

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION OF 1961-66

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 23rd June, 1964.

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 3 p.m. o'clock today.

PRESENT

His Honour J. E. T. BRANCKER, Q.C., (*Speaker*); Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P.; Mr. F. C. GODDARD; Mr. F. E. MILLER; Hon. C. E. TALMA, (*Minister of Communications and Works*); Hon. J. C. TUDOR, M.A., (*Minister of Education*); Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON, (*Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries*); Mr. W. R. LOWE; Mr. L. A. LYNCH, J.P.; Mr. G. V. BATSON, (*Chairman of Committees*); Mr. J. B. YEARWOOD and Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, (*Minister of Health, Housing, Local Government and Community Development*).

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minutes of the meetings of 2nd and 9th June, 1964, have been duly circulated, and unless there is any objection, they will be confirmed.

Hearing no objection, I declare the Minutes of those two meetings duly confirmed.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Premier, I am commanded to lay Message No. 10, 1964 regarding the extension of His Excellency Sir John Stow's term of office as Governor and Commander-in-Chief of Barbados. The text is as follows:-

"HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR TO THE HONOURABLE THE HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

His Excellency the Governor has the honour to inform the House of Assembly that Her Majesty the Queen has been pleased to approve the extension of his term of office as Governor and Commander-in-Chief of Barbados by two years until the 7th of October, 1966."

Also on behalf of the Hon. Premier, I am commanded to lay the following:-

The Drawback of Duties (Containers for locally produced Rum) Regulations, 1964.

The Customs Duties (Machinery and Apparatus for Aeradio Services by Airline Companies) Order, 1964.

Statement showing Net Customs and Excise Receipts for the two months ended on 31st May, 1964.

The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 6) Order, 1964.

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

The Report of the Sugar Factory Smoke Control Board for the year 1963.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

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

Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 6) Order, 1964.

Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of the property known as the Trafalgar Hotel together with the land whereon the same stands.

Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of two parcels of land known as "Wanstead" and "Rock Pleasant".

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following:-

Resolution to approve the rental by the Government of the Warehouse situate at Hincks Street, Bridgetown to Messrs. West Indian Suppliers Co., Ltd. and the Barbados Marketing Corporation respectively in two lots, on the terms set out in the Schedule to the Resolution. 3.25 p.m.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to place the sum of \$415,884 at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1964-65, Part II - Capital, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1964-65, No. 8, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Premier, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to place the sum of \$18,000 at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1964-65, Part I - Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1964-65, No. 9, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution;

Also, Resolution to place the sum of \$62,820 at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1964-65, Part I - Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1964-65 No. 10 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to approve the expenditure required to supplement the Estimates of the Port Department for the year 1964-65 as shown in the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Premier, I beg to give notice of a Bill to amend the Town and Country Development Planning (Interim Control) Act, 1959 to extend its duration for a further period of one year, from the 9th of July, 1964.

Also, a Bill to amend the Liquor Licences Act, 1957.

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

NOTICE OF REPLY TO QUESTION

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I also give notice that the Reply to Oral Question No. 7 asked by the hon. senior member for St. Michael is ready.

QUESTIONS

Mr. LOWE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Questions:-

To enquire of the Minister of Health:

Is the Minister aware that many of the young girls who wish to pursue a career in nursing have been frustrated and at times completely humiliated by the attitude of certain officials at the Barbados General Hospital?

2. Is the Minister aware that many of these girls fail to qualify here as nurses but subsequently leave for the United Kingdom, enter reputable hospitals and qualify without apparent difficulty?

3. Will the Minister state whether he considers the above-mentioned situation to be satisfactory and in the best interest of the community or whether he proposes to institute some remedy?

Mr. YEARWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Questions:-

To enquire of the Minister of Labour:

How many persons from the parish of St. John have made application for emigration to Canada under the Domestic Workers' Scheme during the years 1961, '62, '63, and '64?

2. How many of these applicants have actually been selected?

3. Will the Minister state what is the basis of selection and who is responsible for making the selection?

To enquire of the Minister of Communications and Works:

Can the Minister state whether Works Departments keep accurate records of the quantity of building materials, such as cement, stone and paint used for the many projects they undertake?

2. Will the Minister state what quantities of said materials have been used in the financial years 1962-63 and 1963-64?

3. Will the Minister state specifically what quantity of cement was used by the Department of Public Works during these years, and whether the figures supplied by the Central

Office of this Department tally with figures supplied by the individual sites?

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Bill to amend the Town and Country Development Planning (Interim Control) Act, 1959 to extend its duration for a further period of one year, from 9th July, 1964, be now read a first time.

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

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

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Bill to amend the Liquor Licences Act, 1957, be now read a first time.

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

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

ORDERS 5, 14, 16, 18, 40 & 45, SUSPENDED

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, you will note that the Order Paper for today's meeting is rather slight. There are only two items of Government Business, there are not many items under Private Members' Business, and the indications are that at the next meeting we shall have a very full meeting because there have been quite a number of matters of which notice was given today which would demand our attention.

I am, therefore, going to propose, with the consent of Your Honour and hon. members, that we suspend the Standing Orders to deal with the two matters under Government Business with which we propose to deal and then we will adjourn to come early next Tuesday to dispose of the relatively large number of items which will be on our Order Paper.

Sir, I, therefore beg to move that Standing Orders Nos. 5, 14, 16, 18, 40 and 45 be suspended for the remainder of today's meeting, in order to dispose of two matters - Items Nos. 2 and 3 under the Head "Government Business".

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

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

3.35 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is that these six Standing Orders be now suspended for the remainder of the day's sitting. Hon. members in favour of that will please say "Aye", those against will please say "No". I think the "Ayes" have it. Accordingly I declare those Standing Orders to be suspended for the remainder of the day's sitting.

RESOLUTION FROM SENATE re MESSAGE OF CONGRATULATIONS BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Mr. SPEAKER: Before the Honourable Leader of the House proceeds with the business of the day, I have the honour to inform the Honourable Chamber that I have received from the Other Place a Resolution which reads as follows:-

"The Senate

BE IT RESOLVED that the Senate expresses its deep appreciation of and its warmest thanks for the Message of congratulation and good wishes presented to the Senate by the General Assembly of the Island on May, 28th, 1964.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that as a constituent part of the Parliament of this Island the Senate sends its warm-

est greetings and good wishes to the General Assembly, promises its full support and cooperation in all matters for the good government of the Island, and prays that, under God's guidance, the two Houses of the Legislature will act in concert to ensure the progress, prosperity and happiness of the people of this Island.

H. G. MASSIAH,
President.

Senate Chamber,
18th June, 1964.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE COM-
PULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND
AT RENDEZVOUS HILL

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 3 be taken as the first 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. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day therefore stands in the name of the hon. senior member for Christ Church:-

To move the passing of the following Resolution:-

Resolution to approve the Compulsory acquisition of parcels of land situate at Rendezvous Hill Road for the purpose of highway improvement.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, this is a Resolution for the compulsory acquisition of two parcels of land situated at Rendezvous Hill Road for the purpose of highway improvement. These two parcels of land are set out in the Schedule to the Resolution and both of them are situated at Rendezvous Hill Road in the parish of Christ Church. As the Addendum to the Resolution sets out, Sir,

The owners of the land described in the Schedules cannot give a good and marketable title.

In accordance with the provisions of Section 5 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1949, the approval of the Legislature is sought for the compulsory acquisition of the parcels of land described above in the First and Second Schedules in order that the purposes set out in the Resolution may be effected and that the Crown in right of its Government of this Island may acquire an indefeasible title to the two parcels of land.

Mr. Speaker, these two parcels of land are small and they are required by the Government for the improvement of the highway in that area. The parcels of land are 615 square feet in one case and 650 square feet in the other instance. The price has been agreed to. In the first case, that of the 615 square feet owned by Edna Daniel, the price is 54 cents a square foot making the cost \$332.10 and in the case of the 650 square feet owned by Lionel Beckles, the price is 40 cents per square foot making the cost \$260.00.

Sir, I hardly think that there is any other point which need be mentioned, but if there are other points which hon. members raise I am quite ready and willing to answer them. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE COM-
PULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND
KNOWN AS THE MOUNT

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 2 be taken as the next Order of the Day.

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the honourable and learned senior member for St. John who, I observe, is not now in his place.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to take charge of this Order in the absence of the honourable and learned senior member for St. John.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the House is asking leave to take charge of this Order standing in the name of the hon. and learned senior member for St. John. If there is no objection, leave will be granted. I hear no objection and leave is therefore granted the hon. member to take charge of this Order. This Order is as follows:-

To move the passing of the following Resolution:-

Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of a parcel of land known as The Mount, St. Michael, for the provision of a site for the College of Arts and Science of the U.W.I.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, as you will see from the Addendum to this Resolution, the area in question is known as The Mount in the parish of St. Michael containing by admeasurement 19 acres 0 roods 26 1/2 perches. The Government seeks to acquire this land under the provisions of the Land Acquisition Act, 1949, for the purpose of providing a site for the College of Arts and Science of the University of the West Indies. I should like to begin by correcting the Addendum to this Resolution. There is a slight error in the first paragraph; these errors occur from time to time, and apparently, some of the fault is due to the persons involved in connection with the acquisition of this land by the Government.

