
THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1962

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 22nd October, 1963

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

PRESENT

His Honour E. L. CARMICHAEL, J.P., (*Deputy Speaker*) Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P.; Mr. E. ST. A. HOLDER, J.P.; Hon. J. C. TUDOR, M.A., (*Minister of Education*); Mr. R. ST. C. WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE; Mr. G. V. BATSON, (*Chairman of Committees*); Mr. N. W. BOXILL and Mr. J. B. YEARWOOD.

Prayers were read

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON and Mr. CORBIN entered the House and took their seats.

MINUTES

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that the Minutes of the Meeting of 15th October, 1963, have been printed and circulated amongst hon. members, and unless there be any objection, those Minutes will be taken as read and confirmed. (*After a pause*). There being no objection, those Minutes are now taken as read and confirmed.

Mr. MOTTLEY entered the House and took his seat.

LAYING OF PAPERS POSTPONED

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise to ask leave to lay papers at a later stage.

There being no objection, leave was granted.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS entered the House and took his seat.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES POSTPONED

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise to ask leave that Government Notices be given at a later stage.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister is making a similar request with regard to Government Notices as in the case of Papers, and if there is no objection, leave will be granted. (*After a pause*). There being no objection, leave is granted.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD entered the House and took his seat.

FIRST READING OF BILLS POSTPONED

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, as in the case of my two previous requests, I am asking leave to postpone the first Reading of Bills until later in the day's session.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Will the Hon. Minister give an intimation as to what Bill he is referring to?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have had to ask for leave to postpone giving notice of Bills, and therefore I have to ask leave for the postponement of the first reading of Bills.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister is asking leave to postpone the first reading of Bills, and if there is no objection, leave will be granted. (*After a pause*.) There being no objection, leave is granted.

Messrs. WALCOTT and LYNCH entered the House and took their seats.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Leader of the House: To move the House into Committee of Supply to consider the grant of sums of money for the service of the Island.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I may not have been listening at the moment, but I was listening as to whether the Clerk had enquired whether there were any Select Committees which were prepared to report today.

Mr. SEALEY entered the House and took his seat.
12.25 p.m.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

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

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1963-64 No. 21

Head 4 - Auditor General - was called.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: This Resolution, Mr. Chairman, as you will note is for the sum of \$1,487 to be granted

for the purposes set out in the Schedule. Head 4 is to provide an additional sum of \$800 for new furniture and equipment for the office of the Auditor General. You will remember, Sir, that under Civil Establishment Order No. 7, we provided the following posts for the Department: two Examiners, two Long Grade Clerks and one Stenographer; and it has now become necessary to provide furniture and equipment to accommodate the additional staff, and that is why the sum of \$800 is required.

I beg to move that Head 4 stand part.

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

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

Head 10 - Accountant General - was called.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, Head 10 is a similar request to provide additional office equipment for the Accountant General's Office. The explanation is that the details of pension sub-voucher forms used by the Treasury for the payment of monthly pensions are imprinted by an embossing machine. A cost of living allowance was recently authorised and it will be necessary to amend the embossing plates to show this allowance and also P.A.Y.E. Income Tax deductions. The plates have already been corrected twice, and it is considered that the metal of which they are made will not withstand another correction. We are therefore asking for \$120 to provide new plates for this purpose.

I beg to move that Head 10 stand part.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I am very glad to see that we are having more efficient methods of bringing these things up to date, but I cannot miss this opportunity of bringing to the attention of Government and the Ministers again the fact that this is the third time I am raising this question — and the old man came in to me today — that the Government should make up its mind about these people who are drawing pensions or gratuities based on their years of service. I think some *ad hoc* decision should be made to provide these people with the money. It is very distressing to find a man who has retired from the Service coming to me month after month when I have raised this question and no relief has been given to the man. I think it is positively unfair to a person who is entitled to these things to keep him waiting so long, and I would like to see the Government come to some conclusion and decision, even if it is an *ad hoc* decision, to pay these people on the basis of evidence in an affidavit that can be sworn to, and arrive at something in order to give these people relief; otherwise if they have to wait so long to get all these papers, they will never be relieved, and I think something should be done to relieve them.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I am in wholehearted agreement with the remarks made by the hon. senior member for St. Peter. I am also asking the Minister and the Government as a whole to go into the matter, and see that something is done relative to the computations of these pensions and so on, because I know a particular man in St. Joseph by the name of Hazlewood who used to work in the Public Works for a very long time. He waited and was put off until eventually he died, and now that his wife has made inquiries, she is told that nothing is there for him as he was never qualified for a pension. I understand that he took in all the necessary documents to qualify him. I do not know if it is so because I was not there, neither did I see them; but every week he would ask me to see to it for him; but now he has gone, his wife has been told that there is nothing there for him. I feel that something is wrong with these computations and it is time that Government should do something about the matter. I daresay that if the gentleman to whom the hon. senior member for St. Peter referred should die tonight, his wife would be told that nothing is there for him. It looks to me as if they are only keeping these people until they die then to declare their hands. It

is not fair or honest to them, and I hope that this Government will go into the matter immediately.

Mr. SEALEY: Mr. Chairman, I should also like to associate myself with the remarks of the two previous speakers. Day after day I am approached by people who have spent all their time in the Government Service, and it is said that the day before they were sixty years old, they were given a letter and sent home without knowing where any income would come from. I feel, Sir, it is time enough that Government should go into this matter and see what they can do for these poor people. I quite agree with the hon. senior member for St. Peter that instead of sending these men home without adopting some kind of method on how they are going to be paid, whether it is a pension or gratuity, it is better to allow them to go on working until you have worked out a method to pay them. There are several of them at home now suffering, and they are of the age where they would never get any further employment in the island.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Chairman, I must associate myself with the remarks of the previous speakers. Several pensioners come to me daily and ask me about their gratuity and pension, since they have been laid off for several months and cannot get any recompense at the present time, and they have been appealing to the Public Assistance Board for a pension in order to keep them alive.
12.35 p.m.

This method has been going on, not by this Government, but for many years; men and women have been laid off for many months from the largest Departments, up to eight and nine months, without pension or gratuity, and they have been walking up and down seeing their representatives. I must say that this is not good enough for this time, and I hope that this Government will go into the matter and make some good effort to help those poor people, either with gratuity or some money in their hands until their pension is finalised.

I would like to say that they are being laid off without proper consideration after working for many years. It is not a good method and I am asking Government to look into it and have it ironed out.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, do not think that I would allow this opportunity to pass without adding my quota. I may say that I do not think it can be attributed at all times to the fault of the Government. I have had that experience myself where people — some of them — fail to qualify, and there has been some difficulty where the employees pass away and there is a question of having the gratuity paid to the legal representatives because in some cases it becomes a squabble between the families of the deceased and that of course, makes it difficult for the lawyers to find the right person to pay the gratuity to, and there is another difficulty at times in finding some person to sign bonds and securities.

However, I agree with the hon. senior member for St. Peter that where such cases, as have been mentioned, do not exist, every effort should be made to expedite the matter rather than hold up persons for a year. Just about an hour or so before I came into this House a youngster came to me and gave me a rather pathetic story of his father who was a member of the Local Constabulary, and who departed this life fifteen months ago; and up to this day, he has got nothing because there has been some ramifications in getting matters settled. I think matters like this should be made quite easy for people.

There is another matter to which the Hon. Minister must give some great consideration, and it is a question of granting maternity leave and how it works. While the Government, I do not think, should be a party to encouraging promiscuity, I do not think it is the Government's duty to decide that if persons must be granted maternity leave it must be granted to people who are high up in certain walks of life or in the Service and not to take into consideration people like domestics who have been working, let us say, ten years at the General Hospital or at the Mental

Hospital. I do not want to be definite. I have already referred to the cases as were put by the hon. senior member for St. Peter, the Trade Union Leader. It is not Government's business to decide whether the child born by this mother is legitimate or illegitimate. If you are granting maternity leave, you should consider granting it to all. I can possibly say more than what I have said to prove a case on this point, but I prefer not to do so on this occasion because it might bring some people into disrepute.

Sir, I too, like the hon. senior member for St. Peter, would like Government to try and expedite this matter. There are some unfortunate traits among some youngsters and some oldsters too, that as soon as they are drafted in the Civil Service and become Civil Servants, they come to the conclusion that their job is not to be courteous to people, especially people who cannot quite understand. This is a trait which I dislike among most of them, and you find it most amongst youngsters, who, as soon as they acquire some sort of certificate, feel this way about it. If these people would be more courteous to people who ask them how to go about things and tell them how to go about them and in a way how they could understand, it would be a lot better. I doubt whether some of these unskilled workers know how to go about these things; therefore, I am wondering whether the Government would care to enact legislation so that these people would not have to go through the legal red tape, that is to say, just as if you have less than a certain amount in the Savings Bank, the law allows the nearest next of kin to draw it. I counsel the Hon. Minister of Trade, whose business it would be to go into these matters, to give this matter favourable consideration.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, hon. members would recall that it took a lot of pressurising on the floor of this House by the then Opposition to get on the Statute Book of this Colony what is now known as the Casual Employees Pensions Act. As a matter of fact, it is now only about two years old because it was enacted in September, 1961, which was roughly about three or four months before this Government assumed office. Therefore, hon. members can understand that nothing by way of the appropriate records had begun when we took up office; and since we have taken up office, we have been actively concerned and we are profoundly agitated over the lack of records in many of these cases, and the difficulty attendant upon presenting the picture necessary to qualify some of these retired people for their pension or gratuity, as the case may be.

There were many cases — and I believe many of them are the cases to which hon. members have referred — in which the people themselves have not put in the amount of service to entitle them legally to a pension. There also was the difficulty of persons who worked for a period of eight years or so who thought that they had qualified and also persons who worked for a longer period but did not have the qualifying consecutive period who thought so, too. Those are cases who feel that they are entitled but who are not. Where they are entitled, the appropriate Department has been actively engaged in endeavouring to sort out these things and is prepared to bring up to date the appropriate records and, wherever the people are qualified legally, to pay out the pension.
12.45 p.m.

I agree, Sir, that there should be a time limit or that there should be a time limit allotted to this preparatory work, but I want hon. members to know that this Government is concerned over this situation and that every possible effort is being made in order to finalise the outstanding claims in this respect within the shortest possible time. In the case to which the hon. senior member for the City has referred.....(ASIDES), Mr. Chairman, I will stop talking.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member has asked a question, and now that the Hon. Minister is replying, hon. members are not listening.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: As I was saying, Sir, in the case to which the hon. senior member for the City has referred, that falls within an entirely different category.

The case of a retired policeman is different. It may well be.....

Mr. MOTTLEY: I did not refer to a retired policeman. I am speaking on a point of order. I said that the Government is not blameworthy here. A boy came to me after his father's death and it is a question of getting a year's pensionable emoluments for the time to which the man was entitled. I said that there were several cases of that sort.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: It may well be that the delay is due to the youngster not taking out the appropriate Letters of Administration if he is legally entitled to his father's gratuity. In the case of casual employees, if the gratuity is below a certain amount, there is machinery to enable the beneficiaries to get this entitlements without taking out Letters of Administration. In the case of the policeman, I think that the appropriate authority is only too pleased to tell the youngster in question what steps he has to take in order to get this entitlement. Anyhow, Sir, hon. members can rest assured that tomorrow I myself will join my own entreaties to the representations which have already been made by the Hon. Premier to the appropriate department in this connection, and it is to be hoped that in the near future we should be able to clean up the stables we have inherited as to the lack of records and give those people the amount of pension to which they are entitled.

The question that Head 10 stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 36 — MINISTRY OF EDUCATION (2) ERDISTON COLLEGE

Head 36 — Ministry of Education (2) Erdiston College — was called.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, this Head involves the sums of \$511 and \$56, making a total of \$567. This is in respect of the Ministry of Education and in relation to Erdiston College. The items involved are "Maids" and "Gardeners". If hon. members were to look at Note 3 in connection with the maids, they will see that the amounts for the maids have been increased in consequence of changes in staffing involving the addition of a post of Maid. The sum of \$511 is therefore required to meet wages for the balance of the financial year.

With regard to Note 4, that points out that there has been the substitution of the post of Head Gardener in the scale category iv for one of the existing post of Gardener in Category iii. In other words, a Gardener in Category iv has been upgraded to the post of Gardener in Category iii and therefore a supplementary provision of \$56 will be necessary in order to meet wage requirements for the remainder of the financial year. I beg to move that Head 36 stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to this provision, but I am taking this opportunity to draw to the attention of the Hon. Minister of Education something which is likely to create a little bit of hardship. In respect of the Holidays with Pay Act there is the case of some people who work at the General Hospital who, if they were normally working with private employers, would be entitled to holidays with pay under the Act. It is not stated, or when we passed the Holidays with Pay Act it was not stated, precisely that that Act applied to the Government on the old-time conception that the Government is not an employer under the Holidays with Pay Act, and therefore holidays with pay will be withheld from these people who work at the Hospital. I would like the Hon. Minister to give an undertaking that this information should be passed on administratively, that is to say, that this Act should apply to Government employees in the same way as it applies to anyone else. I did not search the records of the debate in this House; it is true that one statement made by one Minister in one Government does not bind another Minister in another Government; but this is basic commonsense and it is logical that if a man is working in the Government

Service, whether he be a casual employee or a permanent one, holiday with pay is a qualifying period; and if all of these employees have qualified for holiday with pay, then they have qualified for it. I would like the Hon. Minister to know that, as to this apparent legal ruling which may be right in itself, the undertaking should be given to see that you do not have to pass a law to say that you should pay a man something. There is nothing illegal about that because the Government can decide to give everybody holiday with pay. I do not think that there should be something on the Statute Book saying that the Holidays with Pay Act should apply to the Government as it applies in the case of private employers. In our circumstances, with Ministerial Government, they have the power and authority to give an undertaking that all persons who are working in the Government Service should be allowed the benefit of holidays with pay in the same way as the Holidays with Pay Act applies to people in private industry.

12.55 p.m.

I do not think it was the intention of the Government to pass this law and that it should apply to persons working in private industry and not to persons in the Government Service. I think these casual employees and employees in Government are entitled to this treatment like anyone else.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I want to direct my remarks to the Minister of Education as this Resolution deals purely with education. I notice you are asking for \$500 to meet the cost of staffing at Erdiston. This is a very admirable thing, seeing that with your pilot scheme of feeding at schools you are employing maids and the like at these schools. It has been giving me some concern for quite a while as to the position at Combermere, and I know that the Minister must have been looking at this matter himself.

With your change of admitting children at this school, it is observed — and you must have discussed this with your Headmaster — that children from all walks of life can go to this school and make very much use of your canteen, restaurant or cafeteria at this school. Now, besides the fact that Government has been gracious enough to allow us at the City Council to use a sum of money which we had for the purpose of granting these additional children a meal which we are very grateful for on behalf of the parents of the municipality, we see a number still from other areas who go there, and I have been reliably informed by masters at the school that they would be glad to partake, and I have also been told that they would be able to do much better if the Government did give some assistance in the paying of the maids. You cannot make flesh of one and stone of the other, because there is no wire-pulling with these people whom you have; they have been selected purely on ability — at least that is what I have been noticing because I come into contact with them daily — and I have the information from quite a number of masters and people at this school that it would be better if the canteen or cafeteria was not made to carry the cost of employing all the maids, and possibly during the vacation just laying them off.

You were not here, Mr. Chairman, but the Minister of Education will remember that I took this matter up with the ex-Prime Minister who was then Premier about the paying of maids, and I am happy to see this here because I can take credit for raising the point when it was said by the Prime Minister that they could go and look for work during the vacation, and I think the Minister of Education will recall that I said I did not think it was fair. I think you should give very early and careful consideration to paying the maids at this canteen at Combermere where you have something like 700 boys and a tremendous lot of them use the canteen. It is not as it was before where somebody asked which pipe you go at for water, whether you bring water by night or by day or how you got water. (Mr. WALCOTT: You cannot bring Combermere School into this.) Erdiston College is part of the Education Department paid for out of my money; so you could talk until you are sick. It does not matter what the hon. member thinks; this is what I know. Anyhow, I am not addressing my remarks to him; I am addressing them through you, Mr. Chairman, to the

Minister of Education, and I hope the Minister will take the points I have made. You could reduce the cost of this meal to these boys and possibly you could be fairer to the maids at the school. I should like to hear the Minister on this before the Resolution is passed, because the Minister would know the number of children that use the canteen, the number who go outside and use a toothpick or drink water. It is nothing you do not know because I have brought the matter to your attention privately, and therefore I should like to hear your point of view on it; and just as you pay the maids at Erdiston, why can you not pay the maids at this school?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Chairman, in reply to the hon. senior member for St. Peter's request about casual employees' pensions, I should like to assure the hon. member that action is being taken, and within a very short space of time all the Departments will be notified with regard to holiday with pay for casual employees. Only last week the Hon. Premier and myself were considering it and due regard has been paid to it; so that casual employees like those mentioned by the hon. senior member for St. Peter will be able to receive their holiday with pay.

Mr. WALCOTT: I thank the Hon. Minister very much for his reply, and I hope it will be done retroactively.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I should just like to say in reply to the hon. senior member for Bridgetown that the matter has been engaging my attention throughout the course of this financial year. I have at the moment been re-examining the whole position with respect to the canteen at Combermere School, and I hope before we finalise the Estimates to do something about it.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I thank the Hon. Minister very much.

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

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the Resolution for the sum of \$1,487 do now pass.

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

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

On the motion of Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Resolution in Committee and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

LEAVE TO LAY DOCUMENTS

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, earlier today we notified you that there would be a little delay in the laying of Papers and what not. I am now going to ask leave to lay those documents and give notice of Government Business.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister is asking leave to lay documents. In the absence of any objection, leave will be granted. (A Pause)

There being no objection, leave is granted.

DOCUMENTS

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Premier; I am commanded to lay the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 10) Order, 1963.

On my own behalf, I am commanded to lay,

Report of the Public Utilities Board to the Governor-in-Executive Committee under section 52 of the Public Utilities Act, 1951, for the year 1962.

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

Statement showing the sums advanced to the Postmaster General for the payment of Money Orders, the amounts repaid to the Accountant General, and the amounts due by the various Post Offices to the 31st July, 1963;

Statement showing the sums advanced to the Postmaster General for the payment of Money Orders, the amounts repaid to the Accountant General, and the amounts due by the various Post Offices to the 31st August, 1963.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Government Notices were given as follows:—

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On behalf of the Hon. Premier:

Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 10) Order, 1963.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Resolution to approve the lease by the Governor-in-Executive Committee to the Barbados Light and Power Co. Ltd. of a parcel of land at "Avalon" at the corner of Jemmotts Lane and Collymore Rock, St. Michael.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On behalf of the Hon. Premier; A Bill further to amend the Local Government Act, 1958,

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: A Bill to consolidate and amend the Acts providing for the payment of compensation to workmen in respect of injuries suffered in the course of their employment.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: A Bill to amend the law as to the effect of death in relation to causes of action and with respect to the assessment of damages under the Fatal Accidents Act and to abolish the defence of common employment; and for purposes incidental to and connected with the foregoing.

REPLIES TO QUESTIONS

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to give notice that the Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 100 asked by the hon. senior member for St. James is ready.

Also, the Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 134, asked by the hon. senior member for St. Joseph.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries, I rise to give notice that Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 39, asked by the hon. junior member for St. Peter; the Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 58, asked by the hon. senior member for St. James; and also Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 144, asked by the hon. junior member for St. James; all are ready.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

On motion of Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, seconded by Hon. J. C. TUDOR, the Bill further to amend the Local Government Act, 1958, was read a first time.

On motion of Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, seconded by Hon. J. C. TUDOR, the Bill to consolidate and amend the Acts providing for the payment of compensation to workmen in respect of injuries suffered in the course of their employment was read a first time.

On motion of Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, seconded by Hon. J. C. TUDOR, the Bill to amend the law as to the effect of death in relation to causes of action and with respect to the assessment of damages under the Fatal Accidents Act and to abolish the defence of common employment; and for purposes incidental to and connected with the foregoing, was read a first time.

THE BANKING BILL, 1963

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order No. 2, stands in the name of the Hon. Premier: To resume debate on the second reading of a Bill to make provision to regulate the business of banking and for purposes connected therewith.

