right of way on this land so that the public could have access to the beach. I am not now a member of the Northern District Council but it is just some time ago that I learnt that there was some trouble in clearing up this road. I did not make any mention of the matter in this House, but I was told that there was an instruction given that there should be an entrance made to the sea for the benefit of the public. We did not think that they would agree to this and then refuse the community an entrance to the sea. I believe that the road was opened but it was not 20 feet wide. People have been approached about this matter and I think that the Minister should say what has happened. People have been sent from the Northern District Council to see about the clearance of this road. That road had always been near the Telephone Exchange and people should know where the entrance is. Where the provision of that road was concerned, it never cost the Government one cent. I am quite sure that it was laid down in the files that that 20-foot road is situated as you enter on the left hand side of the road and it goes a little opposite the Telephone Exchange. I have spoken about the car park there; I did not come to the House with the matter but the car park is too small. I hope that the Hon. Minister will check his files and see if that road is not mentioned there.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: For the information of the hon. junior member for St. James.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Actually the Hon. Minister has spoken already in that he has seconded the motion for the second reading of this Bill. Perhaps the hon. member might speak on a point of elucidation.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: I thank Your Honour. On a point of elucidation. The hon. junior member for St. James is quite correct in what he has said. It has been clearly set out in the files that this 20-foot right-of-way has been set out in the Plan. Not so long ago, the Northern District Council has been clearing these lands in order to make the entrance quite clear and I have instructed the Public Works Department to have a sign printed and a poster made so that the public can see that there is this entrance and that it should be kept clear. What I think is misunderstood is whether the lands are under the jurisdiction of the Northern District Council or under the jurisdiction of the Ministry of Communications and Works. Mr. Speaker, I have accepted the responsibility for roads and I will make sure that this road is kept perfectly clear. The Northern District Council has turned over this road to us for us to see that it is in order, because there are funds in my Ministry for the purpose of keeping this land in order. I repeat that I have given instructions to the Public Works Department that a sign be made and posted for the public to see that there is a clear indication of the road to the beach. 8.45 p.m.

Mr. SMITH: I am only appealing to the Minister, or whoever will be responsible for the right of way to the land; to erect bath sheds and cubicles as soon as the road is constructed. If the people are not given a right of way and bathing facilities, policemen will go there and make cases.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am not sure whether bathing cubicles form part of a Land Acquisition Bill.

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

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I now beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and that the House go into Committee on this Bill.

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. BATSON in the Chair.

Clauses 1 to 8 inclusive were called separately and passed.

On motion of Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD seconded by Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

LEAVE TO TAKE ORDER NO. 10

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: May I enquire whether Order No. 10 has been circulated? It is a Resolution to place the sum of $29,650 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates, 1963-64, Part I — Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates, 1963-64, No. 7, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have been advised that it has not been circulated.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, that brings Government Business to an end, and I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 9th July, 1963, at 12.00 o'clock (noon).

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

Mr. SPEAKER: I would like to know something in respect of Government Business on the Order Paper.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Government Business will remain as it is, but Federation will not be the first Order.

Mr. SPEAKER: As the matter stands now, Federation is No. 9.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I would prefer the money Resolution to be taken first, Order No. 11 to be taken second and Federation third. There is nothing more on the Order Paper, and, as Your Honour will recall, no notices were given today.

Mr. SPEAKER: What about Private Members' Business?

Mr. SMITH: I would like my Resolution, notice of which was given today, to be moved up as No. 1, under Private Members' Business.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have heard no objection, and the Resolution will now be placed as No. 1, under Private Members' Business on the Order Paper.

The question that the House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 9th July, 1963, at 12.00 o' clock (noon) was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

8.55 p.m.