3.45 p.m.

Simultaneous with drafting this Addendum, they were drafting another one in which the words "protracted efforts" would have been appropriate, but not necessarily in this case. I should therefore like to substitute the following Addendum for the one which appears on the Resolution now before us.

Mr. SPEAKER: Of course the Addendum forms no part of the Resolution, and I do not think that the hon. member can actually substitute it, that is, alter what is printed; but he certainly can explain that error if he likes and say how it should have read.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I do not want to contend with Your Honour,.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the Hon. Leader of the House proceed to explain why the Addendum is wrong.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I propose to take no notice at all of the first paragraph, but to take cognisance of the one I am substituting which will read as follows:-

"The owner of the land and the Government were unable to agree on a price and there was a breakdown in negotiations."

In order that the land may be acquired for the purposes intended, that is, for the provision of a site for the College of Arts and Science of the University of the West Indies, it has been decided to use the Land Acquisition Act and to allow the question of price to be settled subsequently by agreement or by arbitration. As I said, Sir, the error was due to the fact that in drafting another Resolution at the same time for a similar purpose of compulsory acquisition of land by the Government, this phrase "protracted efforts at negotiation" was appropriate and will come before the House in due time, but the draftsman appended the same phrase in the introductory paragraph to this Resolution by error, and it is therefore necessary today to correct that error.

I should not however, Sir, like hon. members to have the impression that there were no negotiations at all with the owner of the land, because there were; but the phrase "protracted efforts at negotiation" may not describe accurately the negotiations which were made. The Crown Solicitor and the owner of the land did discuss the proposals by the Government for acquiring the land, and the owner was told the price which the Government felt was appropriate for the land, and the Government's price was based on the value of adjacent land which it recently acquired. Hon. members are aware that the Government recently acquired Husbands and Oxnards in this area at a very reasonable price. As a matter of fact, they paid in the vicinity of £300 an acre - which hon. members will agree was a reasonable figure - and on this basis, the Government proposes to pay to the owner of the land a price which is considered ample and indicative of the value of the area concerned. Discussions with the owner on this basis broke down and subsequently the owner was informed by the Crown Solicitor that the Government intended to use the Land Acquisition Act to acquire the land, and the procedure in the Act was explained to him.

I do not therefore want the impression to be conveyed, Mr. Speaker, that the negotiations were in actual fact protracted, but the fact remains that the price offered by the Government and the price demanded by the owner involved a tremendous differential; and since it seemed too much to hope for the negotiations being successfully conducted, the owner was notified by the Crown Solicitor that the Government would resort to the Land Acquisition Act to acquire the land for this important and urgent purpose. I should like to apologise for the wording of the first paragraph of the Addendum, as we have the idea that the draft was an error, and that is why I asked for leave of the House to substitute the paragraph which I read for the paragraph which appears on the printed Resolution.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I am not opposing the acquisition of this land for the purpose for which it is desired by the Government, but the Minister in charge has rightly amended the Addendum, because as soon as I saw what he asked to be amended, I knew that my information was contrary to that. There is one statement which the Minister made in which I believe he has been misled, though I do not believe he wilfully tried to mislead this House, and that is that the land which they are acquiring is adjacent to land which they recently bought. It is within my knowledge that that is a statement which is not correct. I do not believe, as I said, that the Minister is trying to mislead the House, but somebody is trying to mislead him. Oxnards and Husbands are quite some distance from The Mount. If he said that The Mount adjoins land owned by the Leprosarium or lands at Wanstead, he would be making a statement of fact.

3.55 p.m.

Seeing that the Hon. Minister has withdrawn part of the Addendum -

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Sir, I rise on a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has given way.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Sir, I rise on a point of order to make reference to a statement made by the hon. member. The hon. member said that he was not accusing me, but that I have not been informed as to the exact location of The Mount in relation to Husbands and Oxnard Plantations. If the word "adjacent" is not exactly accurate, it is in the vicinity. My information was that the The Mount was adjacent; but if it is not exactly adjacent, the term may be used as if it were in the vicinity. Therefore, the price paid for Husbands and Oxnard was the value for all lands in that area.

As a matter of fact, my information is that The Mount abuts and bounds Husbands and Oxnard; therefore, they are adjacent.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The Hon. Minister with his knowledge of English seems correct. He says now that they are in the vicinity. May I suggest that Broad Street may also be termed as in the vicinity of the land by the Constitution Swamp. It depends on how far you are going to stretch it; if you are going to stretch it, you can stretch it as far as two or four miles.

Sir, what I am thinking of is this. It is a fact that I know the sites of these lands. It is part of my business to know that. Now, Sir, it does not necessarily mean, because you acquire land which is of an agricultural nature and which is not producing as it should be owing to the fact that the soil is very thin, that it is the same type of land as that, which - I will now use the words of the Hon. Minister - "is in the vicinity."

I will like to tell the House what you paid for the land at Grajettes. The Hon. Minister is not correct in his statement about protracted negotiations with the owners, because I am saying now that there was never anything of protracted negotiations if somebody has land and you made up your mind that you are going to use your power and acquire it and that you are not going to give that person more than a certain amount for that land. But if you negotiate and negotiate, you might come to a settlement and you might say in the course of your negotiations that this land is in the same vicinity as that which we bought two miles away and for which we paid so much per square foot.

I will make Government an offer now. If Government accepts that this land which they own now is adjacent - not in the vicinity of land which they own but adjacent and in juxtaposition - I will offer Government twice as much per square foot and will offer them a certified manager's cheque from any bank they want.

Sir, I agree with the Hon. Minister that the Government should not allow anybody to fleece the taxpayers but, on the other hand, you cannot say that you were in negotiations and those negotiations have broken down. You cannot say so if you just say that you are not going to pay more than a certain amount for that land.

Sir, much to the displeasure of my own Party, I told them that any lands which they have around corners and bends, they should give it up freely to the Government for the purpose of widening those corners. If you read some of the debates of this House as I have read them, you will see just as I have seen that a Medical Officer objected to putting the Leprosarium where it was because he considered that land one of the most beautiful sites in the Island. It was a site which the Royal Mail Boat saw first when they were coming into Carlisle Bay.

This land is adjoining that land. The C. B. C. now operates from there. That land which was once the Leprosarium is now put to a much better use and you are going to acquire land which you can say is in the same vicinity. I will agree, as I have said before, that Government should not sit down and let anybody fleece them; but at the same time you must not come in here and say that you have to acquire land by the Acquisition Act from a particular owner because you were not able to reason with him.

There are one or two things which I want to make quite clear. I do not believe that I am in second place to anybody who knows the value of real estate in this Island. I also know that land values in this country vary from area to area and vicinity to vicinity.

4.05 p.m.

Some of it, of course, where people go mad down the coast, will bring anything which people will offer for it; but if the Government purchases, I agree that we must be within reason. On the other hand, we cannot sit down and

allow statements of this nature to be made in an Addendum. As the Addendum reads here, it states: "protracted efforts at negotiations with the owner of the land described in the Schedule hereto for the purchase of the area in question have failed to produce any agreement on price." We have been authoritatively told that that is not correct. The Addendum goes on to state this: "In accordance with the provisions of Section 5 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1949, the approval of the Legislature is sought for the compulsory acquisition of a parcel of land described above in the Schedule in order that the purpose set out in the Resolution may be effected and that the Crown in right of its government of this island may acquire an indefeasible title to the parcel of land."

The acquisition of land is a very simple matter. Each side appoints an arbitrator or a referee and they go into the matter; but surely because you acquire land and because it is in the parish of St. James and you acquired it at one price in one part of that parish, now that you want to acquire land in another part of the parish, you should not say you are not paying this money for it. Where did the negotiations break down? Apparently, they have broken down with the Government. As far as we, on this side, are concerned, we do not oppose the idea of acquiring this land for the purpose which the Government has stated today, that is to say, for the provision of a site for the College of Arts and Science of the University of the West Indies. This is a lovely site. Those who have had an opportunity of driving on this site know that you can see the Deep Water Harbour and all the lights shining down there. There is nothing like that at Oxnards or Husbands. There is nothing that we can do but to say that we will go into arbitration and we will see how people feel. I do not think that the Government should be fleeced; none of us will believe in that. However, Sir, I think that the negotiations in this matter could have gone through much more easily. This step could have been avoided if proper negotiations had been gone into.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I am familiar with the area and I say that it can be regarded as suitable for the provision of a site for the College of Arts and Science of the University of the West Indies. I want to agree with the Minister in connection with the removal of the first part of the Addendum to this Resolution. It is clear that the Crown Solicitor negotiated with the owner of this land on more than one occasion and it is unfortunate that you should convey to the public something other than what is the case. I am told that this offer of £300 an acre which works out at three cents a square foot for this land is small. I agree with all that has been said about fleecing the Government over the price of land. This portion of land which is 19 acres 0 roods 26 1/2 perches, is indeed small if you are looking at the immediate requirements in another two years or so. As to your projections for a College equivalent to a University, you will probably be thinking in terms of 50 years.

The land at Husbands and Oxnards is about two miles away from this land which we are talking about and the Ministers are quite familiar with it. Prior Park would be another two miles away and then there is a good stretch before you get to the White Hall area.