On the last occasion, the hon. senior member for the City of Bridgetown was speaking and it was moved by him and seconded by the Hon. Minister of Agriculture that further consideration of the Bill be now postponed, and the motion was carried. If the hon. senior member for the City of Bridgetown so desires, he may proceed.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Deputy Speaker, when the House was adjourned on the last occasion, I had just begun to speak on this Bill and I said then that I did not see any sane thinking person offering objection to a Bill to regulate banking in the country, and I further said that although I have not heard what had been said, I anticipated a Bill of a similar nature would be coming down to regulate the insurance business.

However, Sir, I notice that the hon. junior member for Christ Church in his speech on this Bill said that it goes much further in certain respects than a similar Bill which I have in my hand from Jamaica. I also noticed new clauses inserted into this Bill which are not in the Jamaica Bill. The one point with which I entirely agree, although in that respect after discussing the matter we wanted to find out, is not merely a question of who should have the power to decide upon what was a bank if we have a bank but that there should be a clause or more clauses under the Act setting out what you should do to specify what persons who had that authority as to operate a bank were entitled to. In other words, we are saying that this Bill is really too negative as far as the setting out as to what it is necessary to operate a bank.

As we go through the Bill, we find that the sum of \$250,000 is set down as capital to open a bank, but that in no way shows that it is not the desire to promote small business.
1.15 p.m.

Be that as it may, we cannot play ostrich and bury our heads in the sand; we must face facts and realise that there are many people who are to be protected and a Bill of this sort is therefore of great importance. However much some people may feel that it points in any one direction, we in this Chamber must appreciate the fact that this is a Bill which is for the protection of thousands of people in this country. The Hon. Premier and his Government must be aware that there is a type of business done in Barbados, it has been done for many years and it is not unique where Barbados is concerned. That is to say, besides having your Government Savings Banks and your "Sous sous" in Barbados besides having the small banks, there are the large commercial banks with a tremendous backing; and although it may appear on the face of it that we see the monthly reports of these banks, the Government itself should be in a position to know what the situation is with such banks. However, as I was saying, there is a type of business which has been carried on in this country for years, which has something like over four or five million dollars in circulation and that is one of the things which I believe must engage the attention of hon. members.

In this Bill you will see in the definition Clause, the definition of a Bank which is: "Any company carrying on banking business and all the offices and branches in the island of such a company shall be deemed to be one company." As I was saying, Sir, there must be some concern of those who have this four or five million dollars in circulation outside of the banks in this island altogether. One sure thing which you will find is that there is nothing done to evade the payment of income tax. In respect of all of those people who invest their money in this direction, their incomes are returned or the amount of profits paid to them is returned. I do not know if all of the backbenchers of the Government are acquainted with this matter. People go into this business as something of slow progress. Nobody would

put \$70,000 in any business because you are offering five per cent interest as against the three per cent interest which the Government or the commercial banks are offering just for the sake of the two per cent increased interest; it is more a question of the confidence which they must have in people before they deposit their money with them.

The Hon. Premier is *au fait* with the financial set-up in Barbados. Now there is one Section in this Bill, also the definition Section, and there is the definition of "Banking Business" which means the business of — (a) "receiving money from the public on current account, deposit account or other similar account". Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am not worried about this, but I would like this matter clarified as it stands here. What is meant by this phraseology "Deposit account or other similar account"? People may go into the office of General Traders or DaCosta's or Harrisons who must take up three or four thousand dollars in goods which come into the island and pay seven per cent interest which the commercial banks charge, but they will take the money from people who have money lying down and it all goes back to the decrease in the cost of living. I am wondering if the Hon. Minister, who is an economist, has given serious thought to this matter. My Party has discussed this matter quite carefully and at length and we have realised that the time is ripe for a Banking Bill; but the question which I have raised as to the definition of a "Similar account" in the definition of what banking business is, is something which is giving us some concern where you have these people investing this money, so to speak, not in a current account, but merely putting it down and getting five and a half per cent instead of three per cent interest. Instead of the owners of businesses paying seven and a half per cent or whatever the bank rate is, that reduces the cost to what they would wish to pay; but if they did make a profit of two per cent the Government in turn must benefit from that two per cent profit which they have made as a result of that investment.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to know something about this definition (a) of "Banking Business" which is: "The business of receiving money from the public on current account, deposit account or other similar account." The Hon. Premier would probably say that I am always asking for a definition of legal terms or something like that on points which appear in Bills which we are passing. I should like to say that it is not that I am asking for a definition, but I do not like to think that I am in here, something is being passed and I do not understand the position clearly. No one can make the position more clearly than when you sit down and hear what was the intention of the Legislature when they passed such an Act.

Dealing with the other paragraph which was mentioned by other hon. members which gives entire and absolute power to the Minister of Finance to say what is a Bank, Clause 3 (2) says this:—

"In the event of doubt as to whether a company is or is not carrying on banking business the matter shall be submitted to the Minister for his determination and the decision of the Minister thereon shall be final and conclusive for all purposes of the Act;"

Anything which one says in here you never say it about the present Government because you are not passing an Act for this Government; you are passing an Act for all time. Therefore, human nature being what it is leaving this section as it is without quoting any part of this Bill at all as to what must you do to satisfy the Minister — if you have complied with all the requirements — the matter is somewhat left in the negative. I say, therefore, that there should be some definite Clause to say: "Look here! You should have whatever this is, what that is and what are these various things which you have". It is not merely for a Minister to say: "You either comply with these things and I do not like your face" or something like that. We are not dealing with the Minister of today; we may be dealing with the Minister of 1990 when we pass this Act, and I think you should set out exactly what is meant here or it should be left out altogether.

1.25 p.m.

I personally, feel, therefore, that something should be set out here saying exactly what the true position would be, or that section should be left out completely. I say that for this reason. I remember when I was on the other side of the House with the other members who were also in the Opposition that the last Government passed a Bill in here dealing with Town and Country Planning and that what we considered too much power was vested in one particular person, and I think all of us in the Opposition agreed at that time that something should be done wherein there should be an amendment. Immediately this Government came into power, they made an amendment to the Act and appointed three persons as Reporters, people like Sir Frank Holder and other persons with judicial authority and knowledge to go into the matter and report back to the particular Minister in charge. This in itself therefore, cuts across the policy which was adopted then, and therefore I am afraid that while I do agree, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that there is a necessity for this Banking Act, there are certain sections which I should like to see clarified rather than being left in the negative. What must a person do to satisfy the Minister? This section says "In the event of doubt as to whether a Company is or is not carrying on banking business the matter shall be submitted to the Minister for his determination and the decision of the Minister thereon shall be final and conclusive for all purposes of this Act." Personally I do not like that. I do not mind who would be the Minister or who could be the Minister. I know some people in this country who if they were Ministers would decide that even if a man had £500,000, he could not open a bank. The section says that if there is any doubt, one particular person must decide that doubt.

When we were dealing then with the Town and Country Planning Act, we felt, when the last Government was in power, that if there was doubt it should not be left to the Town and Country Planning Officer himself or the Minister himself, and I can remember distinctly the ex-member for St. Thomas arguing from this side that it was all well and good, and that they would decide it and not let a judiciary decide on it. As soon as they went out of power and the present Government came in, an amendment was made to the Act and three persons were appointed to go into this matter and make a report. There is nothing wrong as far as the principle of having a Banking Act is concerned, and as I said, I hope it is not going to be long before the Government follows on with an Insurance Act, because frankly I must confess that from my own knowledge of business in town, it looks to me as if you need an Insurance Act enacted more rapidly than you need a Banking Act. Whatever people might think or however people might feel about this, it is absolutely necessary to protect people, and therefore the Government in power must bring in some Act which will protect them; but while you are protecting these people, you must also avoid any semblance of allowing any section of this Act to give too much power to any particular one person at any time, because this will not only apply today but forever as long as you pass it, until somebody comes in and amends it. I cannot imagine a company saying you are not to know about the banking business in a community.

What I mentioned about business which is carried on in Barbados, Mr. Chairman, let me repeat for the second time. It is not business which is carried on to get around income tax, because if a person invests \$50,000 or \$60,000 or even \$100,000 with any reputable business who would have to pay 7 1/2% but who could get 5 1/2% from them instead of receiving 3% at the bank, it is a fact that whatever interest they draw is returned to the Income Tax Commissioner. Only reputable business houses in Barbados can get \$50,000 or \$60,000 or \$100,000 and in some cases \$200,000 put there, because we have passed through the 1930's when we knew people who had to take money to the banks just to be kept. We knew people who had to pay to keep money in the banks and who put money there and got nothing on it. There is that amount of money here, and, as I said, it ranges between \$4 million and \$5 million in circulation. I know the Minister of Finance would know whereof I speak if every backbencher is not really acquainted with it, but I do not believe quite frankly that there is anything in this designed to interfere with that business, because it is a

perfectly legitimate way of a person investing money. If you have money and you can only get 3% on it from the bank, there is nothing wrong with putting it in a business with a man who has a reputation, who is able to do business and can get goods from Australia, New Zealand, Newfoundland, America or Argentina so long as you have confidence in his business acumen and ability. It is a gamble, and I know there is a lot of the conservative type would rather put it on the bank and get 1%; but that gets this country nowhere. There are people who would have \$100,000 and would not give a child an education or a house. That gets this country nowhere and I do not believe that this could be designed to prevent people from putting into circulation between \$4 million and \$5 million, because as I said, putting that into circulation is bound to (a) put more into the Governments' pockets. If he allows it to remain in the Savings Bank, all he would be getting is 3%, while if it is there he will get a return of 5%; and (b) in dealing with big money some companies need \$300,000 or \$400,000 at the time, and for the information of hon. members, there are very few firms who can go to the banks and borrow money, and in any event the banks can only lend if they are going to charge interest.

My colleague suggested that this should go to a Select Committee. I am very much in favour of that for the simple reason that it has been drawn to my notice that the bankers in Barbados, that is, Barclays, the Canadian Bank of Commerce, Nova Scotia and the Royal Bank of Canada had seen and known of this Bill for some time.
1.35 p.m.

We of the Legislature did not know of it until we got it two weeks ago. In these circumstances, just to read it through here and to go through all these several clauses and make comparison with the Bill which we had to get from Jamaica, we have come to realise that we cannot very well do justice to all the new clauses; therefore, we too feel that we should be given some opportunity to go into Select Committee on them. I am, therefore, going to move that this Bill be sent to a Select Committee. There is a feeling in this country that when you send a Bill to Select Committee you want to kill it. That is far from the case. If my motion is seconded, and this Bill goes to a Select Committee, it would give persons, other than the four leading banks in this country, who have money to invest, the opportunity to be able to understand all the necessary details surrounding the setting up of a bank and the investment of their money. Let me say that this Bill is not merely for those persons who just receive money; it is also to safeguard those persons who have money to invest, and I believe that this Government is out to safeguard those persons who have money to invest. If the Government has not seen it this way, I do think that now that I have drawn it to them they will agree with me that it is infinitely better to safeguard people who keep their money here and invest it than to adopt the old time policy of investing it in South Africa, Sweden and Denmark. It is better for them to keep it here with private businessmen because it is better for the economy of this Island; therefore, nothing should be done to prevent any such business from going on.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am not going to say anything more on it now. I feel that I should wait until we go into a Select Committee to discuss the matter more fully; therefore, I beg to move that this Bill be sent to a Select Committee.

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to second the motion made by my colleague, the hon. senior member for the City of Bridgetown. In so far as I am concerned, there are several semantic difficulties about this Bill which I would like to have resolved. Beginning from Section 2, which is the definitive clause, the definition of "banking business" means, as it reads here, the business of — (a) receiving money from the public on current account, deposit account or other similar account; (b) paying and collecting cheques drawn by or paid in by customers and making advances to customers; (c) receiving money on a savings account from the general public repayable on demand or after not more than three months' notice.

I would like to enquire from the Hon. Premier what is the difference between "the public" in paragraph (a) and "the general public" in paragraph (c). I have asked quite a few people and nobody would be able to tell me what is the difference between "the public" and "the general public". "The public" has been defined as the community as an aggregate but not in its formal capacity. I do not know if "the public" is X and "the general public" is X+1. However, the Hon. Premier would be given the opportunity to explain the difference between "the public" in paragraph (a) and the "general public" in paragraph (c).

Again, Sir, it is difficult to find out whether paragraph (a), (b) and (c) are co-existent. There is no "or" mentioned nor it does not say whether it is accumulative. The word "or" is not mentioned. If you consider other clauses, as for instance, Clause 6 subsection 3 (a) the word "or" is mentioned. Now, both cannot be right. It would be interesting to discover which is correct.

To say that it is a unique situation that there is money on deposit in certain business firms is not really so. The practice is carried on in certain other Caribbean territories and in Great Britain; therefore, it is not a unique situation. Now, Sir, what are we supposed to gather from "other similar accounts"? Does that mean a Christmas account, a personal savings plan of one particular firm or a trustees account? We would also like to know what is meant by that and whether there was a lack of foresight as it would prevent people from carrying on what is called "meeting turns". Some hon. members exercised their minds as to that.

Now, you have money on loan and money on deposit. There is a certain feeling among certain people that it is difficult to find out the difference between a loan and a deposit. The essential difference used to be that a loan is money from an estate between a lender and a borrower whereas, a deposit is not that. To argue that a loan must be secured is not correct either because there are several insecure overdrafts enjoyed by people who might be even in this very room. Therefore, that is not the difference.

Now, Sir, if we turn to Part II, section 3, subsection (2), it reads: "In the event of doubt as to whether a company is or is not carrying on banking business the matter shall be submitted to the Minister for his determination and the decision of the Minister thereon shall be final and conclusive for all purposes of this Act."

The Hon. Premier remarked that there was nothing in that particular clause which any honest man should fear. But I am one who is going to propagate the heresy that there will be occupying the post of Finance Minister some time or the other some other person, and if there is nothing for an honest man to fear, there is much that a political opponent may fear because in their thinking in politics no political opponent can be an honest man. We are making laws here which must endure from generation to generation.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The hon. member is not usually like that. He says that in our thinking no political opponent can be honest. He cannot surely mean that.

Mr. LYNCH: I think I must have been misunderstood by the Hon. Minister. I was not referring to the present Government. I said that the time may come when a Finance Minister may think no political opponent would be an honest man. I was not thinking of personality. I said that at some time or the other, there might be somebody who might occupy that position.

The Clause to which objection may well be made is this one in which certain dangerous powers are given over to the Minister.
1.45 p.m.

The view might well be taken that the Executive is here invading an area which might well be covered by the Judiciary. Surely, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it would be better

for all concerned if such powers were placed in the hands of judges rather than in the hands of a Minister because from judges there is an appeal. In an appeal from judges one can go all the way up to the Privy Council, but the Bill as it stands now places all of these powers in the hands of the Minister for his determination, and his decision shall be final and conclusive for all purposes of this Act. Again, Sir, no provision is made for the applicant to appear either in person or to be represented by counsel who would put forward his views on the particular subject. In the organization of a society it has been found through long and hard experience that there should be the legislative, the judicial and the executive. When one overlaps and encroaches on the powers of the other, then a dangerous situation is likely to develop especially in emergent territories where we find thinking such as that which obtains in a place like Ghana where the definition of democracy is, generally speaking, one Party in power and the other Party in jail, where the Premier made it possible or tried to make it possible that members of the Opposition should be flogged.

Those are things, Mr. Deputy Speaker, which we have to guard against; we have to guard against the encroachment of the powers of the Executive on those of the Judiciary. Especially must these things be guarded and taken careful consideration of in a society like ours which is undergoing rapid transition. Justice ought to be centralised in the Courts and not in the brains of any Finance Minister. Those are the three points which concern us in so far as this Bill is concerned. Some of us feel that there are certain other provisions in the Bill which may be best discussed when we are in Committee on the Bill, provisions like the one for the approval of auditors which occurs in Section 18 Subsection (5) where this is what is stated:-

"For the purposes of this section, an approved auditor is an auditor who is a member of one of the professional bodies for the time being declared by the Minister by notice in the *Official Gazette* to be approved for such purposes."

If one is going to declare what auditors are to be approved, obviously that should be specified in the Schedule of the Bill and not be left to future Ministers to declare which graduation of what particular school they would favour to be approved auditors in this connection. Again, Sir, in Part VI of the Bill under the head "Examinations and Audit", Section 15 reads as follows:

"The Minister may at any time require one or more qualified persons, whom he shall appoint, to make a special examination under conditions of secrecy of the books and affairs of any licensed bank."

The corresponding Jamaica Act which I have in my hand in part 7 reads rather differently. Under the Head "Inspection" this is what it says:-

"The Governor shall from time to time appoint a fit and proper person to be Inspector of Banks."

That is to say, Sir, that in the case of the Jamaica Act it is obligatory for the Governor to appoint an Inspector of Banks whose duties it shall be to maintain and carry out a general review of banking practices in Jamaica. In the Barbados proposed Act, this is not obligatory but permissive, and the power of the Minister seems to come into evidence only when something has gone wrong, when the Minister has reasons to believe that such-and-such a bank may be carrying on its business in a manner detrimental to the interest of its depositors. That is to say, the Minister's duties are to see that all the stables are locked but finds that the horse is already outside prancing around, rather than have the position as it is in Jamaica where they appoint an Inspector of Banks who maintains a general review of the banking practice in the territory.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, those are a few of the points which we would like to have rectified, and if I may be permitted to return to the one which is the most burning issue, that is Part II in Section 3 subsection (2) of the Bill which says that it shall be lawful for the Minister alone to determine

if a Bank is or is not carrying on banking business. We would prefer the rule of law in this matter rather than the rule of autocracy; we feel that this is a judgement which should lie with the Judiciary from whom there is an appeal. As is well known, Sir, the Judiciary has its own special powers, and a judge as long as he is of good behaviour, is incapable of being removed from his post unless by the joint application of the two Houses of the Legislature to the Queen or the Queen's representative. We are willing, therefore, to agree that these powers should be reposed with the judge and that there should not be any encroachment upon those of the Executive. This dangerous encroachment is one of the factors which must be carefully examined in the case of rapidly changing societies such as ours so that the citizenry may feel confident that justice lies in the hands of the Judges from whom there is an appeal and not in the hands of a Minister from whom there is no appeal. When a man becomes a Chief Minister, he at once becomes the fount of wisdom and justice. I would even like to propagate the theory that if he does things before he is chosen, he will continue to do them when he becomes the Prime Minister of the territory. Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is for that reason that we would like to see this power being reposed in the hands of the Judiciary.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Deputy Speaker, during the course of my speech I made a motion for an amendment which was seconded by the hon. junior member for the City. I should like to withdraw that motion: in fact, I am asking leave to withdraw the motion.

1.55 p.m.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Hon. members will remember that the hon. senior member for Bridgetown made a motion for an amendment which was seconded by the hon. junior member for Bridgetown. Technically the motion was premature under Standing Order No. 41, and the hon. senior member for Bridgetown is withdrawing that motion.

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill be now sent to Select Committee.

Mr. LYNCH: I beg to second that.

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

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have to remind hon. members that if this matter will take longer than five minutes, I am bound to suspend this Sitting.

I have the honour to ask the following members to serve on the Select Committee to consider the Bill:

The hon. senior member for Bridgetown; the hon. junior member for Christ Church; the hon. junior member for Bridgetown; the hon. senior member for St. Peter; the hon. senior member for St. Thomas; the hon. senior member for St. Philip; the hon. junior member for St. Michael; the hon. junior member for St. James and the hon. junior member for St. Lucy.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It now being 2.05 p.m. o'clock, this Sitting now stands suspended until 2.30 p.m. o'clock. 2.05 p.m.

On re-assembling,

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I ask that the Bell be rung.

The Bell was rung and a quorum was obtained.

QUESTION TIME

RIGHT OF WAY TO SANDY LANE BEACH

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: This is Question Time.

There are replies to Question No. 144, asked by the hon. junior member for St. James.

Mr. HOLDER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, to enquire of the Minister of Communications, Works and Housing:

Is the Minister aware that the twenty-foot right of way to the beach at Sandy Lane St. James, which was agreed to be set aside for the use of the public, has not been clearly marked off?

2. Will the Minister issue instructions for the clear delineation of the said right of way, and for the construction of a proper road at least fourteen feet wide leading from the highway to the beach for the convenience of the general public?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 144, asked by the hon. junior member for St. James on the 1st October, 1963, is as follows:

"The only right of way of which I have knowledge is 45 feet wide and not 20 feet.