Barbados is a small place. (ASIDES). We are dealing with land which is overlooking the Paradise Beach Club. Husbands is immediately opposite Prior Park in the Lower part of St. James. That leads to the area going north of St. Stephen's Hill and south of Holders Hill. That is an area which you are hoping to develop. You are paying £300 an acre for this land, roughly three cents a square foot. We are not quibbling about this matter; we are going to acquire this land and it is clear that somebody will get hurt about this, if the price is three cents a square foot. I am familiar with this area myself. I am only sorry that Government is now thinking along this line, and not two years ago when considerable sums of money were lavishly misspent. 4.15 p.m.

As far as the acquisition of this land is concerned, there is no quibble, because we want to think of the University in Jamaica with about 100 acres, and at Mona there

are thinking of expansion, and you can well imagine what it would be like. If you have this faculty for Barbados alone, you can think what the demand will be in another twenty years. However, Sir, I should like to agree with the Hon. Leader of the House on the removal of the first part of the Addendum which concerns the purchase of the area in question and the failure to produce any agreement on price. It is regrettable that this had appeared, because the owner of the land is probably exposed to an unfortunate situation, but these things do happen. I agree that a good deal of thought should have gone into this long before it had reached the satirical as it has, but may be the Minister wants to remove any semblance of satire.

Mr. Speaker, it is unkind that someday those who will want to read the Hansard of the debates on what was going on in the early foundation for the Barbados University will see it messed it up with something as unfortunate as this, because it seems unkind to the owner of this land, and nothing can change the damage that has already been done, because what is broken and mended cannot be like new since it is not without blemish. I say, however, that it is nice to be alive in a period when we are aiming at what might be a West Indian University for Barbados.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker I do not know the area where this land is situated, but I am wondering if the site is near a place where this Government is thinking of having a World's Fair in Cave Hill. I do not know The Mount at all, but after reading this Addendum and reading a denial in this morning's newspaper, what must one think? The Hon. Minister in charge says that this is an error. I am wondering when the Minister found out that it was an error.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order, I do not like these generalisations. The hon. junior member for St. Joseph has said that when reading the Addendum the Hon. Minister talked about an error. I said nothing of the kind. I never said the Addendum was an error. I drew attention to two words in the first paragraph of the Addendum, "protracted negotiations" which any child can understand and I asked to correct those two words; but the remainder of the Addendum is accurate, and I explained how those two words happened to be inserted in this Addendum.

Mr. SPEAKER: In other words, if the three words "protracted efforts at" did not appear, the Addendum would read "Negotiations with the owner of the land described in the Schedule hereto for the purchase of the area in question have failed to produce any agreement on price."

Mr. SMITH: Now, Mr. Speaker, I said when I read the Addendum, not when he read it, and the denial in this morning's paper; so I am referring to myself and not the Hon. Minister. The Hon. Minister is trying now to correct the words "protracted efforts", and I would like to know when the Minister found out that these words were inserted in the Addendum. Now this Resolution was circularised to members of this House since last week; and if the Hon. Minister did not read his Addendum before, he might have read it since it was circularised, and the error should have been corrected at least yesterday afternoon by circularising members, drawing to their attention that the wording was wrong. I take it, too, that when the Ministers decide on these things at Cabinet level, and have them printed, at least the Minister in charge of the particular Bill or Resolution should proof-read it to see what is going to the public or into circulation before coming to the House, and at the same time we are going to discuss it, say that the words "protracted efforts" should not be in the Addendum. The Hon. Minister should have known that long before it went to the Printery, because we are dealing with public business, and this particular Government should at all times be on the alert for things of this sort. If the Minister is going to tell us today that he did not see it until this morning, I do not know how the Government is doing its business. Now what is to prevent me, Sir, or any thinking person from coming to the conclusion that the Hon. Minister is only polishing this now because he might have seen or read what appeared in this morning's paper? If we were circularised yesterday to the effect that there was an error in the Addendum,

what we read this morning would be worth nothing; but I take it that it is worth a lot now. I know the Minister is no fool; I am no fool either; so to tell us that the words "protracted efforts" are wrong is not fair to this House or to the people of this country.
4.25 p.m.

It is not fair to this House; it is not fair to the people in this country and, in my opinion, it is not fair to the owner of the same land. Regardless of what the Hon. Minister may say that it is an error, I am sure that if the denial did not appear in this morning's newspaper this Resolution would have come in here and been dealt with and we would never have been told that "protracted efforts" was an error. What the Hon. Minister should have done, after seeing what was written in the newspaper about this matter, was to withdraw the Resolution. I say that, because I do not think that they are in a hurry to acquire this land. They should have withdrawn it and stated the reason for doing so and confess that what was written in the Addendum was an error.

This makes me to feel that this present Government is built up of errors. You have this Land Acquisition Act; but it is not fair to call on us to say "yes, acquire this land from people" without everything which should be done being straightened out and that you have made all negotiations. "If nothing else can be done, well then, come here and ask us to invoke the Land Acquisition Act.

What has caused you to bring this Resolution before the House? In some cases, you make us believe that the owners of land would not come to reasonable terms, and that is the reason for bringing in a Resolution of this sort before the House. But, Sir, this morning, the owner of this land is telling the entire public of Barbados that nothing of the sort has been done and the Hon. Minister is now telling us that "protracted efforts" is an error. How are we to believe one or the other?

Now, Sir, I cannot remember the Hon. Minister explaining to this House the price offered to the particular owner. If it is so, I would be glad if the Hon. Minister would mention the price offered before this Resolution is passed. However, we should be told that the particular person concerned made an offer, let us say, on the 20th of the month and you should also be told the time, the hour and the price. Let us know the true reasons and causes for bringing this Resolution before the House. I would take it that things have not gone so far or that the owner was that type of person who was unwilling and at no time was willing to come together with the Government and that is why this Resolution is here. I believe that any time a Resolution of this sort comes here, it means that every possible thing has been done by the Government and nothing could be done with the owners. But in this case, there is a doubt. It has been created somewhere. The Hon. Minister has said just now that it is not "protracted efforts" and this morning the gentleman has said "no", there was nothing of the sort. And he also said that a price of some sort was offered. The price in my opinion — I say so because I am not a land valuer — from what I have seen was really too low. I say so, although I do not know the particular site. But, if it is near the place that is suited for a World Fair to be held, well, Sir, it must be worth some sort of money. Therefore, you should not come in here because you have the majority and squeeze land out of people's hands by the powers you have under this Act. That is not the right thing to do.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I object in most emphatic terms to the allegations that implied in the Resolution before the House, there is any attempt to squeeze land out of people's hands. As a matter of fact, the Act under which we are acquiring this land was passed in 1949. It was brought in here by the Party to which the hon. junior member for St. Joseph belongs, and when it was brought in here, the hon. member never said one single word in objection to it. The Bill was passed clause by clause, and the hon. member never objected to a single word in it. Now, he has come here with nothing to say and attempting to mislead the House into believing that no attempt was made to negotiate with the owner of the land.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has made his point, and he has the right of reply.

Mr. SMITH: All that the Hon. Minister can say is that the Land Acquisition Bill was brought in by my Party. We have a law on the Statute Book that if someone kills another, that person must be hanged. That is the law, but you do not hang a person because it is the law; you have to prove your case. Therefore, when the Hon. Minister is saying that it is our Party, what has caused our Party to bring that law in? Why has this man refuted the statement which is in this Resolution? The owner of the land is making his side clear.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The hon. junior member for St. Joseph sat down in here for the last twelve years under his Government and it is now altogether fifteen years — seeing the provisions of this Act enforced. It was brought in by his Party and he, himself, never said one word against the provisions of this Act. He is now coming with his crass stupidity and saying that you are squeezing land out of somebody's hands.
4.35 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is going beyond the point of order.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: No, Sir, I am not. I am entitled to draw to the attention of the hon. member how the Act operates.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member can correct that when he replies.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: If I do not correct it now, the hon. member will go on to make misstatements.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member cannot use interruptions in order to explain what he wants to explain.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I am correcting the imputation that the provisions of the Land Acquisition Act mean that you are squeezing land out of somebody's hand in an arbitrary manner, and that the Act itself does not permit of arbitration or accurate assessments of the value of the land, and that when the final provisions of the Act apply, the owners do not get a fair price for their land.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has really gone beyond the point of order. What the hon. member has said might probably come within the provisions of Standing Order 26 (16) which reads as follows:-

"A Member who has spoken to a question may again be heard to offer explanation of some material part of his speech which has been misunderstood; but he shall not introduce new matter."

The hon. senior member for St. Philip has the right of reply when he can deal *seriatim* and with due particularity with every point to which he desires to reply.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, we have it in plain A B C language, that the Government is asking this House to agree to the acquisition of this land and why I used the words "Squeezing it out of the man's hand" is that the gentleman says that the price which has been offered is ridiculously low. The land is worth much more than that. If it is a fact that the land is worth more than that, and the Government still wants to acquire it for the same price, then what can one think?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: This morning I happened to be at a junior school in St. Philip.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not a point of order.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: The hon. member has said that the owner of this land objects to the price which we offered him, and we have come in with this Act to force him to the price we want to pay him for it. I want to say this:

When we cannot reach agreement, we resort to the Land Acquisition Act, and impartial arbitrators go into the matter and arrive at a decision which is fair to the owner and also to the purchaser. What does the hon. member want? That is what we have been doing for the last fifteen years.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think that the hon. member has made his point.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I have not finished yet. What the hon. member is saying today means that the owner of the land has to agree to the price which the Government has to pay. That is unfair; that is not true.