The pedestrian entrance to the beach is clearly delineated. A signboard indicates that the area is a public entrance to the Sandy Lane beach and that car park facilities are available on the opposite side of the road. I have been advised that the construction of a road of a width of at least fourteen feet leading from the highway to the beach would be a breach of the restrictive covenants contained in the conveyance dated the 12th February, 1962, by which the land is vested in the Executive Committee."

ACCESS TO BEACHES

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The next is Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 39, asked by the hon. junior member for St. Peter, which again deals with the Sandy Lane issue.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, to enquire of the Appropriate Minister:

Will the Government see to it that at Sandy Lane in the parish of St. James beach access is provided and well defined in order that the public may easily ascertain such access?

2. Will the Government see to it that consequent upon the proposed development of Heywoods Plantation in the parish of St. Peter an adequate beach access road be provided, marked and well defined?

3. Will Government see to it that the lands known as Cholera Ground in the parish of St. Peter be made available to the public for the beaching of the fishing boats and a beach access road?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 39, asked by the hon. junior member for St. Peter on the 24th April, 1962, is as follows:-

"Yes, Sir. This has already been done. A notice has been erected on the area of land conveyed to the Executive Committee of the island by Messrs. West Coast Limited indicating that the area is a public entrance to the sea for pedestrians and that car park facilities to the users of the area are available on the opposite side of the road.

"The Government has not yet received any plans in regard to the development of Heywoods Plantation in St. Peter but it will certainly take steps to ensure that adequate provision is provided for access to the beach.

"The Government has recently agreed to lease from the Northern District Council at a peppercorn rent, the lands known as Cholera Ground in St. Peter, and proposes to erect groynes in order to improve the beach area. The entrance to the beach is considered adequate and it is not proposed at this stage to construct a new beach access road.

It has not yet been determined whether this area will be suitable for the beaching of fishing boats."

SHORTAGE OF WATER IN THORPE'S HOUSING AREA

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 100, asked by the hon. senior member for St. James:
2.40 p.m.

Mr. HOLDER: To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:

Is the Minister aware of the acute shortage of water supply with its attendant danger which the residents of Thorpes Housing Area have been experiencing for the past four weeks?

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

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: The Reply to the hon. member's question is as follows:

"Yes, Sir. A water shortage was experienced in the Thorpes' Housing Area, particularly at the higher level.

2. The water supply to the area is now being taken from a different source and is back to normal."

Mr. HOLDER: I beg to thank the Hon. Minister for his Reply.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The next Question, Question No. 58 stands in the name of the same hon. member (*After a pause*). It would appear from the document which I have here, that it is Question No. 59. Perhaps that Question can be allowed to remain over.

The next Question to which the Reply has been laid is Question No. 134 asked by the hon. senior member for St. Joseph. I observe that the hon. member is not now in his place. That concludes Question Time.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

REPRESENTATION OF THE PEOPLE (AMENDMENT) BILL

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, under Private Members Business I am asking leave to have Order No. 6 standing in my name taken as the first Order of the Day. I understand from other quarters that they would like this matter to be got through — this matter of the Amendment to the Representation of the People Act 1957. This matter was sent to a Select Committee and the Report of the Select Committee was handed in and subsequently circulated to hon. members. I am therefore asking that this Order be made the first Order of the Day under this Head.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member is asking leave that Order No. 6 standing in his name be taken as the first Order of the Day under Private Members' Business and unless there be any objection, leave will be granted. (*After a pause*). There being no objection, leave is granted the hon. member.

The first Order of the Day under Private Members' Business stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Peter:- To move the third Reading of a Bill to amend the Representation of the People Act, 1957.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, this matter which is before the House has been referred to a Select Committee, and the Report of the Select Committee has been circulated to hon. members. I would like to take the procedure in asking that the Report of the Select Committee be adopted and then we can deal with the consequential amendments which are a little different from the amendments with which we had to deal originally. When the Report is adopted, I will ask leave that the House go into Committee so that these amendments would be normally passed

as different Sections because the original Bill had only two Clauses. In order to regularise the position, I feel sure that there would be no ambiguity or doubt as to the legality of the matter if it is done in that way. In presenting the Report of the Select Committee I would like to inform hon. members that all the changes are consequential to the amendment which originally passed the second reading in this House. The amendment which deals with Section 13 is a consequential amendment under the Act dealing with the Vestries and this provision has also been amended so as to bring it into line.

Hon. members will see that the Committee had two matters before it from the Government and we did not feel that it was competent for us to deal with those amendments because they went outside of the scope of the amendment with which we are dealing. The amendment dealt primarily with the scope as far as the age is concerned, and we did not feel that we had the authority to go beyond that. In order to regularise the situation I would ask that the Report be adopted and that we go into Committee so that the three Clauses of the Bill would be passed rather than the two Clauses which have already been passed. I beg to move that the Report of the Select Committee be now adopted.

Mr. HUSBANDS: I beg to second that.

The question that the Report of the Select Committee be now adopted was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

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

Mr. HUSBANDS: 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 3 were called and passed.
2.50 p.m.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the Schedule stand part.

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

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

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill be now read a third time.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, in seconding this Bill, I do not think that I should miss this opportunity to make a few observations which I did not make on the occasion of the second reading. Though it is somewhat unusual to have a third reading speech, I think that this Bill is of such tremendous import that I should say a few words on this occasion.

Now, Sir, I think that we as legislators are ushering into positive existence or about to do so by our intention a considerable number of young people who will for the first time be able to use their civic rights as voters in this country. Now it is a real significant step, and though we might be considered very bold in putting forward this bit of legislation on the statute book of the Island, we know from the experience of countries that are now regarded as foremost in importance — considered in a world light — that we are following countries like Australia for instance, and I would not allow the passage of this Bill to take effect without showing my responsibility as a legislator *vis-à-vis* the additional electorate which this Bill will bring into being.

As you know, Sir, we have had consequential amendments made resulting from the discussions in Select Committee, and there are regulations that will have to follow that will enable those who are yet school children to come out and vote. We must be in a position, Sir, not only as legislators but as responsible citizens, to remind the young electorate to be that they too have got to play a very, very responsible part in the affairs of this country, and at this stage, Sir, I should say that we who already know what responsibility means, civic-like, should enjoin the young electors to be of such responsibility. Again we should not prate upon their inexperience that their minds might be diverted from a sense of seriousness and fairplay, but we should also enjoin them not to be as hesitant, if need be, to muster all their intelligence for their new state. I must get into this serious mood, Sir, because I am associated with this Bill, and as far as young people the world over are concerned, there are times when we do think that the majority of them seem to take life in a rather litesome manner. After all, history has proven that those who were once thought to be irresponsible have proved to be responsible. There was a time when people, unless they had certain monied or property qualification were not thought to be responsible enough to have the vote. History has proven that to be an error. I believe history will again prove that the young people who will be added to the electorate on the coming into force of this Bill can rise to the occasion and can choose and discern, and can avoid being made dupes of those who attempt to canvass them.

Education today, Sir, is far more wide-spread than it used to be. The qualifications necessary today to enter certain jobs and positions have gone up as compared with what they used to be two decades or more ago, and academically at least the young people today are able to take advantage of the higher qualifications; and when one considers that they do make successes in their professions, the Government Service and the other vocations, with this new very serious step as citizens; we do not see why they should be deterred from not rising to a sense of their responsibility as citizens. As I said earlier, there are examples of countries which have expanded their electorates to admit those under the age of twenty-one years. Barbados with its boast of a small percentage of illiteracy, I think, can also advance itself in this direction.
3.00 p.m.

I repeat, I am voting for this measure; I am associating myself with this Bill with the full hope that those who have already enjoyed such a right and such a privilege will rise to a sense of responsibility in directing those who now find themselves what I would call new boys in this electoral school. Therefore, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would not let this occasion go by without mentioning that because I know that in the Other Place, certain fears will be expressed. I know that we in this Chamber may be regarded as persons doing something rashly and doing something without giving it mature judgement; but, at the same time, if we look around and we view the living and the educational standards of today, there is no reason why we should bemoan the fact that people of the age of 18 years are being allowed to vote.

Sir, I give my blessing to this Bill and I do hope that any bemoans that may arise in the minds of those who do not favour such a Bill would be erased. If the older people want to know whether 18 year-olds know the meaning of the franchise, I want to tell them that even among those who already enjoy this privilege, there may be those who act irresponsibly and among those who now will be able to use it, there can be even a great majority who would seek to use this as a right; so, the pros and cons weigh against each other.

I do not think there is any room for bemoaning and bewailing the results of this piece of legislation. I repeat, that I could not let this occasion pass by without saying something because unfortunately in the case of the second reading, I could not make a speech. However, I make a speech now with my full senses and being very mindful of my responsibility as a legislator who wishes to associate with a measure of this consequence.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, in a way, I am very grateful to the hon. junior member for St. Peter for the path which he has taken in the last few minutes because until now I have never had the experience of speaking on a motion for the third reading of a Bill. The Standing Orders of the House do not, of course, offer the opportunity to debate a motion for the third reading, and those Standing Orders on debating a motion for the third reading of a Bill deal specifically for amendments which are amendments for corrections but not amendments of a material character so that neither the hon. member nor myself ran into any difficulty with respect to any proposed amendment because we have no amendments to offer to the Bill.

We have both risen to do honour on this momentous occasion. It is significant as a most momentous occasion because as real world shocking events are taking place in the lives of people, this revolutionary step which we are taking here today is being taken in a deliberate Assembly which is over 300 years old and which has seen so many changes in political progress and other progress in this Island for these centuries, and this tremendous change is being done in the General Assembly of the Island without any fuss and without any noise and without suggestion of the nature of the case because unless we said what we were doing, nobody would have known what it is in effect that we have done.

In effect, we are changing here this afternoon the future of this Island, either for good or ill— and I believe it will be for good — we are doing something which would have a tremendous impact not only on other countries in the British Commonwealth but in other countries in the world because immediately after this Bill is passed it will go out that the people of Barbados through their accredited representatives have sought their full right by making it possible for the young people of 18 years to exercise their right to vote.

I am saying that this was not a hurdle for us to climb. We did not have to have any heart searchings on this matter; we approached this matter from several points of view, and from each point of view we received the assurance and commendations which we needed. We thought that if we could forfeit the life of an 18 year-old person convicted of a capital offence and ask that man to surrender his life, we could call upon him to play a fuller life for himself in the country. We thought that if he could undertake the responsibility of parenthood and provide for the support of his children even although he may be so young, at the same time you could call upon him to use his judgement and exercise his intelligence to provide a fuller life not only for his children but for the people of the country. We also thought that if you could call on a young man to exercise the most responsible right to contributing to the economy and well-being of the country by making his own financial contribution to the Treasury of this community, you could not deny him the right of saying whom he should have as his Government to spend those taxes of which his money is part of the contribution, and you could not deny him the right of having his say as to how the financial and other arrangements of the country should be run. In other words, the argument for admitting the 18 year-olds is the same argument which admits other human beings of their rights: "Those who pay the piper should call the tune."

It can be argued that there was a certain lack of maturity which would militate against a full, and therefore the proper, exercise of this right. Happily this is not the case of Barbados.
3.10 p.m.

We have enjoyed an educational system which has produced a standard of literacy, a standard of intelligence which is second to none in this world. We have to preserve and extend those levels and those standards. But what that standard of literacy and intelligence has done this country is this; it has made possible the political education of the masses without much trouble. We have managed to preserve a suitable form of government in this island by giving the franchise to older people who, in most cases, have not had the benefits and the opportunities which the younger generation now has. If we have managed to do that, how

much more so are we justified in extending those benefits to a new generation which enjoys far more and have far more made available to them than their elders and grand elders? That being so, the fears which may possibly be expressed by our friends across the sea who do not know our situation can be proved to be groundless. We go further and say that this lowering of the growing age will change politics in this island. The young people because of their youth, energy and alertness, will make the world a better place; their outlook is less shoddy, nonsensical and counterfeit than what that of their oldsters tends to be, and therefore you will have a better approach to political problems. It will be more direct; the impact which the opinion of the young will make on the political institutions will be searching, and in some cases offensive, to some of us who are older than they. But the young people who are being called upon to exercise responsible citizenship will find themselves challenging accepted institutions and accepted beliefs and tearing them down after they have scrutinised them and found them to be not as useful or as valuable as the rest of us think they are.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the challenge which the older generation has to face is this: we have to re-adjust our thinking to the age in which we are, and a lot of politicians will have to be dragged kicking and screaming into the 20th century, and the cries, pains and groans will be piercing to hear but they will be all to our good. That will be so because for the first time we will be called upon to live along 20th-century reality of the vital ideas and judgements of young people. There is no reason, therefore, to fear the consequences of this age, and politics will be more direct. We shall have to stop dodging issues; we will have to face them squarely, because the young people who are now being called upon to assist in the government of their country will insist that they be told the truth, that they be brought more fully into the confidence not only of the Government but of those managers and directors of institutions which we hold sacred. Although many of them may pay lip service to this magnificent step which we are taking in order to bring the young into the councils of government, in addition to paying lip service to these things why should we not have certain reservations for misinformation and misunderstanding? This is a march to the future, and all of us are happy to be associated with a political Party and in association with all persons of goodwill without fear or hesitancy or doubt. This is what the Democratic Labour Party have long advocated; we have put it in our Manifesto and we have our mandate for it; therefore we are quite justified in lending our unqualified support to the motion which has been introduced and sponsored by the hon. senior member for St. Peter to make this Island a different and therefore a better place by calling the young to reinforce the judgements of the old. (Cheers!)

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

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

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

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

RESOLUTION *re* BUS SERVICE FOR LODGE HILL DISTRICT

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Michael:— To move the passing of a Resolution *re* the provision of a bus service for the Lodge Hill District.

Mr. SEALEY: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the passing of a Resolution in connection with the provision of a bus service for the Lodge Hill District in the parish of St. Michael. I should like to bring to the attention of hon. members the hardship which exists in the Lodge Hill area with respect to the bus service. That district happens to be a very densely populated one, and the people are finding it very difficult to get from one end of the place to the other

in order to get to their bus. There are two bus routes there, one bus goes as far as Thorpe's Corner and the other goes to Montgomery. I am asking that the one which runs to Montgomery be diverted through Lodge Hill and so lessen the burden which is now suffered by the people of that area.

This Resolution reads as follows:-

WHEREAS the district known as Lodge Hill in the parish of Saint Michael leading from Green Hill near the British-American Tobacco Factory to Cave Hill has recently become a heavily populated area;

AND WHEREAS there is at present no bus service available to the inhabitants of the said district;

BE IT RESOLVED that this House request Government to issue a directive to the concessionaire concerned to provide the said district with an extension of the Cave Hill bus service at such times and within such hours as Government shall deem necessary.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. SMITH: I beg to second that.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I should like to say this. A Commission has been appointed to investigate the entire system of Omnibus transport in the Island with special reference to existing fare and stage structure, the award of concessions and any other matters connected therewith and to make recommendations.

In the circumstances, it is proposed to defer consideration of the provision of a bus service for the Lodge Hill District pending the receipt of the Commission's report.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this entire matter is in the hands of a Commission and the results would depend entirely upon what the Commission finds. I hope very soon to have the report on this matter; therefore in view of the fact that we are awaiting the report of the Commission, I am asking that further consideration of this Resolution be postponed.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is the Hon. Minister moving that further consideration of this Resolution be postponed?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Yes, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

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

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

3.20 p.m.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order No. 2 under Private Members' Business stands in the name of the hon. junior member for Bridgetown; to move the passing of a Resolution relative to the system of dividing children into categories at the early age of eleven years.

RESOLUTION re DIVIDING CHILDREN INTO CATEGORIES AT ELEVEN YEARS

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, having seen the effects of an examination system which at the early age of ten and a half to eleven and a half years places a child in the jeopardy of having the type of career which he or she is to follow decided at that early age, I felt it incumbent upon me to move the passing of such a Resolution so that the matter might engage the attention of this Honourable House.

In many countries there has been a great deal of thought given to this problem because it was discovered that many a child who had been an educational reject at the early age of eleven developed into a man who beginning perhaps from the age of sixteen or seventeen became of great benefit and asset to the community in which he lived. This, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is no easy matter in that because of the paucity of accommodation, it is difficult to decide who is to enter the existing Government-maintained secondary schools and

who is to be left out. It is obvious, therefore, that the system of examination would be regarded as the solution; but what some of us wonder is whether this examination should take place at the early age of eleven, that is to say, between the ages of ten and twelve as is done locally.

In certain countries they have had recourse to what is called comprehensive schools, schools into which all of the children go in at one end and are sub-divided as they develop their natural characteristics, and at the other end there will come out those who are academic, those who are fated to work with their hands, those who are semi-technical and those who have a definite scientific bent. No such exercise is possible in a community like this, because we have not got the necessary finance to promote it. There are, however, Mr. Deputy Speaker, other methods of deciding this matter, and one of them is to defer the decision until the child has reached the more robust intellectual age of thirteen. That is a system which has been adopted in certain European countries; it is a system which will recommend itself to many a parent who is very hard put to console a child when the postman knocks and the letter arrives that he or she has not been admitted to a Government-maintained secondary school in Barbados. The child at once receives a stigma of being an educational reject, and this stigma can do a lot to warp its personality.

Many cases are related, Mr. Deputy Speaker, of children who spend many sleepless nights, in many cases they have to be taken to the family physician, while they are awaiting the outcome of this dreaded examination which they have taken, and there are not all parents, Mr. Deputy Speaker, who are sympathetic. There are parents who feel that the child having failed to gain entry to a Government secondary school has not done well by the family and has caused the family to be criticised in the homes where scions have been successful in gaining such admission. It is no light matter, Mr. Deputy Speaker, for a child to be branded at so early an age with the stigma of being an educational reject. Some of the most valuable members of the local community did not begin to make any academic progress until they had reached the age of fifteen and in some cases sixteen years. Now they adorn many of the professions; some are doctors, others are barristers, yet others contribute to the community in many useful ways. So it may well be agreed, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that when a child has reached the age of twelve, it might be rather too early to condemn the child as being non-academic. That might be agreed upon because of local evidence to support it, and because of the evidence taken from other lands of late developers who have blossomed out and become notable assets to the communities which they have graced.

We are wondering, Sir, whether some other method might not be devised in our society of separating the intellectual sheep from the goats at a rather later date. If there are certain schools which are geared to take a child up to and including the age of twelve years and then the child is examined at the age of thirteen and labelled academic or non-academic, technical etc., perhaps it might be better for the future of the community in which we live. To be branded as an academic reject before one has reached the age of twelve ought not to be a prospect to be faced by any child in any community. The system has been universally condemned in England by no less a person than Mr. Butler. It has also been condemned by Mr. Harold Wilson.

3.30 p.m.

Those men who have given great thought to the matter and who have had access to the advice of educational experts too feel that the 11 plus examination or what is tantamount to that in our community ought to go, and that there ought to be some system introduced whether it be a comprehensive form or preliminary form of examination when the child has reached the age of 13 years. Whatever it be, it is felt universally that the 11 plus examination, as it is formally known, ought to go.

Some people have said that it invades the liberty of the subject because if the child has to be directed before it reaches the age of 12 willy-nilly into a training school which might not fit the child's developed personality, as against

the personality evidenced by the child at that age, surely it is an offence against the liberty of the young subject.

It has also been said that it is an offence against equality because a child at that age has become accustomed to regarding others occupying the same class-room as its intellectual equals. Then suddenly they become embarrassed; and those who are good examinees, not necessarily those who are better academically than the child we have in mind, but those who do not turn a hair at an examination are carried off to a grammar school while the others remain to await their fate as to whether there is going to be a technical school or whatever is the substitute for other schools which obtain in the Mother Country.

It also has been argued that it is an offence against fraternity. At that early age, there is a strong bond of fraternity between children of the same age. When some of them are taken away to other schools, that is regarded as an academical cleavage. Surely, those children should be allowed to develop together until they reach a ripper age before they are separated and so, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the point is developed. This early examination, this early labelling of academic or non-academic pupil is an offence against liberty, against equality and against fraternity.

It has also been found that on examination days there are certain pupils who cannot give of their best. Each one of us is made up differently and many a child has become sensitive to the heavy import of an examination because with the constant remarks which he or she hears on that subject by the parents. There are not all parents who would confer together as to the future of the child in private; hence, whatever remarks would be dropped at the common dining table, thus making the child dread more and more an examination by pointing out that failure at that examination might well mean that the child might never obtain a worthwhile career and therefore, instead of encouraging the child to do its best, this harping and hammering of possible failure makes the child become more and more intent on success; but instead of success on the examination day, the child is so tensed by their remarks there looms over its head the possibility of failure and eventually rejection by the rest of the family. There is this warping of personality of the child, and the child cannot give of its best on the examination day.