Mr. SMITH: The hon. member should be the last person to say what he said on the floor of this House. I do not believe that anyone could manufacture anything better than he.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us remember the Sermon on the Mount.

Mr. SMITH: This gentleman said that the only thing he knows about this is that the Crown Solicitor told him that he did not intend to give him less than 3 1/2 cents a square foot.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, you should not allow the hon. member to use a quotation from a newspaper in a debate like this. That should not be permitted. The newspaper is there on the Table of the House. This is reducing the debates of the House to a farce. This sort of thing should not be permitted. The hon. member held it up in front of Your Honour and read it. I cannot see.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I wonder if the hon. member can question my veracity.

Mr. WALCOTT: I said it is unfortunate that you could not see that the hon. member held a newspaper in his hand; and if I were to challenge Your Honour's veracity I would have to challenge it now because it is before Your Honour's eye.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have not seen any document which I have recognised as a newspaper or any other publication as such. However, Standing Order 26 (1) states this:

"A Member shall not read his speech, but he may read extracts from books or papers other than newspapers in support of his argument, and may refresh his memory by reference to notes."

If it is a fact that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph or any other hon. member of this House is reading extracts from newspapers, will he please desist from doing so? If any hon. member has not yet done so, will he please never do so?

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, this is what I had in my hand all the time. (*The hon. member held up a copy of the Resolution*). The hon. senior member for St. Peter.....

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The hon. junior member for St. Joseph actually drew to your attention his desire or willingness to read from a newspaper and he asked your permission to read from the newspaper. It is a deliberate untruth for the hon. member to say that he was not reading from a newspaper.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, when you get that infant, that little suckling thing getting up to make somebody believe.... 4.45 p.m.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, the hon. junior member for St. Joseph referred to some member of this House as a suckling thing. I am asking that the hon. member be asked to withdraw those remarks.

Mr. SPEAKER: What are the words complained of?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: The hon. member referred to me as a suckling thing. I would not even refer to him as a suckling thing.

Mr. SPEAKER: While the reporter is preparing a copy of the remarks to which objection has been taken, I would like to re-read Standing Order No. 69 for the benefit of all who are in the hearing of my voice. It reads as follows:-

"Strangers shall be admitted to debates in the House and to sitting of Committees of the whole House under such rules as the Speaker may make from time to time for that purpose.

2. If any Member takes notice that strangers are present, the Speaker, or in Committee the Chairman, shall put forth with the question "That strangers do withdraw" without permitting debate or amendment.

3. The Speaker, or the Chairman, may, whenever he thinks fit, order the withdrawal of strangers from the whole or any part of the House."

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I do not want to hold up the debate. I do not know what you are waiting for, but if it is that the hon. junior member for St. Andrew wants a withdrawal, I am quite willing to withdraw.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the hon. member withdraw.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I respectfully beg to withdraw the remarks.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the hon. member proceed and go right back up to the top.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is always trying to push himself in things he has no right in. He had no right getting up and making this House believe that you allowed me to read a newspaper. The papers that the Government circulated to me are my newspapers.

Mr. SPEAKER: Any member is entitled to have a newspaper, but no member is entitled to read from it.

Mr. SMITH: Everything this Government does is an error, and the Minister admitted it because he said these two words are an error. As I said, Sir, I did not know who was the owner of the land until this morning. The Government has two Resolutions in front of us. One is for the acquisition of land at Rendezvous where the owners' name is mentioned in that Resolution, but in this particular one no mention is made of the name, and I have now found out why the owner's name was not mentioned. If you have two Resolutions before this House for the acquisition of land and you can mention the name of one owner and not the other, something is wrong. I did not know the name of the owner of The Mount until this morning when I read it, and he said that the Crown Solicitor drew to his attention the intention of the Government and what they meant to pay for his land, which he unhesitatingly rejected. Since he has rejected it, that is why the Resolution is here, because the gentleman did not say that the Government or the Crown Solicitor called on him again and asked what he would take. When he rejected the price which the Government offered, they should ask him his price, but as far as I can see from the Addendum and from what I have heard from the Hon. Introducer, that has not been done.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order, if the hon. member did not hear, it is not my fault. The whole *raison d'être* of the Resolution before the House is on account of what he said we have not done. It is because we asked for a price and because his price was so far apart from ours, and because there does not seem to be any possibility of our arriving at a solution to the wide differential in prices that we are resorting to this legislation. I do not know what is wrong with the hon. member today.

Mr. SPEAKER: The point of order has been made.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, the gentleman said what was offered to him. Could the hon. member say what they offered him?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order, today is Tuesday, 23rd June; this is not 1st April. The hon. member

does not understand what he is saying himself. He said that the owner of the land said what was offered to him; presumably by the Government. Now should I say what we are offering? Does that make sense to anybody beside him? If the gentleman said what the Government offered him, why on earth does he want us to tell him what we are offering?

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, if I said that the Government should have said what they offered, I mean he should have said what the owner asked. That is what I meant if I did not say it, and any idiot would understand I meant that.

Mr. SPEAKER: But there are no idiots in this Chamber.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order, it is because we have no idiots here that we could not understand. He said it in error; so therefore it is the St. Joseph member in error. He is always in error.

Mr. SMITH: Up to now the Minister would not say what the gentleman wanted.
4.55 p.m.

That is what we should be told before the time comes for us to vote because it would be fair to both sides — the Government and the owner. The owner said what has been offered; he did not say what he asked; therefore, it is for the Government now to say what they offered him. The only thing which I remember that the Hon. Minister said and tried to point out was that it was a mistake to say that it was protracted. He was very strong and long on that. The Hon. Minister knows to himself that no protracted efforts were made because when they offered the owner a price, he unhesitatingly rejected that offer. The Hon. Minister said that the price which the owner wanted was too far above theirs. That is why I say a protracted effort should be made. Why was his so far above theirs?

The Hon. Minister referred to the Party to which I belong and said that they brought this Land Acquisition Bill before the House. The Party to which I belong was always thinking in terms of the people. They brought in this Act because they wanted to be fair.

Mr. SPEAKER: Standing Order No. 29 states that members should not read newspapers, books, letters or other documents, except such matter therein as may be directly connected with the business under debate.

I see the hon. senior member for St. Peter is reading a newspaper or some other document and I take it that it has something to do with the matter under discussion.

Mr. WALCOTT: It is on Housing.

Mr. SMITH: Regardless of what it is on, Your Honour, you should ask him to put it down so long as it is not on the Resolution. Up to now the hon. member is still reading from it.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. junior member for St. Joseph should continue his address.

Mr. SMITH: As I was saying, Sir, I feel that this area of land in question is worth more than what was offered. Now, Sir, when you are going to buy land, or your solicitor is going to buy land for you, you generally get two people who know about the valuation of land to go and value the land and they arrive at the market price for the land by what is the price of land nearby; that is to say, if land at Grazettes was sold for more than 3 1/2 cents per square foot, by right this particular land would be worth just as much or the same amount as that of Grazettes. That is how you should go about it. Do not go and put down your own price and say that you are not going to give anymore than that. In fairness to everyone that is how the valuers of this particular land should go about it. See what land at Cave Hill and all around it has been sold for and try and strike a price. It should not be, because you feel for some reason or the other that you stipulate a price, that you are not prepared to move from it. Anyone, apart from the

valuers whom you had, would tell you that the land there is worth more than 3 1/2 cents per square foot. If land at Grazettes was sold for 10 cents per square foot, the land at The Mount up on that hill is such a nice look-out — because as the old people tell you that "he who is above is above all," and you are above all when you are up there — you should not grumble to give the above price. It would not be fair to give the below price.

Sir, I only want Government to be fair. The Government should go into this matter rather than bringing down the sledge hammer rightaway because the law is there and they require the land. It is not fair if the land is worth 6 cents per square foot to offer the owner 3 1/2 cents per square foot. I am sure if the Hon. Minister owned "The Mount" — and he knows about the valuation of land — he would not take 3 1/2 cents per square foot for it. As a matter of fact, none of them on that side would take that for it. Therefore, why offer that price for this land? Is it only because you have the big stick in the corner? If you could not squeeze it out of his hand, you would not do that. I would go up there and pay the owner 12 cents per square foot for it, but I know that the big stick would be in the corner waiting for me and with the personnel or the present make-up of the Government, they would be only too glad to come down one cent per square foot.