Sir, I, myself, have seen children burst into beads of perspiration on receiving an examination paper. Children have been known to ask to be excused and to go into the compound and retch there, and other children are known to faint and thus have to return home. Surely, Mr. Deputy Speaker, if this is a dreaded day, it can be deferred until the child has reached the ripper age of 13 years and much of this harm might well be avoided.

In a setting such as ours which is in rapid transition from an agricultural community to an industrial one, the question of social mobility, that is, movement upward from the occupation of one's parents to a type of occupation which demands more public respect and more salary — it is borne in many a child that upon his or her performance in this examination at the early age of 12 years might well depend its future career and the manner in which it will be regarded by its parents ever afterwards.

Children in a community such as ours can be looked upon as an economic asset, an asset which has to be developed and nurtured when they are of a tender age so that when they attain the age of 18 years, when they become wage earners, naturally, they would earn a higher wage and bring their family certain social economic improvements to which all underdeveloped families look forward in our community. Therefore, it is of greater import that this dreaded examination day which would separate the academic sheep from the unacademic goats should be deferred for as long as it is possible.

As I have said, I thought it necessary that this debate should be initiated so that we might hear the views of the Minister upon this subject, because there are many people who feel that something ought to be done. There are many

who may not be particularly vocal but who have yet expressed their feelings on this matter and on the harm which it does to their child which they realise when they go into a school's compound to fight for one of 80 places when there are over 1,000 children present. Some start off with the idea that they cannot surmount this hurdle and so are doomed before they start. Teachers have come to me and asked me how A or B perform, and when I tell them, they are amazed because it is so different to the performance which they notice between those two children when working under conditions in which there is no strain or stress.

In this competitive world, there must be some method of selection.
3.40 p.m.

We know the reason for the oral examination; but we do feel, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that it might well be deferred for a year or two until the child is a more examinable subject, and when the effect of failure will not leave so lasting and deleterious an impression on the mind of the young examinee. This Resolution reads as follows:—

WHEREAS it has been found in England and Europe that the system of dividing children into categories at the early age of eleven has proved unscientific and unreliable, procedural arrangements being now made in England to do away with the Common Entrance examination in its present form by the end of the current year.

AND WHEREAS incalculable emotional disturbance is caused in the minds of Barbadian children annually subjected to this harmful and dangerous system of early selectivity,

BE IT RESOLVED that this examination be abolished and a more equitable and less rigorous method of selection for secondary education be introduced.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. SEALEY: I beg to second that.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am quite grateful to the hon. member for having drawn the attention of the House to this most important matter in the terms of the Resolution the passing of which he has moved. I fear I must tell the House that I cannot undertake to dispose of this matter in today's time which is allotted to Private Members' Business because the matter is of very profound significance, and its ramifications are so wide and its complexities so various that it will take me more time than that which is allotted to Private Members' Business today to dispose of the matter; and not even then because there is always a second thought and another word to say on this matter.

The hon. member has quite rightly expressed his concern and, in fact, it is not only his concern, but it is the concern of all thinking educationalists and parents here and elsewhere over this vexed question of a suitable examination for young children to move them from the Primary to the Secondary stage of their training. Mr. Deputy Speaker, so vexed is this question that all over the world there is a tremendous amount of experimentation going on; there is a considerable amount of trial and re-trial and error; there is so much of that that it would be presumptuous on my part to say what is or what is not the most fitting age at which children should be fitted for their test for removing them from the Primary to the Secondary stage. Many people would urge that the age should be that of 13 years and not 11 years, and just as many would argue that 11 years and not 13 years is the more suitable age. The hon. member says that it would be better for the child, the parent and the community to postpone the entrance examination of children to Secondary Schools from 11 years to 13 years. It may be more convenient from one point of view to the child in so far as there would be some children who would feel more secure and more settled at the age of 13 years than they would feel at the age of 11 years. That point is well taken. But there would be tremendous changes and financial complications, not to speak of educational

ones, in the matter of removing the age from 11 years to 13 years. What you would have to do in the Primary Schools with respect to providing two years' tuition would be a post Primary Course. You would then have to start teaching children in the Elementary Schools at 11 the whole range of Secondary subjects such as foreign languages, the introduction of mathematics and the introduction of general science, so that when these children are transferred to the Secondary Schools at the age of 13 years they would only be two years and not four years behind the School Certificate course. Those are problems. It is very possible that you could provide a syllabus at 11 which the children could work on until they are 13 years and that would not allow them to waste time in those two years. That is possible, but if you do it in that way, you will have to take into account the possibility that you will have to teach Secondary subjects at the Primary stage, you will have to change teachers for that kind of work and you will probably find that a tremendous amount of duplication would be done between the two stages — between eleven and thirteen and between 13 and those who have come out to the Secondary stage.

As I say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have no quarrel at all with those who say at which age children should sit for the entrance examinations at the Secondary Schools; but I will have them to know that whatever age you set, whether it be 11, 12, 13 or 15 years you will have problems attendant upon that age, and certainly the postponement of two years from the Secondary Schools would involve you in providing Secondary teaching at the Primary Schools before the Secondary stage is reached. Another consequence is that the teachers involved in this exercise might be using different methods and different concepts from those who teach in Secondary Schools. Those concepts may not necessarily be better or worse, but they will be different; and as to the confusion complained of now in the minds of the people who have to jump this hurdle, I may say it would probably be more severe and more frightening at 13 years than it would have been otherwise. They would have to inter-relate the things which would be taught in a Primary School which was doing Secondary teaching. I do not agree or disagree with the arbitrary fixing of the age of thirteen years as the age of entrance into the Secondary Schools and not the age of 11 years. I have given great thought to the problem which the hon. member has raised. There is the matter of the nervous tension which it breeds in children, the amount of frustration and bitterness which some parents at least experience when some children do not jump the hurdles as early as they think they should and when they do not jump them at all.

As to the last examination which has just gone, I have given advice and made suggestions to the personnel in my Ministry which is concerned with processing these matters, that they should give priority to the 11-year-olds in cases where the performance of the 10-year-olds and the 11-year-olds were about the same; I have done that because the 10-year-olds would have another chance whereas the 11-year-olds would not. That is why we have admitted more children from the Primary Schools this year than last year, and more last year than in the preceding years through the old methods of entrance examinations. We have given the 11-year-olds preference of entry when both the 10-year-olds and the 11-year-olds had reached the same standard of work and we have only given the 10-year-olds the preference when they showed exceptional ability. By doing that, we have managed to meet, though not all, some of the hardships which are associated with the competitive examination of children.

3.50 p.m.

This policy will continue because it has paid good dividends. 11 year olds, when their standard of performance is equal to that of the 10 year olds, we will give them the preference. When the 10 year olds show exceptional ability they will not be held back on grounds of age. I do not know of a fairer method within this system than that, and I have given great thought to it, and that is a policy at which I have arrived, and until a more diverse and more detailed study of the entire problem of secondary education has come to this Island, I cannot undertake to disturb the present arrangements to introduce an entirely different system. I can

only say that whenever and wherever it is possible, we shall provide more facilities and make the present facilities more worthwhile to attain. That point I have answered immediately on the hon. member's question of shifting the age from 11 to 13. I go on from there, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to say this: the hon. member is on perfectly good ground when he insists that it is impossible to say arbitrarily that at the age of 11 a child will be this or that, and that there is no possibility of change or development in the child. Those who hold that at the age of 11 you can say once and for all what a child's potentialities would be, I think are barking up the wrong tree and are menaces to education; so I am on common ground with him on this point that there ought always to be a considerable amount of flexibility in any system of selection for secondary schools.

There is a question of the late developer. It is said that when Professor Einstein was 18 years old, he could not undertake to extract the square root of three without misgiving, but by the time he was 22 he was an acknowledged mathematical genius. If at 19 he could not do a sum involving square root, it is very likely at 11, 12 or 13 he would have been dubbed by some of our own educational pundits a hopeless case; but he was a late developer and there are cases even within our own general school system in this Island where the late developer has emerged. The hon. member who has moved this Resolution, the hon. member who is sitting on my right, the hon. member who is sitting on the extreme left on this side of the House are all of them persons with exceptional experience in this matter I am treating of. They spent their lives' work, at least one of them until he was elevated to a different sphere, in taking rejects as they used to be called, superannuees from the old system and making something of them and each of them, if they had the time, could tell a tale as long as your arm of the triumphs and successes they have had of people who had been put out of Government schools under the last regime. I try under my administration and the regime of this Government to do as little putting out as possible, because I am convinced — and I do not say this in any criticism of our private secondary school system, but I state it as a fact based on my own direct observation as well as my own experience as a teacher — that we have still got to pull our socks up in our methods of teaching in Government secondary schools in this Island.

The complaint is sometimes made that the people who go — when I say the people I mean the children — into the secondary grammar schools from the common entrance, although they have done so exceptionally well in the entrance examination, do not seem to show that promise of which they give notice when they passed the examination, and the inference is drawn that there must be something wrong with the children. I do not entirely support that contention. If a child shows promise of intelligence in an examination which is highly competitive and that child falls back in the first or second forms of a grammar school, you should examine your staffing and teaching methods to see whether the children are being taught as properly as they might be; so that I am prepared to examine our own school system for defects and try to remedy these defects. The problem of late developers therefore is common ground with all intelligent and forward-looking educational experts and with teachers and should be with the entire community.

Here again, Sir, this Party, being a party wedded to the idea that all should have their chance to develop their full potentialities, no longer sees any sense in this wanton discrimination so far as nomenclature is concerned in differentiating between one secondary school and another. What is a grammar school? What is a modern school? Names and descriptions pale into insignificance until they have no significance at all when you reflect that in a school like Harrison College third, fourth and fifth forms have a wide range on their curriculum of technical subjects, and when you go into Princess Margaret or Parkinson you find that there are several streams of pupils being prepared for the G.C.E. in the same sort of academic subjects as they would be prepared if they were at Harrison College, Queens College, St. Michael's or what have you. That makes it possible for a boy to leave Harrison College or the Lodge School and take an advanced course at the Technical Insti-

tute, do well at it and get himself qualified and get a scholarship in engineering at the University of the West Indies at St. Augustine. It also makes it possible for a pupil at Princess Margaret to do so well in the G.C.E. examination, get four or five subjects, and good subjects at that, as to enable that pupil to be transferred to Harrison College for the Sixth Form. So under our very eyes, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we are seeing the merging of our secondary school systems. You can call it comprehensive, if by that you mean taking in pupils of all abilities, or you can call it comprehensive if you mean offering the widest possible range of subjects in its curriculum.

I would not quarrel with names, but of this I am certain; that within a very few years if we keep on as we are going, and if we do not go in for what we call silly experimentation, it would be difficult to tell, so far as the attainment, adaptability and promise are concerned, the pupil of Queens College and the pupil of any other school, and it is not that we are aiming at a dead level of mediocrity or at a dead level of poor attainment; we are aiming at improving the standards of all; and what is involved in raising the standards of all is that those who belong to a certain tradition will have to broaden their curricula to take into account the needs of the community, and that the newer secondary schools will offer additional facilities to the facilities which they started with.

4.00 p.m.

The problem of the late developer, therefore, though it is always with us, is a problem which admits of a sensible solution; and as long as you have a system which is flexible enough whether or not a child at 11 years appears to have its full opportunity, you have nothing to worry about. You would have to worry if it were impossible to provide facilities for a child who shows the ability at a later age; but as long as he can get the opportunities, whether he is 11 years, 13 years or 17 years, you have nothing to worry about.

Sir, it may be irrelevant to mention what I am going to mention now. I will mention it now in illustration to the point which I was making that it does not matter what system you have so long as it is flexible. A few months ago, as Minister of Education and along with the other Ministers, we decided that in view of the fact that this country is to have its own radio broadcasting station and in view of the fact that within the next few years from this point, the question of television, television services and facilities will also be available, we would not wait until this development takes place, that we were bound to plan for them right away, so we directed the Technical Institute to lay on a course in radio repair and electronics because in a few months' time the people of this Island would be importing their radio sets in hundreds and thousands and these sets would want servicing. The story would have been different if it could be said that there were half dozen people who could service transistor sets; so we laid on that course and both in interest and work, I am almost certain that it is going further, and what has started off as a one-year course is going to end up in a three-year course on electronics. Some of these people who are doing this course on electronics and radio repair are people who would rather die than do academical subjects and would not be able to save themselves from a shower of rain if they had to pass an examination in French or Spanish. But they are people who have gifts in another direction; therefore, if we can so devise our educational policies as to tap this vast reservoir which is not in secondary grammar schools, given the proper training and direction in other secondary schools such pupils stand to benefit. Quite a lot of late developers, not necessarily in academic subjects, may be men who have done something not to revolutionise the country, but may be able to increase the earning capacity of this community. You can only produce such a man under a flexible educational system.

Sir, to understand whatever problems which faces secondary education in this community, we have to go rather further back. Sir Winston Churchill said somewhere that the farther back you can look, the farther forward you would jump. What we undergo of these strains and stresses

and difficulties are in a large measure products of our history and what our economic and sociological standards have been. You must remember that the economy of Barbados has evolved from a slave economy. That made a lot of difference in thinking on educational problems. Although we have not felt the worst effects of a slave economy, when slavery in these territories was abolished relatively early, the interest which people took in education was not in any way resisted by the planter and the plantation owners because, of course, they had no interest for certain reasons in keeping certain people down. It is true that they had their reactionary method; but they could not summon up enough energy to keep back the clock and to keep the people from obtaining a little education.

There was another reason why we have got so good a primary school system of education, and it was such a good one until a few years ago when we started to tinkle and experiment with it, and by doing so we nearly lost an entire generation by it. It is this. The Negro population of this Island well understood that their economic future would not improve fast enough to make provision of secondary education for all their children a possibility and, therefore, it came about that they insisted on their children getting the best teaching that a primary school system could give. In addition, the people who managed the primary school system, such as members of religious organisations and the people who worked in them, took the view that if you were to have a docile, intelligent, co-operative, working class — and it would be a terrible risk to have an ignorant working class — the very least you should provide for such people would be a primary school system which would enable children to read and write with facility, and from which they would emerge having a tremendous understanding and awareness of their own surroundings in a basic general education.

Now, it is only in the last twenty years or so that this idea has changed — the idea that a primary school education was to be the limit for almost everybody. I still remember when my father took me sometime in 1931 or 1930 to Combermere on a Monday morning before the term was about to begin. There were no more than 18 parents there with their own boys — possibly as many as 24 — and the Headmaster took us and disposed of us in about an hour and a half merely by asking our parents where this boy went to school and if you were sure you could pay his fees. As a matter of fact, when he asked if you could pay the child's fees, and you answered in the affirmative he would give you the order for the tie and cap, but if he asked you and you said "I think so", it was only then that they decided to examine you to find out if you were up to standard.

However, the point which I was making was that the masses never revolted about the conditions which then existed. Those who could afford and those who accepted the responsibility that education was worthwhile for the masses, took it for granted that they should provide for their children a good primary education.

Came the War, and with the War, emigration to the United States, and immediately after that, we also had emigration to the United States and to the United Kingdom and standards began to rise. A new age made its impact upon the consciousness of the population. Parents, especially fathers, made their impact upon the consciousness of the people and there was a general upsurge and the concept was that all should have secondary education.

4.10 p.m.

You did not have it argued that all should have primary education, that was taken for granted because the planters and merchants of that era never really envisaged that all would need or desire to have secondary education. But what they did do was this. They took on the issue to provide secondary education for all and made it available both to the present and to the future by passing the Education Act of 1890 which, in some of its provisions, was as up-to-date and as far-seeing a document until a few years ago — as anything which was passed in this century. They laid it down that they should have a secondary school in every parish. Say what you like about the merchants and planters

of this island who had the control of our destinies for three centuries; they were more forward-looking in their attitudes towards secondary education for the island than the Government was in the years between 1944 and 1961. The merchants and planters gave us the Parry School and the Coleridge School which were later amalgamated, the Alleyne School, the Foundation School, Combermere School, Queen's College and Harrison College. They gave us all of them though not at the same time, some of them going back to the 18th century; but it was the ruling classes of this island - for the benefit of their own children first - who provided secondary schools; and in order to show that they were not the curmudgeons as other people thought them to be, they said that they would give a secondary school in each parish and they bequeathed ten of them to us.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, in this modern period the whole community has been caught with this problem. What should have happened, of course, was that in the years after the Second World War there should have been a progressive extension of secondary schools in this island. It would not have mattered if they had built two or three more schools as ambitious in their range as Queen's College or the Lodge School, because they would still have had hundreds of children to occupy them. It would not have mattered if they had been so narrow in their concept as to build schools with as neat and as little a range of study as the Alleyne School was ten years ago; they would have built a school anyhow. If between 1940 and 1955 half a dozen schools even of the type of the Alleyne School had been built, we would not have been faced with the problems which we now have to face. Therefore, there had been a denial not only of the need of these facilities, but also a refusal to admit that these facilities were required. That is why the hon. member and others like him have been able to rise to the occasion with a lot of trouble and worry, to take in this large school population which exists. That was because, in the first place, there has been this upsurge and demand for secondary education and, secondly, there had been no attempt made to meet the requirements of that upsurge. The existence of the Private Secondary Schools is an effort to grasp the problems which are involved. I wonder whether people really understand that all of us, without exception, are in this mix-up, and that none of us who is contending with one another over these issues is really responsible. We are not responsible for having provided the issue, and therefore there is no reason why we should shirk even now the problem. The problem arises out of the fact that for nearly 20 years we had a set of people running the affairs of this island who did not have the insight to see what was going on under their noses and to provide for it. This is an example of what I mean; nobody told this Government that we should have to build a new secondary school for girls at Government Hill; but were we to wait until the Parkinson School was bursting at its seams or until the Stow Primary School had turned out pupils at 11 years old from year to year and then they cannot get into the Parkinson School, Richmond or anywhere else and then say "If we had known"? I want to say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that a Government which has not got enough foresight to plan and see issues long before they arise has no right to enjoy the confidence of the people; and in educational matters at least you are only justified in maintaining your position if you can see the cloud which is no bigger than a man's hand. If you wait until the cloud is as big as "Flora", then you should not have the Government.

Meanwhile, of course, we have to correct all of these mistakes; we have to adjust all the neglect of the past. One of the most significant ways of adjusting the neglect of the past is in the phenomenal school building programme in which we are now engaged. We are doing that because, although it is not all the answer to the problem, people will realise that we have got to grasp the problems posed by the existence of the Private Secondary Schools so that we will realise that, at the same time, we cannot allow the solution of current problems to wait upon the solution of future problems.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I speak in that way because I want the hon. member to understand that the question of providing an alternative way in which people can enter the secondary schools cannot stand by itself or in isolation; it is a

problem which reaches down into the whole economic and social outlook and structure of this community. Parents now ask for facilities, and they demand facilities which parents did not demand some twenty or thirty years ago. 4.20 p.m.

There were even times that I remember as a boy when in some cases, even if parents could afford to send their children to a secondary school, they did not do it on the ground that it would make the children too uppish and would give them ideas above their class and above their station; and in one case which I remember very vividly a young lady was told by her mother and father: "Send you to St. Michael's for what? You are not a white missy!" Well, that is a reflection, I fear, on the level of conscience obtaining among our people at that stage of their development. Nowadays nobody talks like that. Nowadays tremendous sacrifices are made by all parents to get a secondary education for their children, and it is this desire, this universal desire, which contributes in large measure to our problem.