I say, Sir, that it would be high-class robbery if that happens. If this Resolution is passed and 3 1/2 cents per square foot is put in the Treasury for that gentleman who owns this land, it would be high-class robbery. The Government would be robbing him out of his property and it would not be fair to do it only because the law is there. I therefore ask that the Hon. Minister go into this matter and it would also be a good idea if he postpones this Resolution. The Government should go through it for themselves and do not take the time from whom they sent to value it. Let them look and see the land which is adjacent, and the amounts which were paid for the other places adjoining, and come to their own conclusion. The Government would have to get its own valuers, but the valuers can make a mistake sometimes. I am not saying that they will do it wilfully. It may be that on another thing, they are going to value it to such an extent that they recommend twenty cents per square foot and the Government would take the time from them. However, I wonder, if they value something at 20 cents per square foot, if the Minister would still take the time from them. If they feel that the particular area of land is worth 3 1/2 cents per square foot and the valuers value it at 20 cents per square foot, I am sure that they would not agree to pay that for it. If that is so, in this case, unless they have made up their minds to pay 3 1/2 cents per square foot, I am going to ask them to postpone this Resolution and pay a visit to the site along with the owner. I repeat, for them to put 3 1/2 cents in the Treasury for the owner of this land and it is worth more than that, this Government would be robbing the owner and I do not believe that this Government would want to rob the owner.
5.05 p.m.

That would be highway robbery in my opinion. The land is worth much more than 3 1/2 cents a square foot and for that reason I am voting against this Resolution.

At this stage MR. SPEAKER left the Chair and MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER took the Chair.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, when the Government has no business to do, I think that we should have some means of adjourning the House until the Government has something to do. When the Ministers have nothing to do they put something on the Order Paper and make us come here to do it. They are not particularly interested in leaving the House, and when we have something worthwhile to debate, they postpone it.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order. The hon. member should not say that. The hon. member has said that we had no interest in leaving here; but if he were here earlier, he would have known that it is because we had interest in leaving here that we suggested that Private Members' Business should be postponed so that we could

deal with two matters on the Order Paper under Government Business and leave. That is what we were trying to do. We cannot account for these protracted and silly debates.

Mr. WALCOTT: We should have some business on the Order Paper to do. When you have nothing to debate and you call hon. members here, it looks just like a waste of time to get through the business in five minutes. The hon. junior member for St. Joseph is representing a rural constituency so that when he comes here he feels in duty bound to spend some time here. The Hon. Minister in charge of the Resolution has contributed to this state of affairs because there is no point in rising on a point of order at everything which an hon. member says. The hon. member was debating something on which Your Honour could rule quite easily. The question as to the price which is offered for the land is none of our business. If we were to discuss the merits and demerits of the price to be paid for land, then there would be no point in our having a Land Acquisition Act. What is the purpose of the Resolution being placed before us? The Resolution is here in order to give hon. members of this Chamber the opportunity, or to give the public an opportunity to see that land would not be acquired by the State which may prove to be useless. It is not a question of the price; the Act settles that. It is not a question that you are injuring a person, that you are taking away something from him for spite. The Legislature may feel that you do not want to acquire a piece of land because it is not in the public interest. Are we acquiring land in the public interest or are we acquiring it for spite? In order to save the Community from that sort of thing, you make it incumbent on the Government to bring the matter here. As I say, that gives hon. members of this House the opportunity of seeing whether it is in the public interest to acquire land. If we were to come to the conclusion that it is a waste of time and money to acquire this land, then we would not agree to this Resolution. If the Hon. Minister of Social Services wanted to acquire land at Pico Teneriffe, for instance, because some friends are willing to sell land in that area cheaply, we would say "No" because we are not agreeing to the acquisition of that land. We are not here to determine if the price of land is fair or not because the machinery has been set up to deal with the question of what is a fair price or not. We have arbitrators for that.

I do not think it is necessary for it to be said that the Government offered three cents, three and a half cents or five cents a square foot for this land. I do not think that the negotiations for the price of land should be brought in the House of Assembly. That reduces the whole idea to a farce. There has been so much speculation in land in this country that I do not think anybody should talk about a fair or unfair price. Some people have been extremely lucky in the speculation of land. Land has been sold at fantastic prices without apparently any money being passed purely as a result of negotiations, and it reaches a stage where thousands of pounds have been made as profit and in the final analysis the poor people who have to rent house spots are the ones who have to pay for this sort of thing. These poor people have to rent the land because they cannot put their houses in the air.

Hon. members will remember the affair in relation to Grazettes. I was a member of the Executive Committee, and as to the discussion of that whole affair, I would hate to think that we would fall into such a situation again, because land was sold by persons because they are closely allied to people who were in the Government, and it was not subject to proper acquisition. It was a public scandal, and that is why a series of retributions are taking place today. A lot of people are paying for this scandal because this land should not have been bought at the price at which it was sold, but certain people at court wanted to get on with certain other people. These backhand methods will bring the whole thing into ridicule. The land at Grazettes was sold at an inflated price and I know the reason for it. If the Hon. Leader of the Opposition were in his seat now, he would agree with me because he knows more about it than I do.

5.15 p.m.

Grazettes was bought by the last Government as a housing area, but there was more to it than buying Grazettes as a housing area. The hon. junior member for St. Joseph talked about 3 1/2 cents or four cents per square foot, but when you buy 19 acres or 20 acres of land, you cannot talk about square feet. You would buy land in Broad Street by the square foot, but you would not buy a plantation by the square foot. If Bulkeley was selling out, would you buy it by the square foot? Would you buy 900 acres of land in the United States of America or in British Honduras by the square foot? When you buy land at 3 1/2 cents per square foot, that is something like £300 an acre. If you went to a shop to buy a pound of salt, would you ask the man what per ton he was selling at and then divide the amount by 2,240 pounds to find out what a pound it costs? I do not think we should begin to equate 3 1/2 cents per square foot. Nineteen acres of land is a lot of land, and therefore the arbitrators would fix a price which you could regard as fair. When people buy bits of land to sell again or a plantation cuts up land to sell, they sell it by the square foot. The whole works at Sandy Lane with so many acres of land and a factory were bought for so many thousand pounds, but now they are selling, it would be sold at so much per acre or per square foot; but could anybody in Barbados go and buy a plantation or large areas of land at the rate of \$1.00 a square foot where an acre of land would nearly be equivalent to £10,000? You would buy a plantation at £10,000 an acre to plant canes, where you do not have to put roads, or water, and where you do not have to develop the land.

Mr. Speaker, hon. members must bear in mind that when the Government is purchasing a lot of land like that, they have to pay whatever price the arbitrators award. The Government is buying this land to develop it into a University College; they are not buying to sell again to make a profit off someone else; so you want to know what is a fair price to pay for a large area of land like this without calling on the person to develop it before he sells. I do not think it would be fair to say that because Grazettes Land as a developed area is adjacent to this undeveloped portion of land, you should think in terms of such a price unrelated to what the development charges would be on those lands, and that is where you leave it to the arbitrators. I do not think we can manufacture arbitrators. They are here already, and I would say that land owners are usually arbitrators. From my experience in Barbados, I have found that the persons who arbitrate on land are usually people who have land to sell, and the person who wants private land has to pay what is regarded as a reasonable price. Where you buy land privately or otherwise, I have never found that the valuers go in and undervalue the land. The opposite has been the case, because they have a vested interest in keeping a good price for land. If they keep a poor price on land, all the people would own land or a property, and therefore a man who owns land or a property is not going to reduce the value of that property. If the gentleman concerned had said that he had bought the land at a price and the Government wanted to reduce the price, I would agree with the hon. member. If a man went and paid a higher price for land than could normally be regarded as the true value, I do not think that the Government would be bound to give that price. I hear hon. members make those statements; but when the Government or the Income Tax Department go to value land for death duty purposes, that is where I find people have two different voices. When it comes to valuation for the purpose of death duties, automatically the value of the land and property goes down to the lowest; but as soon as you want to sell, the value goes up. It would be interesting to ask some person to pay death duties on the value of the property after they have sold it, but you do not do that because you do not want to squeeze the person who has to pay the taxes.

I do not think it is fair, Sir, for the hon. junior member for St. Joseph to repeatedly make these arguments about the Land Acquisition Act and talk about disclosing the prices or about robbery. Apart from the hon. senior member for Bridgetown, I do not think any other hon. member here is a real estate broker. Sometimes our membership in this House precludes us from exercising civic functions

in matters that are likely to come within our own jurisdiction from time to time, I do not know what takes place in his capacity as a professional real estate man, but any member of this Chamber who is called upon to value land can only do it in relation to what is reasonable and in the light of what is going on. I would say that if the gentleman concerned objects to the sale on the grounds that the Government is offering him too low a price, he has a perfect right to do so and to allow the arbitrators to decide. I do not think it is for us to say that the Government is offering a price that is too low and wants to rob him out of his land, because under the Land Acquisition Act in Barbados the Government cannot rob any person in any sale. They have to accept what the arbitration awards, and the Government can only act in accordance with the Act; so I do not agree with the charge being made that the person will be robbed. It was unfortunate that this Addendum was worded in this way, but all it shows is that Civil Servants are a little bit too stereotyped, and try to find the easiest way out of writing things in an Addendum.

5.25 p.m.

I will say that the Civil Servants should learn not to be stereotyped and should be original and all it shows is that they are looking for the easiest way of writing it. You have people of the calibre of Permanent Secretaries who are well educated men, and they should be capable of not using the normal copy book style of copying out what has been written; they should be more original than that. All our Permanent Secretaries are capable of writing any Addendum to a Resolution without the scrutiny of a Minister saying how it should be worded because that is the job which any Civil Servant must be capable of doing, and without this verification which sometimes seems necessary. I say on the part of the Civil Service that it is only a matter of carelessness that has caused this, because they have copied out what they are accustomed writing on other Resolutions. It shows that there is too much of this routine business going on in high places and that no originality is taking place.