I wish to be very frank, Mr. Deputy Speaker, because until we iron these matters out and discuss them between us, we will not either see solutions to present problems or solutions to future problems. What is at stake nowadays is not so much whether or not we should provide secondary education for all who want it. We have to; that answers that. What is at stake is this; that because there has been a time lag between the insistent demands of the community for secondary education and the actual preparation and establishment of all the facilities, all sorts and conditions of things are now known as secondary education. Certainly I would be the last person to condemn either out of hand or deliberately the very valuable attempts which have been made by all sorts of people in this island under the most trying and difficult conditions to provide secondary facilities in their schools. I have taught both in Government schools and in private schools and I know the difficulties and frustrations, and I particularly know because of experience which I had of private secondary school management at a most formative period of my own political life, and I was able to see at a moment's notice what the problem was; so I know what the problem was like, and nothing I say here at this juncture must be taken to cast a reflection on those conscientious and sacrificing individuals - some of whom are close personal friends and associates of mine - who carry on and maintain secondary schools in this island. It is not their fault at all if they came into the pressure which is coming against all of us on all sides, because - make no mistake about it, Mr. Deputy Speaker - if you have a love of children and you are passionately interested in education, there is no point beyond which reason just does not operate with you, and you are well tempted to take a child into a school to start it on a secondary course, even sometimes though you know the child cannot benefit by it, because some part of your conscience tells you that you ought not to exclude from an opportunity any child whatever. So you take the child in - you know it cannot benefit by the kind of training which the parent insists it should have - but you take it in because you want to help, and because you feel that you can make something of it, and that - you can never tell - the child may develop.

I, therefore, do not subscribe to the attacks which are made on Private Secondary Schools to the effect that the people who run them are concerned only with filling their pockets and stuffing all their class-rooms from floor to ceiling with children without necessarily caring if the children will learn or not. It is possible that there are a few who think that way, but certainly those which the Ministry of Education has approved and recommended as fit and proper institutions do not take that view at all, because we of the Ministry have a knowledge of the conscientious work they do. But, you see, parents do not always understand that what they call a secondary education is a varied thing, and that the person who passes out of primary school and learns how to make a watch, has had as good a secondary training as the person who passes out of primary school and has learnt, shall we say, to conjugate Greek irregular verbs or to write a good Latin prose. That is the whole point, because all that attaches to secondary education is that it is education past the primary stage; so that if your child is not gifted in a certain direction and you force it - I cannot

say against your better judgement because if you had better judgement you would not force it - against the child's interest to take a course of study in a school simply because it is a secondary school, whether Government or private, you are damaging the child eventually.

The fact that certain children emerge from certain schools with only one certificate has to be balanced against the fact that other children - and many more in percentage - come out of these schools with more than one certificate and do rather well. On the other hand, a lot of children come out of Government Schools with only one certificate and many more come out of Government Schools with more than one; so that it would appear that whether you force a child through a common entrance beyond its best interest into Harrison College, or you force it by asking a private schoolmaster to take it against his better judgement, and the child turns out to be a disappointment, you only have yourself to blame because you did not understand what the secondary stage of education was all about. I will resume, Mr. Deputy Speaker, on the next occasion.

HOUSE REVERTS TO GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It now being 4.30 p.m. o'clock this House will now revert to Government Business.

The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Premier: to move the passing of a Resolution to approve the Statement set out in the Schedule thereto, showing the mileage, locality etc., of highways or portions of highways in the Northern District Council Area which the Governor-in-Executive Committee proposes to place under the control of the Director of Highways and Transport.

RESOLUTION *re* TRANSFER OF ROADS TO CONTROL OF DIRECTOR OF HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORT

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on 26th November, 1962, the Northern District Council passed a Resolution to the following effect:

"BE IT RESOLVED that due to the lack of adequate funds and technical staff at the disposal of the Council, the Governor-in-Executive Committee be requested to take over the control of Highways in the Northern Area under the provisions of Part III section 9 of the Department of Highways and Transport Act, 1945-12.
4.30 p.m.

The Resolution which we now have before us, Mr. Deputy Speaker, seeks the approval of the House for the taking over of these highways to an extent of 93 miles. Some of the highways in the several parishes, or all of the highways in some of the parishes, have already been under the control and jurisdiction of the Central Government, and what the Northern District Council is seeking to do is to bring all the highways in that area under the control of the Central Government.

Sir, the Schedule contains in accordance with the provisions of the Act, a comprehensive list, parish by parish, of the highways which it is sought to take over. The estimated cost of the construction is \$208,700 annually for a period of three years, after which the estimated cost of maintenance will be in the vicinity of \$191,216 annually.

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

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, one of these Councils has taken this line of dealing with this matter of roads, and I thought that I would have heard from the Hon. Premier a speech on this whole question of road policy in the other District Council because it seems to me that, now that you have the Northern District Council giving up the roads in that area to the Central Government, and the roads in St. Michael are already in the hands of Central Government, there is no justification for having the

Southern District Council continuing with this pork-knocking business of finding some jobs for people as road engineers who know nothing of road engineering and who are every week repairing roads based on the old plantation system of repairing them. I cannot tell you how many years I have been travelling over Cox Hill and found cart patches just filled in with rocks which cause you to ride over that rough road as if you were riding in Texas on one of those Texas animals.

Sir, I do not want a rehash on the working of Local Government Councils, but the price which you pay for it - do you mean to say that you have to take what you get? Some Councillors seem to believe that they have inherited some dispensation of the past and they have to place their friends or political supporters in jobs. I feel that sort of thing must come to an end, and when it comes to efficiency and utilisation of public funds, that we have to be very strict about that.

I am satisfied in my mind that the Southern District Council is incapable of performing their job when it comes to road construction and road repairs, and the time has come, now that you have road engineers in the Central Government - and this Island is only 166 square miles - that all the roads should be turned over to the Central Government. We are simply playing the fool by leaving this task in the hands of inexperienced people to fool around with. The whole road system should be turned over to the Central Government. Probably, if the Northern District Council had the necessary funds, they would not have passed that Resolution.

Barbados has a reputation for good roads, and there is no denying the fact that the Central Government does a good job in road construction and repairs even if at times the men who work on the roads take a little longer. If politicians are running the business, they should not be afraid to tell the people who vote for them or who will vote for them that if they want to get work, when they get work they should be prepared to tell workers that their attitude must change; and if they do not do so, they are wasting time. We find politicians still leaning on the old time system of patting people on their backs. We have to tell road workers and the like that road work is a means of relief work; but in the modern concept they cannot do it as relief work; they have to do it as part of the economy of the country. Therefore, if it is part of your economy it should not cost \$5,000 more than what it is estimated to cost. You do not raise the standard of lazy men by giving them a better house to live in or by allowing them or their supervisors to rob us out of the maximum benefits which we should get out of a project. Somebody has to tell them this. Those of you who are afraid of losing votes, of course, cannot say what I can say, because I do not care who votes for me. There are some rum-shop keepers around the town who have got the idea that because they can get some votes for some politicians, they hold the key to this place. I say that if they were so popular, they should come forward.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise to support this Resolution and even to associate myself with the last hon. member who spoke. I think this is one of the best Resolutions I can think about which has come to this House today, because I am sure when this Resolution is passed, it would save much money in the taxpayers' pockets. I must say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that when you and myself of the Northern District Council went around and saw the dilapidated state of the roads in the northern area, we were obliged to ask the Central Government to take them over.
4.40 p.m.

Again, Sir, after examining the roads I see that the appropriate authorities who were in charge of the roads were incapable of managing or of carrying out any proper construction. I saw where they were re-surfacing roads with three-inch stones. I am an expert road builder, and I saw that they were using four-inch, five-inch, six-inch and seven-inch stones and they were also calling for three-inch stones. Mr. Deputy Speaker, it would take all the money in the Bank to get this road in keeping with what it should

be. They are using three-inch stones when they have four, five and six-inch stones for use. I spoke to the manager about this job; I asked him what did he order. He said that he had ordered three-inch stones and I said that they were using four, five and six-inch stones. You would be surprised to see how many roads would have been done with the proper stones.

Another point is this. The machinery which they are using is not capable of carrying out the construction of the roads. Some of this machinery is not heavy enough, and some of it is too heavy. When they are rolling over the bigger stones, they crush the smaller ones to powder and for all the years they would not be able to have proper roads. I am sure that when this Resolution is passed better roads will be obtained. I was working as a contractor in those days when the roads of St. Lucy and St. Andrew were taken over. I am certain that, as soon as these roads have been taken over, they will remain for about ten or fifteen years before they require any re-surfacing. When the Northern District Council builds a road it cannot last for two or three years before it begins to deteriorate, and they have to be continually building the roads. I do not know where we would have got the money from to repair the roads if the Government did not take them over. Some time ago I stood on Mt. Hillaby and looked around the whole island, and one could see many sections of road building. You have the Northern District Council, the Southern District Council and the City Council; I am saying that the work is no more than what the Central Government could do in the whole island. They could give a better and a more lasting job; they could guarantee a substantial job and they would not have to waste so much money.

The Department of Highways and Transport is giving us a very good job, and I hope the time will come when we will be able to take over the roads of the whole island. I do not see that we need to have any right with any Councils at all in any part of Barbados. I say that this Government is in a position to carry out its own road-building programme. All of these Councils should be done away with and let the Government take over the whole island and run it. I am sure that the Government will be able to take over these roads and maintain them more economically than the Councils can maintain them.

You will forgive me, Mr. Deputy Speaker, if I run off the latitude, but I will come back. I would like to see the Government take over the matter of sanitation in this island as well. I will sit down and lay out the plan myself; I am sure that seven men can run the whole Northern District Council. All they require are three Treasurers, three public Assistance Officers and one Clerk. I am sure that in that case we will not need any more District Councils. As a matter of fact, seven men can run the whole island. The same Treasurers who pay out the money to the poor will receive the money and bring it to the bank. This sum of \$112,000 which they are paying for the administration of the Northern District Council will be saved to the taxpayers and we could have a better livelihood. It is time that the Government takes over the administration of the whole island. I sincerely hope that on the next occasion the Government will take over all the roads as well as the sanitation of the island. I am sure that justice will be done, better work will also be done, there will be better facilities and we will be saving money in the pockets of the taxpayers.

I went to Welchman Hall sometime ago and I saw the construction of the road. I called upon the supervisor of the work. The men cursed me to my face. I saw them with a 25-foot road running out into people's yards. The hon. senior member for St. Peter has talked about politics, but we do not want to mix politics with administration; they are not to be close in relationship and I want to see the gap between them widened. Let politics work on one side and let the administration work on the other. You should not try to intervene so much in the administration. We, as politicians, have our work to do and the Administration had its own work to do. I want to say that I shall never have to beg for a vote, not "Homie" Corbin (*Laughter*). I do my work, and when the time comes around you will see my salvation. I do not have to beg or run behind anybody for any vote; I work for the people and my work follows me wherever I go.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I welcome this Resolution and I sincerely hope that all hon. members will vote unanimously for it because it is a Resolution of a good nature. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I thank you.

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

4.50 p.m.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order No. 4 stands in the name of the hon. Minister of Agriculture: to move the passing of a Resolution to approve the sale by the Governor-in-Executive Committee of a parcel of land situate at Bay Street, St. Michael, and described in the Schedule thereto.

RESOLUTION re SALE OF LAND AT BAY STREET

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Deputy Speaker, as the Addendum sets out, in accordance with the provisions of section 12 of the Executive Committee Act, 1891-22, as enacted by the Executive Committee (Amendment) Act, 1951-27, the approval of the Legislature is sought for the sale of the parcel of land described in the Schedule. The Schedule sets out the description of the land and the area of the land very distinctly, and it reads as follows:-

ALL THAT certain piece or parcel of land (being part of the lands of a place called the Esplanade) situate at Bay Street in the parish of Saint Michael in this Island containing by admeasurement three hundred and ninety square feet or thereabouts abutting and bounding on other lands of the Executive Committee being the remainder of the lands of the place called the Esplanade, on the sea, on other lands now or late of Dr. A. W. Trieloff, and on Bay Street or however else the same may abut and bound together with the wall erected and standing thereon.

As hon. members will know in matters of this sort where the Governor-in-Executive Committee proposes conducting any sale, the approval of the Legislature is necessary. This matter has been gone into very carefully by the Town and Country Planning Officer who has no objection to the sale, by the Standing Valuation Committee which is the Committee which acts for the Government in such matters as to price and other recommendations, and also by the Crown Solicitor who investigates the matter generally; and subject to the approval of the Legislature the Government proposes to sell an area of 390 square feet to Dr. A. W. Trieloff at the rate of \$2.00 per square foot for the land and \$5.00 per linear foot for the wall on condition that the wall will not be altered or demolished without the specific approval of the Governor-in-Executive Committee and should be maintained in a good state of repair on both sides. The Government is therefore getting a fair and reasonable price for the land and for the wall, and the selling value and other aspects will be protected because no alteration is to be made without the sanction and approval of the Town and Country Planning Officer and the approval of the Governor-in-Executive Committee. The total price will be \$1,370.42. At present, as hon. members will realise, the wall and the little strip of land does not lend anything to the Esplanade, and the people who use the Esplanade will still have the wall and all the facilities which are at present available to the public.

With those few remarks, Sir, I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order No. 5 stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture: to move the passing of a Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition by the Governor-in-Executive Committee of the Sugar Work Plantation called Graeme Hall, described in the Schedule thereto, for the purpose of ensuring a proper system of land utilisation for the use and benefit of the public.

RESOLUTION re ACQUISITION OF GRAEME HALL PLANTATION

Hon. G. E. TALMA: Mr. Deputy Speaker, as the Addendum sets out, the Government had commenced negotiations with the company which owns Graeme Hall Plantation with a view to purchasing the plantation for the purpose of furthering its policy of ensuring a proper system of land utilisation for the use and benefit of the public, but it was not possible to reach agreement on the terms of the purchase. The Government has therefore decided to acquire the land under the provisions of the land Acquisition Act, 1949.

The Schedule sets out the general description of the Land which is being acquired by the Government, and it reads as follows:-

ALL THAT Sugar Work Plantation called Graeme Hall situate in the parish of Christ Church in this Island containing by estimation Three hundred Acres or thereabouts Abutting and bounding on the public road known as St. Lawrence Road, on the sea, on Graeme Hall Road, on other lands formerly of Graeme Hall but now of sundry owners, on lands of Warners Plantation or however else the same may abut and bound.

These negotiations have been going on for some time, but it has not been possible for the Government to reach agreement with the owners, and it is for that reason that the Government has decided on a compulsory acquisition for the reasons which I have explained. Hon. members will probably want to know how the estate is comprised, how many acres are rab and so on. It is 180 acres arable (including a house), 43 acres grassland, 30 acres swamp, 2 acres tenantry, 39 acres roads, etc., and beachland including approximately 570 feet frontage, totalling 304 acres, and the price is in the vicinity of £100,000. I think that is all the information I can give that is strictly relevant.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think that this purchase is a different cup of tea from the 380 square feet you are buying at the Esplanade, and I should like to hear a little more from the Minister than what is stated in the Addendum to the Resolution to the effect that it is for the purpose of furthering its policy of ensuring a proper system of land utilisation. Now I am a believer in an agrarian policy, and an agrarian policy must be explained to show what it proposes and how flexible it is. I must say, however, that I have not heard anything about that, and I want to know what are the real reasons behind the purchase of Graeme Hall as a land utilisation scheme, because the area of arable land is comparatively small; it is 181 arable acres. When you say it is for land utilisation, you must explain the purpose because you can have land utilisation in many ways, and I think we should know what is your policy with regard to the utilisation of Graeme Hall.

Now let us be frank about it. You are buying 30 acres of swamp. I do not think the Barbados Government would at this stage be interested in buying a plantation that is going to have a high percentage of swamp land unless it wants to carry out some investigation in mosquito control and therefore it would be a good thing to have this unto itself. I am not facetious; I am saying that in a community like Barbados where you have a land-hungry people, you should not buy a plantation purely for the sake of buying a plantation unless it offers excellent facilities for your land utilisation policy. I am not a critic of the Government buying land, because I asked the previous Government on many occasions to buy certain plantations that were going out and utilise them on a co-operative basis in order to have a better insight of what is taking place.
5.00 p.m.

For example, there is Dodds in St. Philip. I have not heard over the many years how Dodds is utilised as a Government-owned plantation, within the context of any

agrarian policy. I would like to know if your agrarian policy is one of giving small holders some land, or if it is to modernise the system of agriculture and its diversification.

I am satisfied, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that Barbados, if it relies solely on sugar, cannot be looked upon with serious consideration. I must also say that I do not have a tremendous amount of faith in all of the advice which this Government has been getting, because it seems to me, as the hon. senior member for St. Andrew said in a different context, that some of the administrators seem to be more politicians than the politicians themselves. If a man is an administrator, he must give advice on matters. You have some administrators who would come along and make the most outrageous statements while they are in one regime, and then they come back and make a complete metamorphosis. I fail to respect a man's ability if he is going to be so vacillating and is going to change overnight. This Government has a policy of land utilisation; but if you have predominantly the same people advising you — and I have been in the House long enough to know that the former policy was geared to the plantation system — how can you expect your policy to be carried into effect? That is where I have a lot of misgivings about these things. I believe in the agrarian policy; I do not believe in fragmentation. Although I represent a rural area, I believe that if we take the land in Barbados and divide it up in lots of small pieces, it would not be a wise thing to do. There are some people who are always looking for votes; so they do not always think in terms of what eventually is going to take place; and then when you have done that, you find that you have spent more money to keep a peasant as a peasant than the total crop would carry. I am not going back to politics in the 1920's when this is 1960. We must begin to tell the people that this is economical and that is not economical; and if representatives are not ready to tell the people so, they are not ready for what is taking place inside here.

When you say "grasslands", that has to be determined; it must have some sort of valuation. There are some grasslands which do not have very much valuation; you may have grassland on a bit of stone. We have all of these experts, and we have some people who tell you that one of my experts told me that we must buy grassland and put it in sheep rearing. Sheep do not multiply overnight, and the meat which you may get from sheep may not give you back the money. If sheep used to breed every night, you would be able to say that if you buy this grassland, it will pay you to rear sheep; but you must bear in mind that although they do not breed overnight, you have to feed them and look after them, and if you have money to spend on them, you cannot go along with these old time fancy ideas that rearing sheep is a paying concern. It is just like the average man who keeps chickens. That cannot be considered economical if you are raising them in a backyard, and you have to pay people for doing things for you. It is all right for a little saving for a man who is working in the morning and afternoon if he comes home and does a little extra work; but he cannot decide to stop working and say that he is going to keep a sow pig or keep chickens. As I have said, if he is doing a job, and he decides when he comes home to put in a little work on such a thing, financially, it is all right because his spare time in itself is not of economic value, and he puts it to use by rearing a cow, a pig or chickens.

I should like to know from the Hon. Minister more of the Government's land utilisation policy in relation to the purchase of this plantation so that we can see whether it is a sound scheme. I want to know what are your proposals in relation to the purchase of Graeme Hall Plantation. What do you intend to do with the 181 acres of land which includes some land on the beach. I hear of all these wild cat schemes I do not know if it is going to be the site for the Federal Capital. I want to know if it is bought with the view of being the site for the Federal Capital. If it is bought for that purpose, I do not think it would suffice because it is just a little bigger than a baseball playing field.

I have been hearing too much of land utilisation. Is it going to be like at Seawell when you bought the remainder of Seawell and divided it up among peasants giving each four

acres of land? What do you have in mind when you buy Graeme Hall? What do you intend to do with it? I think the Minister must tell us so that we would know if your policy for the utilisation of land is useful. No Government has ever bought any of the land which I told them to buy; for example, I told the last Government to buy Heywoods Plantation and they never did so. If I were a business tycoon, I would have bought it because it is a most beautiful area. Land utilisation can be effected in many ways, but no Government has ever bought any land which I told them to buy. It seems to me that I have run afoul of all Governments.

However, Sir, I am a believer in utilising land and you should not allow land to be fragmented, nor should you allow land to fetch such a price. What I have been noting here is that plantation land is being sold from person to person at exorbitant prices. People have been borrowing money from banks to buy a plantation and then they have been asking us, the workers, to underwrite these mortgage loans and all of that. All that is part of your expense.
5.10 p.m.