Sir, I am sorry that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph made this charge of robbery because it is beyond any member of this Chamber to suggest that you intended to rob a person who has land to sell.

Mr. COWARD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not think I can sit idly by without adding my voice to those hon. members who have spoken on this Resolution. In the Addendum to this Resolution, I have seen that the Government intends to buy this land so as to erect a building for the Arts College in Barbados. I happen to know The Mount and I feel that the Government could not have secured a more suitable site for this Arts College than The Mount. It has a very good view overlooking the Harbour and it is a very quiet place.

However, Sir, from the Addendum, I see nothing telling you about the price; therefore, I am only concerned with the acquisition of the land. I know that there are people in this area who do not fully observe the full importance of education, and more so, the need for qualified teachers coupled with the fact that we are doing everything possible to look after our own people. However, I am somewhat worried to see that wherever there is land needed for essential purposes, this Government has to acquire it compulsorily. I agree that land whose title deeds are at fault should be acquired compulsorily so that Government would secure those lots with a fair and marketable title; but in this case, I hope that the Government and the owners of this land will be able to get together and negotiate a price for it without having to acquire it compulsorily.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have much pleasure in supporting this Resolution.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, this parcel of land in question was part of an area of 1,000 acres which was frozen in 1960 by the previous Government. It was frozen then by the Town and Country Planning Officer because it was considered as not so suitable for building houses. The Government, at that time, was looking around to site a number of houses in Barbados on another site, and the site they selected was considered the more suitable site

near to Bridgetown for such a project. But this was some four years ago, and since then this Government has acquired two plantations at a price of £300 per acre. I understand that both of these plantations are 400 acres; but when you come to deal with a tenantry in the same vicinity, it does not mean that the valuation placed on the large plantations can be the same thing as that for the small parcel of land. As a matter of fact, it will be admitted that all of that 400 acres would not be as ideal as this small parcel of land.

Anyhow, Sir, as the hon. senior member for St. Peter has said, we are not now here to place a valuation on the land. The Government said that they could not come to terms with the owner and it is for that reason that they are going to arbitration. I feel convinced without putting any value on it that if 3 1/2 cents per square foot, as has been reported in the newspaper, is offered by the Government to the owner for this land, that that price is far beneath the market price which it can fetch. When you consider that the owner has this land frozen, it goes to show that it is not suitable for agricultural purposes or for intensification purposes but it is good building land, and for that reason the arbitrators would have to take that into account despite the fact that the land is to be acquired for the purpose of establishing the Arts College.

It is 19 acres of land. This land is not in juxtaposition of any Government owned land. I understand that 30 or 40 acres of land would be required for the Arts College. If that is so, then Government would have to acquire land which is around this 19 acres. Holders Hill area does not adjoin this area; therefore, they would have to acquire land from other small holders around shortly. There is land owned by small owners around, and the Government presumably would have to acquire that by negotiations or acquisition. If the Government should see fit to acquire this land at what the public considers too small a price, well then, it is also setting a value for the other small holders who would come into the picture in the near future. Land in Barbados is high costing because there are so many people who are willing to pay down money for an acre of land. But that is part of us. It is not only so in Barbados, but even in the smaller Islands which are in the course of development. If you want to know that, just go to St. Vincent and try to acquire land near the City. That is the condition in these small Islands, and it is so because we are of a limited area and lots of people want land to buy.

5.35 p.m.

Government must expect to pay what the market value is. We do not want to see the Government fleeced in the purchase of land above the market value, neither do we wish to see the Government acquire land below the market value. We want to have a proper valuation. If this land or site is not big enough for the provision of a site for the College of Arts and Sciences of the University of the West Indies, would they not consider siting the College of Arts and Science of the University of the West Indies on a part of that 400 acres which they have already acquired? It may be that the Government realises that this piece of land is more accessible from the Bridgetown area, and all of that might have been gone into. If that is so then the Government should be prepared to pay the value of this land. I see that land in Christ Church which is owned by plantations and what was considered as agricultural land is bringing four or five times as much as the value of such land. I see that there is an area of land at Warners, and the price is four times as much as that for which the Government secured land at Graeme Hall. If you are paying at an enhanced value, then you pay for that; but when you come to building land, that is another matter. I have heard that this matter will go to arbitration, and the owner of the land will have ample opportunity to state that this land is non-agricultural. It can be used for housing. It was frozen four years ago for the purpose of land development, and it is still so today. Land which is now acquired by the Government in and around that area is for that purpose.

MR. HUSBANDS and HON. E. W. BARROW rose to speak.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: My eye caught the hon. junior member for St. Peter first.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am speaking on a point of order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member did not say that at first.

Mr. GODDARD: In that case I take it that I can reply.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: That is so.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, as far as other speakers who may want to add their contribution to this debate are concerned, I would not like them to fall into the error into which the last speaker has fallen in saying that the price which the Government pays for land for public purposes must be based on the use to which the land is to be put. Under the 1949 Land Acquisition Act, the price which arbitrators fix in awarding compensation is based on what a willing seller — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I will quote the Section. It is Section 1 subsection (1) which says this:-

"The value of the land shall, subject as is hereinafter provided, be taken to be the amount which the land if sold in the open market by a willing seller might be expected to realise at the date of the first publication in the *Official Gazette* of a notification in accordance with section three of this Act or if no such notification is published as aforesaid, of a notification under section five of this Act."

This Act was passed in 1949. It was amended last year at Chapter 27 and we must get our facts straight. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I intend to reply when all hon. members of this House have spoken on this Resolution and to go into the whole matter of land acquisition in this island. I cannot allow the discussions and the debate to proceed on false premises. Subsection 2 of Section 11 of the 1949 Act says this:-

"The special suitability or adaptability of the land for any purpose shall not be taken into account if that purpose is a purpose to which it would be applied only in pursuance of statutory powers or for which there is no market apart from the requirements of any Government Department or any local or public authority."

Subsection (3) says this:-

"Where the value of the land is increased by reason of the use thereof or of any premises thereon in a manner which could be restrained by any court, or is contrary to law, or is detrimental to the health of the inmates of the premises or to the public health, the amount of that increase shall not be taken into account."

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I go on to read subsection 4. That Sub-section states:-

"Where land is, and but for the compulsory acquisition would continue to be, devoted to a purpose of such a nature that there is no general demand or market for land for that purpose, the compensation may, if the Judge is satisfied that reinstatement in some other place is *bona fide* intended, be assessed on the basis of the reasonable cost of equivalent reinstatement."

This is the important subsection of Section 11 of the whole land acquisition Act of 1949. Subsection 5 states:-

"No allowance shall be made on account of —

- (a) the acquisition being compulsory or the degree of urgency or the necessity which has led to the acquisition;
- (b) any disinclination of the person interested to part with the land acquired;
- (c) any damage sustained by the person interested, which, if caused by a private person, would not render such person liable to an action;
- (d) any damage, not being in the nature of deprivation of or interference with an easement or legal right,

which after the time of awarding compensation is likely to be caused by or in consequence of the use to which the land acquired will be put;

- (e) any increase in the value of the land acquired likely to accrue from the use to which the land acquired will be put;"

No allowance shall be made for any of these things. The law has been like this since 1949, but it has been changed and it makes it difficult for any one to argue that because a person can find a speculator from Canada or the United States of America to make him an offer for land, that person should be allowed to sit down and draw unearned increments and get fifty, sixty or seventy times the value of the land.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member's point of order has been properly made.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Your Honour does not know what is happening: therefore you should wait. I am still on a point of order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The point of order, I think, has been properly made, and if the hon. junior member for Christ Church is willing to reply, he can do so now.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I have made several references to the amendment of 1963.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: If the hon. member is not willing to take the ruling of the Chair — I say that the point of order has been duly made.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: If Your Honour will listen to me, I have made several points.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am saying that, up to this stage, the point of order has been properly made. If the hon. junior member for St. Peter is willing to speak, I will hear the hon. member now.
5.45 p.m.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: If I may attempt on a point of elucidation.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am not hearing any point of elucidation now. I have ruled, and I am asking the hon. junior member for St. Peter, if he wants to make a contribution to the debate, to do so now. I will ask the Hon. Leader of the House to take his seat while the hon. junior member for St. Peter begins. If both hon. members continue on their feet, I will suspend this sitting right away. Let the hon. junior member for St. Peter proceed.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, in beginning I will say that I am not opposed.....