For that reason I myself do not like this policy which I have seen going on here. You will find that a plantation has been bought for £30,000, it is run by one owner for about ten years and then it is sold for £60,000; therefore the growth of the price of plantation land in Barbados is destroying the economic position of this island. It means that somebody, and it must be the worker, is underwriting all of these excessive charges because they are putting them in as fair operation charges; they are not regarded as normal charges. The Government has offered to buy plantation land from the point of view of the money which the Government is receiving. You cannot sell land at a price which is cheaper than what the Government is charging you for income tax purposes because that is regarded as a reasonable rate. All of that has to be taken into consideration; when you jack up the price of land you make the matter of building houses and so on more expensive.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I support the purchase of land and keeping it under control. I think, however, that the Hon. Minister of Agriculture owes us a duty to tell us something about this policy. You must have a policy about this matter and the Minister should tell us what is the policy. You are not just going to hold land; you cannot buy land until you are ready to use it. You are spending this money on the basis that you have a policy and a plan which you will carry into operation within the foreseeable future, and it will be good for the Minister to tell us what is the policy of the Government in purchasing this land. We just do not want you to buy land when you cannot tell us the policy which you are going to pursue.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Central Foundry Site was bought as land to be utilised and it was bought at a very high price. It was purchased at something like £3 per foot and up to now nothing has been done with it; but members of this House are very docile because you have all of this party politics (Hon. E. W. BARROW: We have only just been in office.) I do not go in for that sort of thing.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order. Mr. Deputy Speaker, the hon. member is informed that we have had architects drawing details of the plan of the new Finance Department and we would like to utilise this site. Up to now we have not got the drawings from the Hilton Hotel people or that building would have been up already. You have to be kept waiting for eight or ten months for engineering drawings. We did not acquire this site, but we will use it.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I cannot tell you or the Chairman what to do, but that is not a point of order. The hon. member has not said that what I said is not true. I am merely making an analogy that the Minister did not specifically state what they are buying this land for, and I said that that is why you have this situation at the Central Foundry site. This land was bought at a high price but it was never utilised. I must be quite polite; the Hon. Premier can reply, and when he replies I cannot say anything. Your Honour must not permit an hon. member to rise on a point

of order so as to reply to a statement which an hon. member is making. That state of affairs makes for too many quarrels. There would have been a point of order if the Minister had said something to correct what was a wrong slant. I am saying that the Minister has not stated what is his policy of land utilisation in relation to the purchase of this land.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: At this particular point do not let there be any disorder. Both hon. members have spoken and that will be the end of the matter.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, there will not be any disorder because it will be my turn and I am going on to speak. There will only be disorder if I go mad. I am making an analogy which is appropriate to the Resolution with which I am dealing; I am speaking on this matter which is a public matter. The Government proposes to purchase Graeme Hall Plantation which is 300 acres of land. The members of the Cabinet are proposing to buy this land, and now that the matter has reached here we should know something of the public policy, as to what are the Government's intentions in relation to the utilisation of land. We are giving approval to this Resolution for the purchase of this land. I agree with an agrarian policy; I agree with the purchase of this land; but I am saying that we should be told what is the Government's policy of land utilisation. If I were to take up the Hon. Premier closely and precisely, the same problem would occur in the land utilisation policy because the agricultural officers are very limited and they are all pressed now. What do they propose to do now? It may mean that just as there is the case where the Premier's engineers are being pressed for time, he might find himself buying this land and not being able to utilise it as quickly as he would like to utilise it.
5.20 p.m.

You may say it is still better to buy it and hold it, and you can do that, but it just depends on the finance at your disposal. But I think I am right in saying that the Minister should explain to us and let us know what are the projections about this scheme. I take it that the Government would not buy this sort of thing unless it had something in mind that it wanted to do with Graeme Hall. I heard the Hon. Premier say already that it is not the intention of his Government to purchase Barbados; so you are not buying all the land that would become available in Barbados, because you would turn the Treasury into a land holding department, and I do not know where the money would come from.

I am not one of those suspicious people who like to envisage that you are doing something improper, but if Government comes and says it wants to buy a plantation, there must be some reason behind it. What are the reasons for the purchase? What is stated in the Addendum cannot be regarded as an explanation, because it merely says the Government had commenced negotiations with the Company which owns Graeme Hall Plantation with a view to purchasing the plantation for the purpose of furthering its policy of ensuring a proper system of land utilisation for the use and benefit of the public, but it was not possible to reach agreement. What does that mean in specific terms? I know that Trents was up for sale also and the Government was asked to buy it, but they did not. They would have good reasons for not buying Trents. Colleton was up for sale and the Government did not buy it for good reasons, and I would say from the point of view of land utilisation that Trents is no less suitable than Graeme Hall would be, because Trents has more valuable beachland than you can get at Graeme Hall now, because the frontage is from the time you pass the school along the road until you get to Porters; and when it comes to the land on the main highway, you can see what could be built up in years to come so far as houses are concerned. Do not think I am envisaging that the next ten years you will see chattel houses still adorning the main road and being the collecting receptacles of all the termites.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I made no quarrel because the Government did not buy Trents or Colleton since they might have had good reasons; but now the Government has decided to buy Graeme Hall, I feel it is owed to us to let us know

the utilisation plans you have for Graeme Hall that will make us approve of the purchase, because that would make it easier for us, and I do not think that is an unreasonable request. If that is an unreasonable request, then I would say that Government has no policy now as to what is its reason for buying Graeme Hall as distinct from the others. Moreover the Government must be prepared to say as a settled matter of its land utilisation policy what it proposes to do about land utilisation in this Island, and we should know that not in vague terms, but just in manifesto terms, but at some time a White Paper should be prepared on land utilisation so that we know this is what the Government is committed to on land utilisation. Any Government that is projecting a new scheme or schemes of this nature must be prepared to produce a White Paper on these things as a guide-line for the public to see, because a White Paper is open to criticism by the public, so that people can come forward and say the Government is committing us to these things, say whether or not it is good, and the Government can revise its plan and policy. I say that for this additional reason: all of us in Barbados must have vested interest in money that is public funds, and no sector of a community that is an important sector can be so stupid as not to have very close interest in it, because we have a vested interest. It is public funds we are using, and as we have a vested interest, anything done in the community must be done on a sound basis.

For that reason, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think the Hon. Minister should let us know some of the plans they have for this scheme so that when we vote for it, we are clear in our minds that it is sound even if he cannot give us minute details. What does your utilisation policy aim at? Is it an agricultural utilisation policy? Is it a utilisation policy on a comprehensive basis to embrace housing, agriculture or building up small communities? There is no one utilisation policy. Is it a policy to create co-operatives among farmers? Is it a policy to create co-operatives for housing ownership? Are you taking a housing plan into Graeme Hall? Are you using it for an extension of some type of agriculture that you do not now have? Are you going to use the swamp? Are you going to reclaim the land in the swamp where the reclamation of such land would make so much more land available to you and you are satisfied with regard to the drainage and the cost? Is it going to be a means of ridding that area of the mosquito menace? I feel that if you let us know these things, you will be giving us the information that we require. I am a believer in the best utilisation of land, because I feel that if the Government can utilise land effectively and efficiently, it has a progressive outlook in general; but if a Government takes land out of the community and leaves it just like how some of our land has been left as the Panama people did, then it is no use to anybody, because it is lying fallow and not producing, and therefore it is not giving us the maximum benefit we should get. I do not want to encourage Government to purchase land unless it has a plan and a policy for the utilisation of it in the quickest possible time.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Hon. Minister of Agriculture will reply adequately to many of the questions raised by the hon. member, but I should only like to enjoin hon. members that we are not very dense on this side of the House, and if members want to ask a question, it is only necessary to ask it once, and I think we get the message pretty quickly. If the Minister could not go into detailed explanations on the land use policy of Government, there are several reasons for it; but perhaps the most important reason is that when we come to the House with a Resolution asking the concurrence of the House for the acquisition of any kind of property under the Land Acquisition Act of 1949 which has recently been amended, it must be appreciated that negotiations are still pending. If the Government had to come here and break down the land into half acre lots — and when I say 'break it down into half acre lots', I mean in so far as utilisation is concerned — and bring in surveyors and show in detail what the Government intended to do, when we went to arbitration we would find representatives of the vendors, the people from whom the land is being acquired, arguing that this is the value of this land for so and so; but we do not intend to do that.

We do have a land utilisation policy and I promise the hon. member that a White Paper will be issued on this; but six weeks after I came into office — as a matter of fact less than that, because I happened to be in Washington — I made a request of the United Nations to have a complete cadastral survey made of the Island of Barbados. This is probably the only Government in the world that goes in for economic planning in so far as every single inch to the foot of this Island is being brought into a cadastral survey right now.
5.30 p.m.

Now, we intend to introduce a system of land registration. I intend to set up very shortly a Department of Land Surveys under my Ministry, and the only problem which is facing us is whether the Town and Country Planning Department, being what it is, should be transferred to the Ministry of the Premier. All of this we have been working on from ten days after we were in office. We have been lucky in getting the necessary experts for the cadastral survey. In so far as this is concerned, this House has already passed a Resolution to give us the development necessary. We are not approaching this question of land development on a piecemeal basis at all. If we say in this Resolution "to further the Government's land utilisation policy", I have given the reason why the White Paper on it has not been produced to members before.

The hon. member has virtually answered all the questions. He has said that he does not believe in that. All of that, we also go along with him in. He has said that he does not believe in fragmentation. We do not believe in fragmentation of land in an economy like this. If you read page 76 of the report of the Royal Commission which came to investigate the circumstances in Barbados after the 1937 disturbances, you will find that one of the leaders of the last Government, no less a person than the first Premier of Barbados, said that the way of settling the conditions was to divide up the whole Island into lots having the average of five persons per family. Of course, he was going to take his in Broad Street and probably I would get mine in Graveyard, St. Lucy. Mr. Morgan Jones asked him what he was going to do with the other 160,000 people who would not get any and his final answer was that what you would have to do with them is to get rid of them. That is where you have no policy at all. The method by which he was getting rid of the 160,000 people, I take it, was the method used at Buchenwald, Dachau and Belsen where they built elaborate gas chambers and put train loads of people in them. That is the difference of approach between one Government and the other.

Sir, we have a complete cadastral survey. We have geographical surveys, soil surveys and we even have a hydro survey as well. We have already laid one White Paper in the form of the Water Plan, and hon. members therefore should not press the Minister to give details of the use to which Graeme Hall will be put.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I did not ask the Minister to give in detail what he intended to do. I said that he owes it to the House to give us an idea, and he should be able to do so now that you are purchasing Graeme Hall. I asked what are your reasons other than land utilisation. I said that if you have a land utilisation policy, you should be able to say under what part of this policy this is going to come. I did not ask for any details.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I understand the hon. member right from the beginning. As I have said, our land utilisation policy will be presented in the form of a White Paper, and I hope that, when we come down with the money Resolution after the terms for the arbitration have been finalised, at that stage we will be able to give the House more details about the immediate use of this plantation and the long term plans to which the land would be put. But the hon. member will have to vouchsafe to us now some credit for having a land utilisation policy. At least, part of them have completed their surveys. When I said that the hon. member has partially answered the questions himself, it is because we, too, do not believe in fragmentation nor do we believe in speculation.

Let me say that Barbados has a limited amount of land. Graeme Hall Plantation was advertised for sale in English and Canadian newspapers and was never advertised for sale in any of the Barbados newspapers, so that in Barbados no Barbadian knew that it was for sale. I saw that advertisement in a Toronto newspaper and it was actually stated in the newspaper that it would suit Canadians for hotel purposes. After I saw it, I called in all of the Ministers and said that we would have to put an end to this sort of thing, because we may wake up overnight and find the whole of Barbados sold out.

There is absolutely no law in the Island, since the Other Place and this House actually killed the Land Holdings Bill, to prevent land being sold to foreigners. There is absolutely no control over land, and already we have people who are very dutiful to the Soviet regime, and we may wake up one morning and find by the B.L.P. vote that the Union of Soviet Republics would be running the country. Under the existing state of the law, there is nothing to prevent us coming under the Soviet Union — and I say the words again advisably. Our headquarters have never been adorned by the hammer and sickle, and it never will be as long as I am the Leader of the Party.

I should say, Sir, that when we discovered that this plantation was being advertised in the Dominion of Canada and in England, and people were coming down here and asking us questions and telling us what they intend to do with that plantation, we said that we could not allow Barbados to be sold over the heads of persons. If you study a map of the exodus from the rural districts, you will find that Bridgetown is bursting from its seams, and the only plantation not for sale is the Belle Plantation. There are the Pine Plantations, Graeme Hall Plantation to the south and the other Plantations — Waterford, Codrington and other plantations — to the north, which we are also negotiating for now for the mortgage insurance scheme. In fact, we are negotiating now for the purchase of three plantations. So you had the position where the people of Barbados owned no land — because we have not got Crown lands — but the position is changing. In the space of eighteen months this Government would be acquiring 3,000 acres of land for the use of the people of this Island. We are completely surrounded by these plantations, and we cannot allow the plantations around our borders to be used for the purpose of speculation. The people of this country should be making a profit out of the land of Barbados and not any Canadian, Russia or any speculator. But we know at the same time that in the Island of Antigua, 40,000 acres of land were acquired by the Antiguan Government during the last 15 years, and the Antigua Government is not as well off as our Government because they never had a surplus which our Government had in 1951. As a matter of fact, our average annual surplus was equal to the total revenue of Antigua. 5.40 p.m.

Yet the Government was in a position to buy 40,000 acres of land, because the Chief Minister did not intend that people should come in and make inordinate profits out of land which was the national heritage of the people of the island. I think that the experiment at Seawell was a gross bit of folly; I cannot go along with saying that the way to settle unemployment in Barbados, when we know that sugar cane has got to be grown on a large scale, if it is to be profitable at all, is to divide up the land in half-acre lots. I do not agree with dividing up the land into half-acre lots and giving it to people on the theory that they will be happy if you were to give them a cow and a half acre of land. That, in my opinion, is unadulterated nonsense. When the hon. senior member for St. Peter approached the Hon. Minister of Agriculture and myself about the acquisition of Trents and Colleton Plantations, we realised that these estates were in Chancery because whenever the owners wanted to borrow money from the Sugar Industry Agricultural Bank they had to apply to the Court and we would try our best to salvage the operation. We went into the matter with a great deal of care and we considered that none of these plantations could be sold in this way. Dr. Tulstrom has pointed out that no more fragmentation should go on in the area. We could not use the land for the cultivation of vegetable crops and all we would be doing would be buying a "white elephant". We

said that we would allow somebody who could really live in the place to try to make a hand of it.

As far as Trents and Colleton plantations are concerned they have never made any money, as far as I can remember, for 40 years; and therefore why should we acquire deliberately something which we know is not going to make any money, something which we could not diversify? We cannot change the pattern, neither can we intensify the pattern of Trents and Colleton. The hon. senior member for St. Peter was satisfied about that. Trents and Lascelles together only have two acres of beach land, whereas Graeme Hall has approximately five acres of beach land. When the Federal Capital was to be placed here, they would have served notice to all the people living on the Worthing Beach, as a matter of fact, all of that land is the property of Graeme Hall and the Government would have had to find somewhere to place these people. The beach land alone would have paid off for the estate.

When we come to the money Resolution, the hon. senior member for St. Peter would have been the first to congratulate the Government for taking the step which we took. We have to make proper planning on the circumference of the City so as to make sure that we do not have the kind of jerry building which we have up to now.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not think that I should trespass any further on the premises of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture. The hon. senior member for St. Peter also spoke about the breeding of mosquitoes in the Graeme Hall Swamp; he will be interested, however, to know that the Belairs Research Institute has been very interested in using some of the place for the handling of shrimps, so that we may have the breeding of shrimps rather than the molestation of mosquitoes in the area.

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

DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC PROSECUTIONS BILL

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Premier:— To move the Second Reading of a Bill relating to the Director of Public Prosecutions.

Hon. E. W. BARROW. Mr. Deputy Speaker, this Bill seeks to establish— as a matter of fact the office has already been established by a Civil Establishment Order — but this Bill seeks to deal with the Question of the appointment and qualifications of the post of the Director of Public Prosecutions. We have been before the House before with a Civil Establishment Order, as I have just said, which would cover the question of the establishment. As part of the great constitutional changes which are necessary in this country, the idea of having a Solicitor General is a very antiquated one. We have another Bill dealing with the post of Attorney General in which we will repeal the Act relating to the Attorney General and make other arrangements for the post of Attorney General.

Sometime ago, in 1960, constitutional changes were introduced in this country and the then Government reserved for itself the right to make the appointment of a political Attorney General. There has been long correspondence with the Secretary of State for the Colonies on this matter, and we have now been given the "go ahead" because of the accepted policy of all parties concerned that this island of Barbados has now moved into a stage where we should be in line with the United Kingdom and with the ever-advancing countries of the Caribbean area. 5.50 p.m.

Members who fear that the administration of justice may be impaired by such a move should have their fears completely allayed by the provisions of this Bill, because the Director of Public Prosecutions will be appointed by the Governor acting on the recommendations of the Judicial and Legal Service Commission. Whereas even the Chief Justice is appointed by the Governor after consultation with

the Premier, there is absolutely no question of consultation or advice when it comes to the post of a Director of Public Prosecutions, because the Director of Public Prosecutions will be taking over that part of the functions of the Attorney General dealing with the liberty of the subject, and it is felt undesirable that any political appointee to the post of Attorney General should have such far-reaching powers of life and death. This is not a view to which I myself necessarily subscribe, because in theory, if not in practice, in the United Kingdom the Attorney General still has the right to grant or withhold his *fiat* in cases involving treason, sedition and the more important criminal cases. The Attorney General still has a certain amount of control in certain cases involving the security of the State and matters of that kind, but this Bill makes provision for the appointment of the Director of Public Prosecutions by the Governor acting on the recommendation of the Judicial and Legal Service Commission, and therefore it will have to be included in the Second Schedule of the Judicial and Legal Service Commission Act, 1961-26.

The qualifications of the Director of Public Prosecutions and his powers under the Bill will be in accordance with Clause 2. As far as I can remember, the qualification will be ten years' practice and call at the Bar. Clause 3 deals with the remuneration and tenure of office, and Clause 4 makes the necessary consequential provisions for adaptation of existing laws and for the making of Orders for transferring to the Director such statutory functions vested in the Attorney General or the Solicitor General as may be considered necessary.

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

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I agree with this Bill because I have given my views on these important constitutional changes, more so when it comes to these legal changes, and I am glad to see that in this Bill people's fears will be allayed in that the Director of Public Prosecutions will be free and unfettered in his relations. What is worrying me, however, is that it has not been stated to me yet what the Attorney General in the new setting is going to do, because the Director of Public Prosecutions Bill only relates to matters of a criminal nature. I am a politician; and though we might not be involved in criminal matters, we may be involved in civil matters. I prefer the English system, because they have long years of tradition, where the Attorney General is still Attorney General - though he is a political Attorney General - with authority, and even in the British Government some years ago the Attorney General overruled the Prime Minister in determining whether or not somebody was to be prosecuted, and it was not for the Prime Minister to tell him if the person was to be prosecuted; otherwise he would resign. That is one post in the British Cabinet that is not assigned to a non-professional person. You can make a Minister of Health somebody other than a doctor, but you cannot have an Attorney General who is not a barrister or a legal man.

Though I am in agreement with this, I am in doubt as to the relationship *vis-a-vis* the Attorney General and the Director of Public Prosecutions, because in England as the Premier has rightly said, the Attorney General has the right and can say tomorrow if he is going to prosecute someone, and if he says there will be no prosecution, then there will be no prosecution. That is his power. I do not know what is going to happen here, because in this Bill, it says he has the right to do all the prosecutions in criminal matters, but I do not know what will happen when it comes to civil or other matters, whether there is going to be a conflict between the Attorney General's position and his, as it is clearly defined that he is going to be there for all criminal matters. The question now is who is going to be responsible for the legal position in this country. We know in England the powers of the Lord Chancellor. Here the Chief Justice is Chief Justice and the Attorney General is going to be a member of the Cabinet. What is going to be expected of him as a member of the Cabinet? We had a constitutional Bill that came here saying that the Attorney General is going to be a political appointment. Nothing was put down in that, but this is what you expect him to do be-

cause if you give this Director of Public Prosecutions the criminal side, I can see the protection it would give people not to feel that their case in court was based on a political Attorney General and therefore there would be any spite work. I did not even have any fear of that because I consider that if a man is Attorney General and is in charge of criminal matters, he should be a man big enough in his office to determine that the question of prosecuting a man cannot be based on political overtones or undertones.

I agree with this Bill, but I should like the hon. member to explain what is going to be the relationship between the Attorney General in his capacity as Attorney General in civil matters in which this man has the prerogative, but there are still other things to be dealt with. As the hon. member said, it is security of the State and other matters like seditions and the like, but there are other matters that will be criminal matters, and I do not know how that is going to be reconciled.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker,.....

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I wonder if the hon. member would allow me to make the position clear on a point of explanation. The power and authority of the Director of Public Prosecutions are outlined in Clause 2 of this Bill; so after tonight when the instruments have been duly assented to, the other Bill which we have to consider will be another Bill outlining the powers of the Attorney General, because we are repealing the Attorney General's Act. The only person therefore who can have any kind of jurisdiction or control over criminal prosecutions will be the Director of Public Prosecutions. There can be absolutely no question of conflict as in England where the constitutional practice has grown up about the powers of the Attorney General, the Lord Chancellor and so on, because as far as I remember, there is no Lord Chancellor's Act. I cannot remember any Attorney General's Act in the United Kingdom either; but here we have enshrined the Director of Public Prosecutions' office with statutory authority, and there can be no question of the Attorney General in Barbados interfering in criminal prosecutions. I only mentioned what happened in England to demonstrate what the position in England was, but even at that time as I said, prosecutions would be securely vested in the hands of the Director of Public Prosecutions. 6.00 p.m.

It is a rather long explanation, but I feel it is necessary that it should be given because we are repealing the Attorney General's Act. No Attorney General can look forward and say that because so-and-so happens in England, it should happen in Barbados because any Attorney knows that any Statute Law of Barbados overrides any Imperial legislation. We have not since the Dissolution Act of the West Indies any legislation to override ours. We have been given the assurance that the West Indies (Dissolution) Act does not relate to Barbados.

We never in the Courts of Law talk of civil prosecution; we talk of civil actions. There is no conflict of authority there at all because the Crown Proceedings Act of 1955 - I think it is that year - says that all Civil actions for or against the Crown shall be brought by the Attorney General and against the Attorney General; therefore any time you want to sue a Government Department, you have to bring a case of Mr. Jones *et al* against the Attorney General. Similarly, if the Attorney General wants to sue some firm for negligence or sue in relation to damage to one of the Government's water boats, he then brings a case in the name of the Attorney General against so-and-so, therefore, the Crown Proceedings Act in the first case regulates the bringing of proceedings by and against the Crown through the Attorney General and criminal cases should be dealt with exclusively by the Director of Public Prosecutions.

I hope no hon. member would get up and represent anything of a Minister doing so-and-so. This is something universally accepted, that we should divide the functions of Attorney General and Director of Public Prosecutions.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I agree in principle with the Bill and now that the Hon. Premier has

clarified the situation as regards civil proceedings, I am more fortified in my belief that the measure is a good one.

Sir, we have to accept in the light of the advancing constitution that these changes and these differentiations in offices must take place. At the same time, I feel that the time is ripe and ready for us to go one step forward. This may not be very palatable to members of the legal profession - and I say "may not" advisedly - but I think that now we are developing constitutionally, now that we are becoming more and more aware of the services to which the public is entitled, it is a very good thing to have a Public Prosecutor, an Attorney General, and we always have to retain their services. But there are numerous cases in which because the poor of this Island are so poor, they cannot avail themselves of the means of justice. I am very sorry that this Honourable House is so short of members of the long robe today because it would be interesting to me to listen to their comments on this matter. There are many, many cases, and Mr. Deputy Speaker, as an experienced barrister you have come face to face with some of them; you have come face to face with people who are not able to take full advantage even of their rights to property in a Court of Law because they need money to do so, and I do not think that, in this enlightened day and age, justice should be denied anyone who stands in need of it.

Sir, I am coming right to the point. While I appreciate the establishment of Director of Public Prosecutions, and while I can appreciate putting the position of the Attorney General of this Island on a political level, I still feel that we need a public defender who would be paid by the Government to defend the interest of very poor people who may have the experience of being taken advantage of and who may be very ignorant as to the existing means as to how they may avail themselves of their right. I am speaking even on civil questions. I am not suggesting a public defender in criminal cases; I am suggesting the introduction of the office of Public Defender in order that he can be of service to the very poor who cannot avail themselves of their rights which are there in the law. The law is there, but the means by which they can avail themselves of the rights which the law of the land provides may be absent.

While speaking on this Bill, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I will address these remarks to the House in all seriousness hoping that the day will soon dawn when I shall see introduced on the floor of this House the establishment of a Public Defender who will be a legal man with the necessary qualifications and who will be there to defend the rights of the poor when they have such rights - the poor who, left to themselves, are not able to obtain these rights.

We are advancing step by step constitutionally and we are making provision that justice may be preserved. You are making provision for a Public Prosecutor and confining him to instances of criminal procedure, separating that post from that of Attorney General. We have an Attorney General now soon to be made a political appointment. All that is very good; but I wish to say that too often people come to me interviewing me on matters. I am not a legally trained man and I can send them to somebody who can advise them, but too often they do not have the wherewithal to avail themselves of the rights of justice. The establishment of the office of Public Defender would come rightfully into play and, of course, more justice would be handed out to the public of this country.

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

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

6.10 p.m.

Clauses 1 to 5 were called and passed.

The Schedule was called and agreed to.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I beg to move, Mr. Chairman, that you do now report the passing of one Bill in Committee.

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

ATTORNEY GENERAL (APPOINTMENT, CONDITIONS OF SERVICE AND DISMISSAL (REPEAL) BILL

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day also stands in the name of the Hon. Premier:- To move the second reading of a Bill to repeal the Attorney General (Appointment, Conditions of Service and Dismissal) Bill, 1961.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am asking leave to take charge of this Bill which stands in the name of the Hon. Premier.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister is asking leave to take charge of this Bill which stands in the name of the Hon. Premier, and unless there be any objection, leave will be granted. *(After a pause)*. There being no objection, leave is granted.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, in moving the second reading of this Bill, I should like to say that this is a Bill which will institute one of the major constitutional changes in the history of this colony. It is a matter for some gratification that Barbados has reached this stage in our constitutional advancement that we can appoint an Attorney General under the Letters Patent in the same way as we appoint any other Minister of the Crown. If you look at the Bill itself, Mr. Deputy Speaker, you will see that it is proposed that there should be a politically appointed Attorney General of the island and that the office should be established as a Ministerial Office pursuant to Clause XVIII B of the Letters Patent. That is to say, Sir, that the only step which is necessary to change the post of Attorney General from being a post in the Public Service of this Island is that there should be a politically appointed post, and it will take the same step which is taken for election when Ministers of the Crown are appointed with the responsibility to conduct the Island's affairs.

Hon. members will agree, I am quite sure, that this is a very far-reaching step and it is also in itself another step on the road to complete self-government and independence. As such, therefore, I am sure that hon. members on both sides of the House will demonstrate their unanimity by giving their complete support to this Measure. The appointment of a political Attorney General is nothing new in the sense that the idea has been mooted for sometime, and it is now about five or six years that Parliament have agreed on the necessity and the possibility of taking this step. They have appreciated the fact that such a step is almost inevitable in our democratic march towards an independent institution.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I do not think that there is much more which I need say about this matter because all we have to do is to repeal the provisions of the Attorney General (Appointment, Conditions of Service and Dismissal) Act, 1961, since those provisions would not be consistent with the provisions of the proposed political Attorney General. With those remarks, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

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

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

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA: 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 3 inclusive were called and passed.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I beg to move, Mr. Chairman, that you do now report the passing of this Bill in Committee.

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

CARIBBEAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION BILL

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 10 be taken as the next Order of the Day.

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

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

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day now stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Communications, Works and Housing:— To move the second reading of a Bill to provide for the establishment of a Corporation to be known as the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation, for the functions of the Corporation, and for purposes connected with the matters aforesaid.
6.20 p.m.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Deputy Speaker, this Bill seeks to create a Corporation to be known as the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation for the purpose of establishing and operating a Wireless Broadcasting Station on behalf of this Government.

As the name of the Corporation implies, the Broadcasting Station to be established will be of significance not only to Barbados, but to the Caribbean area in general.

The following aspects may be emphasised:

The Corporation which consists of a Chairman, a Deputy Chairman and not less than five or more than nine members will have full powers of control over the management of the affairs of the radio station as indicated in Section 7.

Under Section 8 the Corporation is authorised to determine the charges for their services in respect of advertising and otherwise. In this connection, it may be stated that the proceeds of advertising will be the main source of revenue for the day-to-day operations of the Corporation.

Section 9 enables the Corporation to call on other knowledgeable persons to assist in an advisory capacity wherever experience of a particular kind would make for a more effective performance of the Corporation's functions.

In Part II of the Bill which deals with the financial arrangements of the Corporation, provision is made for closer collaboration with the Government.

In Section 12 for example, the approval of the Minister of Finance is required in regard to the fixing of rates of depreciation and in matters relating to reserves, accumulated surpluses or deficits and the disposal of balances on net revenue account.

Under Section 13 the raising of loans by the Corporation is subject to approval by the Governor-in-Executive, Committee, as to the amount, sources and the terms on which such loans are raised.

Section 14 enables Government, through legislative process, to contribute by way of grant or loans to the finances of the Corporation and to underwrite loans raised by the Corporation.

The Government is also responsible under Section 16 for approving proposals for investment of funds of the Corporation.

Section 18 provides for the audit and presentation of accounts, and it is to be noted that adequate safeguards have been included as to the selection of auditors in connection with which the Minister of Finance decides on the qualifications to be held by such auditors. Additionally, this section ensures that the Legislature is kept informed of the financial position of the Corporation. In Sub-Section 7 the Auditor General is enabled to make an independent report to the Legislature on the Corporation's affairs.

Part III of the Bill deals with matters of staff, and reposes in the Minister powers in regard to the appointment and dismissal of the General Manager and certain other senior members of the Staff of the Corporation, and in the determination of the terms and conditions of employment of all members of that Staff.

In relation to Section 22 which deals with the training of staff of the Corporation, while it will be necessary at the beginning to employ a number of expatriates with the requisite experience, the aim is to train local personnel to fill all posts on the staff of the Corporation.

Subject to the enactment of this Bill, it is proposed to proceed with the appointment of members of the Corporation at an early date, and it is the intention of the Government that the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation should go on the air early in the month of December.

The Consortium consists of Television International Enterprises Limited, Thomson Television (International) Limited and the National Broadcasting Corporation of America.

This agency is proceeding with the technical aspects of the establishment of the radio station on the basis of a letter of Intent and Instruction which has been laid in the House.

Overseas Sales Representative is Television International Enterprises.

The Lazaretto is to be modified and renovated as the site. Estimated cost of this work, exclusive of electrical air-conditioning and telephone installations is \$22,500.

The Agency proposes the installation of two transmitters of 10 kilowatts each. An "all-in" estimate of the cost of transmitters and ancillary equipment and studio equipment is \$288,000.

The Windward and Leewards should receive the transmission, and to this end a survey has been undertaken to determine the possible need for unattended booster transmitters in one island in each group.

Operation costs in the first year are estimated at \$211,160. This excludes rental of premises. Government

proposes to lease the site and the area of land required by the Corporation at a peppercorn rental of \$5 a year, but the Corporation will be responsible for improvements and renovation.

In reward for the services outlined above, the Consortium would receive a commission of 15% per annum for the years 1, 2, and 3; 10% per annum for the years 4, 5 and 6; and 5% per annum for years 7, 8, 9 and 10, upon the revenue derived from the sale of Radio airtime and other revenues which could be regarded as wholly commercial, after deduction of all discounts and commissions. The Consortium would bear the costs and expenses related to the Project Manager's functions, including travelling expenses, and in addition the expenses of any and all Consortium members required for consultation on behalf of the proposed Radio service in Barbados and overseas.

With the advent of Television, the Consortium, as consultants, would advise on the problems of staff integration and on the re-organisation of the Radio Service. The fee for these additional services would be negotiated with the Government through the Designated Authority at that time.

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.
6.30 p.m.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am in agreement with this, but I would like the Hon. Minister to explain certain things to me as regards certain clauses.

Now, Sir, when you look at this Bill, there are some things in it which you have to query. Part II of this Bill states: "Notwithstanding anything to the contrary, where any loan is guaranteed by the Governor-in-Executive Committee under section 14 of this Act the repayment of the principal moneys and interest represented by the loan so guaranteed shall during the continuance of such guarantee be a first charge upon such revenues and assets of the Corporation as shall be specified by the Governor-in-Executive Committee."

Then it says further down at 14 (1): "With the approval of the Legislature of the Island, the Governor-in-Executive Committee may from time to time grant or lend to the Corporation out of the general revenues of the Island, on such terms and conditions as the Minister of Finance may approve, sums of money to finance the construction, extension or improvement of capital works and for such other purposes (including the provision of working capital) as the Governor-in-Executive Committee may approve."

That is all right. Then, when you turn to page 8, at subsection (3), you see stated: "Where the Governor-in-Executive Committee is satisfied that there has been default in the repayment of any principal moneys or interest guaranteed under the provisions of this section, he shall direct the repayment out of the general revenues of the Island of the amount in respect of which there has been such default."

Now, Sir, I cannot agree to that. Here it is: we come to the Legislature for money and the Legislature is underwriting loans for the Corporation; but if a default comes, why should the Governor-in-Executive Committee repay this money out of the general revenue of the Island without the Legislature knowing that this is a default? (A VOICE: They are guaranteeing it.) No; you can guarantee the repay; that is to say, the Legislature agrees to repay; but when you do that, you want the public to be able to know about it. Bear in mind that you are dealing with Government's money. According to what is in this Bill, you are guaranteeing them to obtain loans, and if they get in difficulties we are going to pay back; but you are paying back out of the general revenue. That is not merely an executive matter; I feel the Legislature involved should know that you are going to pay back out of the general revenue so that members of the Legislature should have some opportunity of speaking on it. You should let the Legislature know about it if you have to

repay. This Section does not strike me as being what it should be.

Now, let us turn to Clause 19 on page 10, Sub-clause (2) states: "The Minister shall cause a copy of the report together with the annual statement of accounts and the auditor's report thereon to be laid on the Table of both Houses of the Legislature of the Island."

But in the next paragraph, it says: "Copies of the Corporation's report together with the annual statement of accounts and the auditor's report on that statement or on the accounts of the Corporation shall be published in such a manner as the Governor-in-Executive Committee may direct and shall be made available to the public by the Corporation at a reasonable price."

Why should not these reports be published in the *Official Gazette*? Laying a report on the Table of the House does not necessarily mean that this report would be printed unless a member asked that it be printed. It is not an automatic job of printing everything that is laid on the Table of the House, and I think, if you set up a new Corporation like this, that it should come within the full glare of the public's scrutiny; therefore, I feel that all its reports should be published in the *Official Gazette*. Copies of the *Official Gazette* are not given away; they are given to members of the Legislature, but members of the public have to pay for them.

Sir, I would not make too much of Clause 21 so long as the Minister is observing Trade Union rights. It reads as follows:-

"Subject to the provisions of section 20 of this Act, the Corporation may with the approval of the Minister make regulations determining generally the conditions of service of employees of the Corporation and in particular, but without limiting the generality of the foregoing power, may make regulations relating to: (a) the appointment, dismissal, discipline, hours of employment, pay and leave of such employees."

That does not mean that these people do not have the right, because may I tell you that such persons have grown accustomed to Trade Union rights. Anyhow, I do not think this Corporation will tell them anything different.

You are setting up a Corporation with more or less power. You have set down in the Act that the Corporation can have the power to dismiss the General Manager subject to the prior approval of the Minister. What do you mean by that? As I take it, that means that you are giving some person the right to come along and sack you like that. How are you going about that when you say "subject to the prior approval of the Minister"? What do you mean by "prior approval"? The Corporation sits down to discipline somebody and when it reaches the point where you have to dismiss that person, would you have to go to the Minister and seek his approval? I would like to know why is it with his prior approval?

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I was at school long enough to understand simple English. I will read it again. "The Corporation shall have power to dismiss the general manager, subject to the prior approval of the Minister." That is stated at paragraph (b). In paragraph (a) it is stated: "No person shall be appointed general manager without the prior approval of the Minister." That means that I am not appointing this person at all unless I have the Minister's approval; therefore it means that the Minister is appointing this man. Do you really mean that?
6.40 p.m.

Do you really want that? How can you have somebody who is controlling a Board and a Corporation and he cannot dismiss anybody? I really want to know if this is a Department of Government. Section 20(b) of this Bill says that: "The Corporation shall have power to dismiss the general manager subject to the prior approval of the Minister." Then sub-paragraph (c) says: "No salary in

excess of the rate of \$6,000 per annum shall be assigned to any post without the prior approval of the Minister." Sub-paragraph (d) says: "No appointment whether permanent or temporary shall be made to any post to which a salary in excess of \$6,000 per annum is assigned without the prior approval of the Minister." In sub-paragraph (e) it says: "Except with the prior approval of the Minister, no person shall be dismissed from any post specified in paragraph (d) of this proviso."

Mr. Deputy Speaker, what is all this? Normally a Civil Servant is not to be appointed with the approval of the Minister. How long since a Minister wants to be employing and dismissing people? Sub-paragraph (a) says: "No person shall be appointed general manager without the prior approval of the Minister." How long since a Minister wants this power? (Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: There is nothing wrong with that.) This Section says that you can dismiss a man, who is receiving a salary of under \$6,000, without the approval of the Minister, but above that salary the Minister can dismiss him. (Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: You can recommend the dismissal.) I would like to say this: From a practical point of view, if you regard this as a political appointment like the appointment of the Attorney General, then you will have it. I quite agree that you should safeguard a man, but why not appoint a Commission to deal with the question of dismissal? What is the difference between a man being appointed — You say to a District Council that a man must be appointed by the Local Government Service Commission and be dismissed by the Commission as well. In England a Minister does not really do these things; these things are done by a Public Service Commission; if you want a job at the Housing Authority and the salary attached to that job is over \$6,000 per annum, the Public Service Commission must see you and that is as it should be. Take the Development Board; you dismiss the Manager of the Development Board because the Minister does not like him.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker, if the hon. member would reflect carefully he will realise that the present set up is this; in the case of salaries in excess of \$4,000, in case of appointment and dismissal, that is subject to the approval of the Governor-in-Executive Committee; but in this case it is subject to the approval of the Minister. The question of the delegation of powers is taking place so that the Minister is put in place of the Governor-in-Executive Committee. There is no place for the Public Service Commission where Statutory Boards are concerned.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I should like to say that sometimes the Ministers talk to me as if I came in here yesterday or as if I went to school in August or on Christmas Bank Holiday (Mr. MOTTLEY: When there is no school.) when the schools are closed. (Laughter.) The Ministers seem to forget that I have been a member of a Statutory Board. At Harrison College you can appoint a Headmaster subject to the approval of an overriding authority; that means that somebody on the Harrison College Board decides that he will appoint a Headmaster who is illiterate and then the Governor says: "You cannot appoint this man." You may be on a Board where the Governor may not approve of an appointment and he asks you to appoint somebody else. In this Bill, when somebody applies for a job which carries a salary of over \$6,000 you cannot appoint that person; that has to be subject to the prior approval of the Minister.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not agree with this provision because we are living in a small community. I feel that, if anybody is qualified and you want a Minister to have approval of the appointment, I say, let the person apply and have the approval of the Minister, but not the prior approval. We have laws on the Statute Book which say that you can appoint somebody subject to the approval of the Governor-in-Executive Committee. Why are we putting it in this way in this Bill? In the old days it was not said that the appointment was to be made subject to the prior approval of the Governor-in-Executive Committee, but the appointment was made subject to the approval of the

Governor-in-Executive Committee. I feel, Sir, that the Minister should be above the question of appointing people. You have a Broadcasting Corporation and you are going to set up a Board which is being run by this international organization. The international organization will submit people; in any case, the Board which is to be appointed will be appointed by the Minister. If the Board is appointed by the Minister, the Minister can change the Board whenever he feels like doing so. If you are giving the Board authority, why should you saddle the Minister with the authority of dismissing a man? I ask, Mr. Deputy Speaker, if these appointments are to be made subject to the approval of the Minister, why must they have the prior approval of the Minister?
6.50 p.m.