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: If I may, on a point of privilege, interrupt, the hon. senior member for St. John attempted on a point of order to draw to the attention of the House the basic differential between the principle of the 1949 Land Acquisition Act to which the hon. junior member for Christ Church referred and the new Amendment of 1963. During the course of the remarks on the 1949 Act, Your Honour will recall that the hon. senior member for St. John.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am hearing more than one voice.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: The point is that during the remarks on the 1949 Act, the hon. senior member for St. John on more than one occasion.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Let me remind the Hon. Leader of the House that on a point of privilege, you rise and state what the privilege is. I have exercised my discretion and it will not be abused. If your point of privilege is in effect to contradict or oppose my ruling, I am not hearing you.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: All I am doing at this point is endeavouring to explain a point which may have missed Your Honour's attention.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I understand the point you are making. I will hear the hon. junior member for St. Peter.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, allow me at the outset to say that I am not here to enter into any controversy regarding the implementation of legislation which has for its object the acquisition of any parcel of land by the Government, or to make any references whatever to the Act. As a matter of fact, speaking on it, in my opinion, is strictly out of order because it would be a reflection on a vote of the House, and you would have to bring in an amendment if you want to speak on it. Now, Sir, what has brought me to my feet is a certain piece of information which has been vouchsafed certain gentlemen of the island — and when I say "gentlemen" I mean members of Parliament — and has given the impression that there has not been any attempt at negotiations. I am not in a position to say whether that is false or absolutely true.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, if the hon. member wants to find out whether there was any negotiation, he should ask a question and not develop a whole thesis on the absence of negotiations and waste the time of hon. members. On a further point of order, the Act was passed in 1963 before the Prorogation of the House, and it could not be reflecting on a vote of this House if after Parliament is reconvened we draw to the attention of hon. members that there were certain provisions of the 1949 Land Acquisition Act which were amended in 1963. The hon. member is always speaking *ex cathedra*. I do not know whether the exercise entitles the hon. member to be equally as misguided.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will ask the hon. member not to descend to that. Let the hon. junior member for St. Peter continue.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would not attempt to waste my time and that of hon. members in making any remarks or even a passing reference to what the hon. member has just said. I am in sympathy with all those who are in a like position as the hon. member, and I must be so. I had the privilege when once I was in England of visiting an institution, and when I saw the inmates thereof, it moved me to pity; and I will say no more about that. I repeat, Sir, that I am not here to make any reflection on the acquisition of land for Government purposes, because in principle, I agree with the Resolution. It has a very laudable aim, that of furnishing a site for the College of Arts, as we shortly term it; but we know the purpose of such an instrument when it comes to acquiring land this way, and that is that some agreement will eventually be reached that is satisfactory to both parties.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am not talking about the price of land to be developed or the comparative price of adjoining lands. That is not my business this afternoon. What I said brought me to my feet is that it is now a matter of public information that it appears, rightly or wrongly, that there has been little attempt to negotiate. If that is true, I would chide the Government on that score. If that is not true, I dare not chide the Government on that score; but if the public has been informed — and we are included in the public of this country — that there was little or no attempt to negotiate before invoking compulsory powers, then I say that Government should be chided severely for attempting such a procedure. Of course, when I sit, there might be a torrent of abuse rained on me, but again I would sympathise with those who give the torrent, because I have seen other people with whom I have had to sympathise, and there might be one or two in this room with whom I have to sympathise. Any person of normal experience would readily sympathise with such persons wherever they can be found.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Let the hon. member continue on the Resolution.

Mr. HUSBANDS: I myself never thought there was so much land on top of The Mount, Mr. Deputy Speaker. When I say "so much land", I mean so much land capable of being developed for this purpose. Since there is a Resolution, I am in entire agreement with it; but I am not in agreement if it is ever discovered that there was undue haste in invoking the powers which we are about to give the Government this afternoon.
5.55 p.m.

In other words, if the owner of the land has been told "take this, or leave it; take this amount", and there is no further negotiations on the matter, I am against such an action, if it is true. No Barbadian who wants to be fair and just, no honest Barbadian would condone such a course of action and say that it is fair. If the owner has been told — I am not saying it is so — "take it or leave it", I am against such an action. I hope it is not so, but I would not be surprised if I am accused of saying that it is true.

Sir, that and that only is what brought me to my feet. I do not have to make any long-winded speech to tell this House that. As far as the amendment to the Act is concerned, I will end by saying, that as far as I know, I do not know what reflection has been passed on it.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will say again, that while I do not want to restrict the hon. member, I will restrict any hon. member if he goes off the course as far as this debate is concerned.

Mr. HUSBANDS: I thank you, for that, although what I was saying was not, in my view, particularly off the course. I vent my displeasure openly in this Place, if there has been any undue haste, if there has been any attempt to say, "take it or leave it", to the owner or if there was any inharmonious attempt made to arrive at a price before these powers have been invoked. I do not and I will never accuse any Government for acting in this manner of invoking the Land Acquisition Act when they have to purchase land. I am not making reference to the powers of this Act. It has been going on for many years now. But when a single instance is cited to the public that there is undue haste and that despotic action precedes the present situation, I sincerely condemn the action.

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Deputy Speaker,.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair.

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Speaker, there are one or two points relative to the land under discussion which I would like to draw to the attention of the House. We accept the explanation given by the Hon. Leader of the House about the words "protracted efforts", because it is well known that the owner of the land did not enter into protracted negotiations with the Government on the price of this land. We accept the explanation given by the Hon. Leader of the House.

Now, Sir, perhaps, in my opinion, the prices which have been paid for land in approximately the same vicinity may well be mentioned at this stage. The hon. junior member for Christ Church mentioned just now that some land at Warners, Christ Church, was sold at 80 cents per square foot and some at 60 cents per square foot. That gives us a rough idea of land values in certain areas and that must bear some relation to the price of land under discussion.

Now, we are told that the owner of this land was offered 3 1/2 cents per square foot.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The owner was not offered 3 1/2 cents per square foot. The owner was offered £300 per acre for the land. We are paying him precisely what we paid for good agricultural land at Husbands and Oxnards, which are next door, and the reason why we proceeded with the Acquisition Act for the purchase of Husbands and Oxnards, was because the owner of this particular small parcel of land was being unreasonable; so we wanted to stabilise the price of land in that area for the benefit of people in that district. We do not buy land by the square foot. We are not buying cloth.

Mr. LYNCH: Next door to that, land was sold at 40 cents per square foot. The land to which the Hon. Premier referred is more than one mile away. However, it does seem to be discriminatory that the owner of land right adjacent to the land under discussion was told to sell his as building land at 40 cents a square foot, while this land which is of the same value was to be sold at the price mentioned. Sometimes, if one has property to sell and, let us say, that it is worth £2,000 and somebody offers \$2,200 for it, then the offer is so staggeringly below the price which the owners were selling at, that the owners become inflamed and infuriated and there is hardly any basis on which the value of the land can be discussed.

I am not aware that the matter is to go to arbitration; I am not aware that the Government would want to expropriate this land under discussion. However, it is known that the price offered was so staggeringly low that it offered little basis for discussion between the two parties.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, there are just one or two points to which I want to reply as the Hon. Premier under whose name the Resolution stands was not present when these points were made, but he has signified his intention to speak on the matter. I want to begin by asserting.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I take it that the Hon. Leader is exercising his right to reply now and that the Hon. and Learned Premier proposes under Standing Order No. 27 (2) to conclude the debate on the ground that the motion is critical of the Government, or reflects adversely on or is calculated to bring discredit upon the Government or a Government Officer.
6.05 p.m.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: That is what we are proposing, more or less, to do. As I was saying, Sir,.....

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order, I would like to have this thing straight. You have proposed a question which is dealt with in the Standing Orders. If the Hon. Premier wants to reply now, it is within the province of the Hon. Premier to reply in the debate. Any member of the Government can reply if, after some person who led the debate, somebody said something which is critical of the Government. If the person did not have the opportunity to reply, then he could do so. If it is now the point for the winding up of the debate, you do not want to end a debate with two Government members speaking. It is either a question of the Premier winding up the debate or the Hon. Leader of the House doing so. The winding up of the debate by the Premier is in relation to something which is critical of the Government. The Premier can say that something is critical of the Government as soon as the hon. member closes the debate.

HON. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I have not yet spoken in this debate and the Hon. Leader of the House will reply. I have a perfect right as a member of the House to speak on the substantive motion.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is no record to the effect that the hon. member has spoken.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: My speech was drastically curtailed when I attempted to speak.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am very grateful to the hon. member.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I have been very distressed over the remarks which I have heard during the short time that I had been listening to the debate. I am distressed, Sir, very much because of the unkind remarks which were made against the Government to the effect that the Government wanted to expropriate people's property. We are not concerned with the political parties in Barbados, but with the social philosophy which should exist in this island. This is a speech which I could have made if hon. members on the other side of the House were not interested in personalities, but in principles, at the time when the Land Acquisition Act was amended by this Government. The Land

Acquisition Act, 1949, was amended by this Government for the simple reason that it was our experience that the provisions of the Act were such that the whole community could be held up to ransom by recalcitrant landowners. I may say that I am not putting the gentlemen concerned in this particular transaction in that category; I am not being personal at all. This Government has embarked on a Development Programme. The only acquisition not involving compensation which has ever taken place in Barbados is the 92 acres reclaimed at the Deep Water Harbour. We have inherited a social and economic system, whereby the large plantations belong, or 80% of the plantations or of the arable land in Barbados belongs, to 360 people. I am not including the gentleman with whom the Official Opposition is so much concerned, he being a member of their Party, I believe.