Nobody can be dismissed without the prior approval of the Minister. It is a big thing, and all it means is that somebody will get around to the Minister and tell him that he is going to fire this man, get the Minister's agreement to have him kicked out and get his friends on the Board to work him out, because he is going to have the Minister's approval to kick out the man.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order, I will attempt to assist the hon. member here. The phrase is a little clumsy in that the word "prior" has been used, but in practice how it actually works is that the Statutory Board will make the recommendation and then it goes to the Governor-in-Executive Committee. In this case it will go to the Minister; so it means you cannot actually get him out of the job until both the Statutory Board and the Minister or the Governor-in-Executive Committee have approved and finalised the matter. The word "prior" is causing all the confusion in that it is not strictly necessary, because it is not really "prior" in the sense that the recommendation comes from the Board first then goes to the Minister or the Governor-in-Executive Committee; so the word "prior" need not be paid too much attention. Legally in this case it does not mean anything. It means that before you can actually get him out of the job, his dismissal must meet with the approval of the Minister, and in normal other cases without any delegation of powers, the Governor-in-Executive Committee.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, that is putting it a different way. The Board shall have power to dismiss the General Manager. It is really difficult unless lawyers were going to argue this and say what it means. Here we have "no person shall be appointed general manager without the prior approval of the Minister." I understand what that means. Then it says "the Corporation shall have power to dismiss the general manager subject to the prior approval of the Minister." And then it says "except with the prior approval of the Minister, no person shall be dismissed from any post specified in paragraph (b) of this proviso." How are you going to proceed to get the approval of the Minister? It means you will have to discuss the man's dismissal with the Minister. What I want to know is why the Board should be saddled with that. When you have these Boards and you are not sending people to a Commission, it is going to be very difficult because you cannot appeal against a Minister. Why should a man working for \$6,000 with a Corporation not be in a position to appeal to a Commission? It seems to me as if the Ministers are willing to say that the exercise of Ministerial authority should be exercised in such a manner as you get from a Judicial Committee, but what I do not like with this Colonial type of business is that you are gradually making Ministers into Judicial Officers, because you are putting them in charge of policy and also making them judges, since the Minister has to deal with the dismissal of people. Why does the Minister have to be involved? If you appoint a Board and the members are satisfied that they do not want a man, let them get rid of the man, and if he wants to appeal, you should have a Public Service Commission. This savours so much of someone wanting to appoint people to give them security of employment, and I would say quite frankly that I do not like this idea of Ministerial control in a judicial capacity. A Minister should be an Executive, and his duties and functions should be

separated from those who are hiring and firing, and when it comes to the point where you have to make Cabinet appointments, then do not set up a Board.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the appointment and dismissal of people should always be something that is not interfered with by a Party, and I have enough experience to know that where these things occur, many people on many Boards have had to be in the invidious position of seeing people being planted on them though you have asked somebody to administer the Board. If that occurs, you will get the greatest bit of inefficiency you can get on these Boards. You have an example in the Transport Board. What is the use of setting up a Board and putting some of us as members on it, and then all the yard fowls can come around and tell the Minister that the Manager and others are no good and to get rid of them, then you put on these yard fowls and the next thing you know is that you have landed the Board with all your yard fowls and the Board starts to lose money? It happened with the last Government, and I would not say it would not happen with this Government, because the pressure of political satellites on you saying that when these people were in power they used to give all their people jobs, and it is time that you give your people jobs or they are not going to vote for you at the next election. So you will get on these Boards somebody wanting to pull down some competent person because he can pressurise the Minister by saying that that man was talking about him at the last election or at Hothersal Turning he said the Minister was the last man he would vote for; and then up goes this man on the Board.

I would not suggest to the Minister of Industry and Trade that he should not have a say as to who would be the Manager of the Development Board, but this should not be the case in little jobs when there are so many people who would come to him about jobs, because I have reason to believe that the Ministers of the Government have acted with propriety in these matters.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is now 7 p.m. o'clock, and except according to the Standing Orders of the House the business can be concluded in ten minutes, the Sitting will have to be suspended.

Mr. WALCOTT: I intend to finish my speech, but I was just making the point.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Unless I can get the assurance that the business of the House will be concluded in ten minutes, I will suspend the Sitting right now.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: So far as we are concerned, Sir, this is the last item we intend to do this evening. It depends on whether or not hon. members intend to talk on this matter.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I want to make it clear that I will not be entertaining any motion for the suspension of the Rules at this stage.

I am still waiting on the Hon. Leader of the House to indicate what course Government is going to take. 7.00 p.m.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I appreciate your powers, but I cannot make any motion which would not contain complete unanimity. We can adjourn now and come back at 7.45 and finish this Bill or we can adjourn until next Tuesday. (A VOICE: Adjourn until next Tuesday.)

I beg to move that this Sitting be now suspended for three-quarters of an hour.

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

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Let there be no misunderstanding. I said that except the business of the House would be completed within ten minutes, I would be forced to suspend the Sitting for three-quarters of an hour. This Sitting now stands suspended until 7.45 p.m.

The Sitting was accordingly suspended, 7.03 p.m.

On re-assembling

Hon. G. G. FERUSSON: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I ask that the Bell be rung.

The Bell was rung and a quorum was obtained.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: On the suspension, the House was dealing with Order No. 10, and the hon. senior member for St. Peter was speaking.

He is not now in his place.

The question is.....

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Objects and Reasons to this Bill are clearly set out and defined. My Party and myself are entirely in agreement with the establishment of a Radio Broadcasting Station; therefore, we are entirely in agreement with the establishment of the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation. I do not think that it is necessary for me to remind hon. members that we are so blindly devoted to private enterprise that we feel nothing should be run by the State. That is stupid, because the pattern which we have taken in this country follows the pattern of the United Kingdom. It is obvious to all and sundry that today there are several things like utility services — although this Broadcasting Station cannot be considered a utility service — which must be run by the State.

However, Sir, it is not my intention to delay this House but to come straight to the point. While we, of my Party, welcome a Broadcasting Station in Barbados, we are unalterably opposed to Government participating in it except from the point of view of protecting their affairs and having it run and passing laws on the line how it should be run; but from the financial point of view, we are unalterably opposed to Government spending money on it. I heard the Hon. Minister mentioning something about \$211,000. Is that the correct figure?

Hon. G. G. FERUSSON: For the information of the hon. senior member for the City of Bridgetown, the correct figure is \$211,160.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I take it that that represents the purchase of machinery etc. This is tricky business. I have gone through this Bill very carefully. I am not going into the question of any of the sections which the hon. senior member for St. Peter went into, dealing with whether the Minister or the Corporation should be the person to fire the general manager. I believe that people who are absolutely trained should be allowed to run a business and they should take their capital to run it, and that the Government should have the controlling voice and take their 40% plus, I think, another 19 1/2%; and if the time comes that the Government can take more, it should take it. As I have said, Sir, none of my Party has ever said that no service must be run by the State. I take pattern from the policy and philosophy of our counterparts in Great Britain; therefore, you will understand what our position is like.

On the other hand, the Hon. Minister should be able to tell me and should be able to tell us on this side of the Table if they ever had other applications for the purpose of operating a Broadcasting Station here and why have they not decided to let private enterprise run it. Or, he should tell us if it is their policy that private enterprise must run nothing.

There is one other point which I am going to make. With your present contract with Rediffusion, there is nothing to prevent them from picking up through Cable and Wireless and broadcasting programmes of yours; therefore, I counsel this Government to be very careful under these circumstances. I do not pretend to know anything about this type of business; but when I want to know anything I discuss it with people who are knowledgeable about it.

I am not going to waste any time. As I have said, we, of my Party, welcome your establishing a Broadcasting

Station. I think a Broadcasting Station means much to us; but in this case, I do not see the necessity for its establishment with Government's backing. I think the Hon. Premier said that the Thomson Brothers are going to operate this station. Why don't they operate this by themselves? Honestly, with our political philosophy and outlook, I do not see why you should spend one cent to operate this station. The Hon. Minister is going to argue that if you read through the Bill, it says that you are going to establish a corporation and you are giving power to someone to operate it. As far as I see, all this means is that you have the power to underwrite and you agree that if this company fails to pay, you have to pay.
7.55 p.m.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am going to be bold enough to say this: No one will take the same interest in running the business of the Government as he will take in running a business for himself. The best proof of that is in the bus business. You found that people gave over their buses to the Government and then they took them back and they made money out of those buses. Those people were prepared to put in 18 and 20 hours' work a day, but they were not prepared to do that for the Government.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, when it comes to the second reading of this Bill we will have, if we stand alone, to vote as being opposed to this Government having to participate in any way, form, shape or fashion in this business, except in the matter of drawing up such laws as will give the Government a Broadcasting Station. The Government must have that right. The usual thing which you have is that the company will set up a Broadcasting Station here; and when we pass this Bill if they do not provide things, then we must provide them. All this means is that the Government is providing this thing and they are paying somebody to run it. There is nothing in this Bill to say that they will put in \$100,000 and you will put in \$100,000. As far as my Party is concerned, we all welcome a Broadcasting Station in Barbados and the Minister should be able to tell us what is the Government's policy. We came in here just as the Government came in here, with a Manifesto saying that we will do these things.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would prefer to see them taking this \$200,000 and begin the erection of two or three other schools and provide more facilities at the schools. There are many businessmen who would be willing to come in here and operate, and all the Government has to do is to provide the laws to rule them and the Government can draw their trade and income tax from them. You would be a silent partner without taking one cent from the taxpayers; you, the Government, should say: "You operate, nobody can operate but you. You have to pay your trade and income tax and we will sit down as a silent partner." I know that hon. members have had a long day and they do not want to hear anything more about this matter; but as I say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we are absolutely opposed to the Government having to find one single cent in connection with this matter. You are responsible to the Banks for the money which is utilised in the setting up and operation of this Broadcasting Station. It is a very good thing to have a Broadcasting Station on this site which is a very good site. Although we are definitely not voting for this Bill, I hope that the Hon. Minister will be able to tell us that they had applications from persons who would, without any guarantee from the Government, provide their own funds to run a business such as this. Mr. Deputy Speaker, as I have already said, we cannot vote for this Bill because it is against our policy.

Mr. SEALEY: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I welcome the setting up of this Broadcasting Station. This is one of the best pieces of legislation which has been brought before this Branch of the Legislature of this island. A Broadcasting Station in this island is a "must". We have suffered materially as a result of the old situation, but I do not agree with the Government taking any financial part in this Broadcasting Station. In a matter of this sort, I would prefer that it be run by private enterprise and let them go to the bank and borrow money or, on the other hand, if they have their own money they can use it. I am saying that the Government

should sit back as a silent partner and draw their 40%. I should like to say that nothing that the Government have put their hands to in Barbados are they getting even a fifty per cent return. I sat and heard a speech from the Hon. Minister of Education who said that he was quite satisfied with the work which was done at the last school which was erected at Government Hill, namely, the Stow Primary School. If you have co-operation then you will get things done. I repeat, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that in a matter like this, I would like to see it taken on by private enterprise. I think that the affairs of the Transport Board should be a warning to the Government in this connection. I have great pleasure in supporting the Hon. Leader of my Party in this matter.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I see that the Hon. Minister is tired and he wants to get home very quickly.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: All of us.

Mr. SMITH: Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I will not be long in speaking on this Bill. Like other hon. members, I welcome the erection of a Broadcasting Station in Barbados because I like to have competition.
8.05 p.m.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to see another Telephone Company and another Electric Company because I like to see competition, since the consumer benefits as soon as there is competition. From the outset, Sir, I should like to say that I do not like some of the wording in this Bill. The hon. senior member for St. Peter has raised the same point that I would have raised relative to employment and dismissal where everything is to go by the Minister. Sir, I always say we have to be very careful in giving this power to one man, and if I were a Minister in any Government, Premier or otherwise, I would not encourage too much power on my part, because it is liable to be detrimental at some time. When it comes to employment and dismissal, politicians should be very careful and keep from that because you cannot please everybody. One job may become vacant and 100 of your supporters may apply for it, and whichever of that number gets it, the other 99 will be disgruntled. I can clearly see, however, that the corporation will only be a rubber stamp, because it cannot do anything without the approval of the Minister. You are appointing a corporation to run this business, but they cannot run it because they still have to come hat in hand to the Minister and hear what he has to say. It means therefore that the Minister would be the boss and not the Manager.

Now, Sir, I really should like to know when the Thomson group made its application, because I notice in paragraph 2 of the Minister's Statement it is stated that "in pursuance of this decision, Government has been in negotiation with representatives of the Thomson group for several months now, to arrange for them to manage and operate a station on behalf of Government, providing all the technical and managerial skills which the Thomson group had acquired by its experience of operating stations in Jamaica and various parts of Europe, Africa, Asia and America." Now there are other people who applied, but the Government took the Thomson Group and I would really like to know when they applied and who else applied. I was not in my seat when the hon. senior member for Bridgetown was speaking, but it appears to me that he is not in favour of this Thomson Group running the Broadcasting Station for the Government. I was not in favour of the Hilton people running a hotel for the Government either, because if these people lose, they only have to pack up and go and give the Government the bag to hold. I should therefore like to know when they applied and what are the terms of agreement between the Government and the Thomson Group. I hope the Minister will make a note of that. I should like to know all these things before I vote, because we have to be very careful in voting today, because as a friend of mine said, we may be voting away our birthright. I should also like to know what is Government's policy with regard to Rediffusion. I do not have any brief for Rediffusion; they can go up or come down, but I would not like to hear that we are going to push them out so suddenly because they were with us for a very long time and have done, and are still doing, a very good job.

There is another point which I want to put to the Minister, and in fact I may move an amendment. I know, Sir, that we can encounter some small-minded people, and I should like to know what will be the Broadcasting Station's policy relative to broadcasting, because during the tenure of office of the Government of which I am a member, I understand that a programme used to come on the air under the title "In The House" which was stopped by the Government in power. I did not enquire about it from my Government nor did they tell me anything. I have also heard that my Party wanted to broadcast and this Government stopped it. Now both Governments were wrong in my opinion, and that is why I say you can come up against some small-minded, petty people, regardless of who it is. I live at Sugar Hill. I want to find out now what will be the policy of this Corporation, because I feel the time has come when every well-constituted Party should have broadcasting time so long as they can pay for it, and so long as they are not broadcasting anything libellous or slanderous. I do not see why anyone should be deprived of having the privilege of broadcasting.

Now I know that with the powers I see in this Bill where everything is to be done with the approval of the Minister, that if I wanted broadcasting time under the present Minister, I would never get it. It is the people's money that will be spent, and I do not want the corporation to feel that they are setting up a corporation for their own private uses; so I want to know what will be the corporation's policy along these lines.
8.15 p.m.

If he cannot convince me, well then, I will have to move it into one of these sections in the Bill whether I succeed or not. As I have already said, Rediffusion has done a good job and I would like to know the policy of the Government because I would not like to see them pushing out Rediffusion overnight although, Rediffusion being a private company, it would still be subject to the Government because it would not be able to let certain people broadcast over their service. As you know, Sir, the programme "In The House," had to stop. Although it was Rediffusion's own programme, they still could not broadcast it.

This Bill is for the establishment of the Caribbean Broadcasting Station, and unless the Hon. Minister can assure me that none of these small provisions will exist in this corporation, I will not be able to vote for this Bill. This station is not set up with my money nor the Minister's money; it is the people's money and the people's Broadcasting Station, as far as I can see and understand. All the losses, as I understand the Minister, will be ours and all the burdens will be put on us; but the sweets will be put in somebody's pocket. As it is late, I will leave the remainder of what I have to say on this matter until later. I will sit now and await the reply by the Hon. Minister.

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, we on this side of the Table cannot approve of this total financial commitment of the taxpayers' money to this enterprise. Section 14 says in part: "With the approval of the Legislature of the Island, the Governor-in-Executive Committee may from time to time grant or lend to the Corporation out of the general revenues of the Island, on such terms and conditions as the Minister of Finance may approve, sums of money to finance the construction, extension or improvement of capital works and for such other purpose (including the provision of working capital) as the Governor-in-Executive Committee may approve."

That to me is a definite financial commitment taken on behalf of the taxpayers of the Island for an enterprise which may or may not succeed.

This Island has been well served by the wired broadcasting system which has been installed in many a home; but for this Broadcasting Station which you are about to establish, receiving sets would be necessary and the minimum amount for one would be in the vicinity of \$30. I cannot conceive of anyone getting a set costing less than that amount.

It is obvious that there is considerable risk in this enterprise, not to the Thomson people of course, because what this means is "heads, you win; tails, we lose." This business of a territorial broadcasting, trying to keep up with the territorial Jones' is not necessary for Barbados. It is an open secret that applications were made by more than one company for this right and they were willing to accept the possibility of losing money.

That is what is exercising the minds of those of us on this side of the Table. We should not be delivered bound hand and foot that they should make money from its establishment, but if they lose money, Government would have to finance it. Would it not be very much better for Government to collect 52% from successful operation rather than to imperil the taxpayers' money at this time when there are many priorities which are more urgent than the one under consideration?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the hon. senior member for the City of Bridgetown as well as the hon. junior member for St. Joseph have asked if they were not other people who applied for operating a broadcasting station in Barbados. There have been about 15 applications from various companies in various parts of the world such as Canada, Venezuela, the United States and England. Early this year — I think it was in the month of April — we were in contact with the Thomson Television people and they were the one and only people who were prepared to run the station on a percentage basis.

I mentioned in my speech that in reward for the services outlined above, the Consortium would receive a commission of 15% per annum for the years 1, 2 and 3; 10% per annum for the years 4, 5 and 6; and 5% per annum for years 7, 8, 9 and 10, upon the revenue derived from the sale of Radio airtime and other revenues which could be regarded as wholly commercial after deduction of all discounts and commissions.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it would be rather strange for a company like Thomson's Television to agree to work on a commission basis unless they were sure about it. They decided to work on that basis after they had carried out an entire survey as regards their getting a reasonable revenue coming in for the operation of this station. These people are not now experimenting in the field of radio broadcasting; they are established all over the world and obviously they know their business and they know that, even operating on a percentage basis, they are going to make a living.

People in Barbados believe that the Government can only go in for business of losing money. As long as money is to be lost, the taxpayers must lose it, but if there are avenues opened up for Government to make money, half of the world seems to think that it has no right to enter upon such ventures. We say: nothing ventured, nothing gained; and if this Government is to help its people, any method which we can find to make money will be adopted and I do not see why we should not enter this field.

The Hon. Premier stated here this afternoon in the debate on the acquisition of Graeme Hall plantation the same thing and I do not see any reason why people should come from outside and monopolise all of the money.
8.25 p.m.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, as long as there is money to be made and the Government can pay 15% and make 85%, I think that we have every reason to make it. With regard to the comparison between the Broadcasting Station and Rediffusion, I am saying that there is absolutely no comparison at all. One is a separate box tied up in your house and you have to take what you can get; whereas with the other, you can get what you want. With a Broadcasting Station you can tune in and get whatever you want. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have absolutely no doubt that a firm like Thomson Limited would operate a Broadcasting Station on a commission basis, after they had carried out every phase of investigation of what revenue they would receive. This firm has carried out operations in Jamaica, Canada, England and worldwide.

Mr. SMITH: On a point of order. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I asked the Hon. Minister about the policy of this Broadcasting Station whether in operating, parties will be given the freedom of the air.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Deputy Speaker, for the information of the hon. member, I will say that this Broadcasting Corporation has not yet been established. What the hon. member is asking will be a matter for the corporation as to its policy and administration. (MEMBERS: Question!)

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will not have hon. members on different sides of the House telling me to put the question.

The question that this Bill be now read a second time was put and resolved in the affirmative.

A division was taken as follows:—

AYES: Mr. BATSON, Honourables J. C. TUDOR, W. A. CRAWFORD, C. E. TALMA, G. G. FERGUSON, A. DaC. EDWARDS, Messrs. LOWE, YEARWOOD and BOXILL — 9.

NOES: Messrs. SMITH, SEALEY, LYNCH and MOTTLEY — 4.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The question has been resolved in the affirmative, nine hon. members voting "Aye" and four hon. members voting "No", I now declare that the "Ayes" have it.

MOMENT OF INTERRUPTION

At this stage, it now being 8.30 p.m. of the clock,

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is now 8.30 p.m. of the clock, the moment of interruption. Is there any matter of a non-controversial nature with which hon. members would like to deal? *(After a pause)*. Judging from the vote which has just been taken, I gather that this Bill is controversial.

Mr. MOTTLEY: It is highly controversial.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS CONCLUDED

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Government does not propose to continue with any more business today; as a matter of fact, there is nothing further on the Order Paper with which we can proceed. The other two Bills, namely, the Barbados Development Bank Bill and the Quarries Bill, have not been circulated. However, we hope to have both of them printed and circulated to be dealt with at the next meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

The Order Paper having been fixed,

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next, the 29th October, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

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

The question that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next, 29th October, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.