Let us look at this matter in its right perspective. We have an island of 166 square miles and with a population of 240,000. We have an average of 1,400 people to the square mile and the average Barbadian has no chance of ever holding a sizable proportion of this island on which he could rear two cows and three pigs, unless you win money or you can buy land from somebody who wants to dispose of it or you can make use of the Court of Chancery in order to increase your holdings. There are many people who have gone to the United States of America and have helped their grandsons and their aunts, and they have come back here and found that their relatives have passed their land through the Court and acquired a title. Barbadians are land hungry. We have large numbers of people who cannot afford to buy land at the existing prices; we have people in the lower brackets, who, if this Government did not have a policy of providing for housing areas, would not have owned any of this land. The word "Conservatism" just means holding on to what you have at all costs or at a special price to the detriment of everybody else in the community. In 1794 the Conservatives resisted the introduction of Income Tax as they did later Mr. Gladstone's Reform Bills and the Education Act. Because I speak to Conservatives does not mean that I accept the philosophy of Conservatism. You have a majority who never had any chance of owning anything. That is the kind of situation which is endemic in a community such as this, and that leads to much more serious things than acquisition. It leads to what is taking place in British Guiana, that is to say, 53 deaths within a few weeks. You have people owning thousands of acres of land on the one hand, and on the other hand you have the man who is never in possession of sufficient money some of which he can save so as to buy shoes for his children. And you cannot persuade him that even those irresponsible agitators such as they are in British Guiana, who come along and say: "Look at what this man has and what the other man has," are not Messiahs.
6.15 p.m.

In all this you make room for the Jagans, the Brindley Benns and the Castros. The philosophy of Conservatism is such that it creates that kind of situation; but what we are trying to do in Barbados is to give the people in this country an opportunity for education, a chance of getting a square meal, a chance of living in a decent house, and a chance of getting a job for which they are qualified without any discrimination whatever. Those are the things we have been trying to do and we have not created any revolution in this country. I would not even try to pretend that a social revolution has taken place in this country. All that has taken place in Barbados in the last two years is that we have managed to satisfy the people in this country that all is not lost and that something can be done to ease their lot, although we cannot guarantee them pie-in-the-sky or mansions in Spain.

Now let us be honest and straightforward about this whole thing. The reason why I am speaking in this debate - and I intend to speak at some length - is because this debate has highlighted the fundamental differences in the social and economic philosophies existing between the major Parties in this House, in other words, between the Government on one side, and the Official and Unofficial Opposition on the other; and therefore this is a good opportunity to have a restatement of why we think as we think, why we

know that we are right, and why we know that if we were not here the people who have vested interests would be completely oblivious to the low living standards of the rest of the community, completely unconcerned and that their indifference has created gun powder that might actually make them insecure and blow them through the roof. They themselves create the conditions; and unless you have a group of people in this country who are prepared to redress the balances, to see things in the broad, social context, to see the economic importance of legislation, the economic importance of development, the psychological importance of removing distinctions between one class of the community and the other, then you are asking for trouble. All that those people on the other side are doing this afternoon is inviting trouble, because they do not seem to know how the masses of people think. We have been the safety valve, and we are prepared to act as the safety valve; but we must be satisfied that there is some reconditioning going on on the other side, that there is some kind of rethinking and a restatement of their own position being satisfactorily made in their own minds and the people they are supposed to represent.

Now, Sir, what is the position? We have been attacked here because a gentleman wrote a letter to the newspapers complaining that there were no protracted negotiations. The hon. senior member for St. Philip said that the word "protracted" which appears in the Addendum is wrong, though the Addendum does not form any part of the Resolution. It is not normally drafted by us. As a matter of fact, I beg to say that this Addendum was actually approved by me, and it was pointed out by me subsequently that it might be an irritant to use the word "protracted"; but the hon. member said that there were no protracted negotiations. There were protracted negotiations in relation to the surrounding estates, Husbands and Oxenards, but we arrived at an amicable agreement as to the acquisition of those properties without invoking the provisions of the Act, and having settled that, we were then able to move on to other parts of the area. I think we did a Resolution for one plantation last week, but I do not want to go into that because that is a very sorry story. For this particular small parcel of land which was producing nothing, which has no services, no roads, no light and no water, in my humble opinion the price which was offered by Government was generous and far from being absurd, as some hon. members would suggest.

Now I want to clear the air on certain fundamental matters. I regard this as a personal debate for this reason. I regard that the members of the Conservative Party are not going to like what I say. As the hon. senior member for St. Peter has often said, and I join with him in this; I am not looking for any friends now that I am in Government because I did not have any before, and those whom I had I have clasped them to my bosom with bonds of steel, but I do not waste my time with each new-found untried comrade. If I get up here, therefore, and have to offend some people in stating what the philosophy of this Party is, it does not worry me, because all the time that these individuals were growing wealthy, they were not with you. When we were fighting the battle of the masses, they were not with us, because after they reached a certain stage, their social ideas and economic philosophies are crystallised - and not only crystallised, but they coalesce into groups, and the more acquisitive they are, the more unconscious they are of the basic needs of a community. They are all of them extremely acquisitive, but we expect this. We are not saying that it is a crime, but in every democratic society you will find people like this who do not take the trouble to look around the world and see what is happening, and you will always find them adopting this holier-than-thou attitude, that you are coming to take away what they have, that you must go and work for it. Mexico is one of the richest states today, but they were not talking about that in 1923 when the oil fields were taken over. One of the greatest oil-producing countries in the world is Venezuela, but you have about 70% of the population illiterate, and some of the people have to walk miles in the centre of town to get a bucket of water. Are we going to let people who have been able to amass money come in from outside, and when the public programme demands that something should be done, hold up the progress of this community on the basis that somebody can take an aeroplane trip to America and persuade some-

body to pay more money than the Government is able to pay for a parcel of land? It is as simple as that.

I will tell you something right now, Mr. Speaker, even if His Lordship the Bishop may get offended. When I see some of the people who go to the Anglican Church in this island, my infrequency of attendance rises, because I notice that they, like the Republicans in the United States and the Southern Protestants, are always the most acquisitive people; if you want to find people who have a little social philosophy, you have to look for the Baptists or Methodists because the Established Church in Barbados has been for generations a church of vested interests. It is a property owner, and therefore all the property owners tend to congregate there, and they think it is not respectable to go somewhere else.
6.25 p.m.

I was born, baptized and confirmed in the Anglican Church; therefore, I speak with impunity. The infrequency of my attendance at Church is because I have noticed that good Protestants are the most acquisitive people. So, you will see that we have a religious organization buttressing up these people, and you will never see in the Anglican Church anybody being critical of the landed gentry of this country. I have never heard of one Anglican priest saying that you should have canteens for workers at factories and plantations, but I have heard of Ministers like the late Francis Godson from other denominations talking of old age pensions for the people. We are getting more trouble from the people in the Anglican Church over this same question of land than from anybody else; therefore we are saying this about these pious Anglican politicians going into Church so that you should know that they are going there to have a sense of security. You have Rectors who want to charge the Government more for land than the biggest capitalists in the United States would want to charge their Government; therefore, I have to say these unkindly things, but I am speaking facts. I want to be like the late Prime Minister of India. I want my ashes to be scattered all over the sea thus relieving the City Council of the pressure with which they are now faced of finding more land for a burial place.

The reason why I have mentioned the Anglican Church is just because I want to show that its philosophy was deeply engrained in the sanctity of private property ownership, that it has become glorified in its religion and it has actually been sponsored and promoted by the Anglican Church. As a matter of fact, they want us to pay \$3 million for their property now when we have kept it for all these years in the state and condition which it is in now. Who are their advisers but the same people that come in here and who write letters to the newspapers talking of the iniquities of socialism?

Now, Sir, let us get down to the basis of a Resolution of this kind. I pointed out at an earlier stage that in 1949 the Legislature passed the Land Acquisition Act. I suppose that there was some opposition to it, because we had some previous Acts which did not go as far as dealing with compensation for land. The people of the country need land for a variety of purposes. They need it for roads, schools, and even the hon. senior member for St. Joseph has brought in a Resolution to acquire land to do something which is already in our Manifesto.

I am not satisfied with the Land Acquisition Act as it now stands. We realised what the programme of development of this Government would be over the next four years and we introduced a Bill to amend the Land Acquisition Act of 1949, because we had been experiencing difficulties, and so as to give a more realistic method of compensating owners without in any way depriving them of the benefit of a reasonable return for their investment. The whole philosophy of conservative capitalisation is based on getting a reasonable return for your investment. What is a reasonable return? There is no capitalist who will quarrel with you if you say that you should get a percentage on your money. Let us try and work this out. Under the Land Acquisition Act, Section 11 states certain basic principles. The principles under which all the members of the House have operated from that time was that the Land Acquisition

Act was fair and reasonable because no one, until we introduced an amendment, thought fit to criticise it. I will go further. Members of this House within my knowledge have appeared before an Arbitration Tribunal and accepted the findings of the Tribunal based on the 1949 Land Acquisition Act.

I have been in here since 1951 with a short hiatus or sabbatical in 1949 and I have never heard any criticism of that Act until today when the House was told by the hon. junior member for Christ Church that the amount should be paid on the basis of what the land could bring in to the owner.

Under the Land Acquisition Act, 1949, Chapter 56, Section 11 states:

"No allowance shall be made on account of -

- (a) the acquisition being compulsory or the degree of urgency or necessity which has led to the acquisition;
- (b) any disinclination of the person interested to part with the land acquired;
- (c) any damage sustained by the person interested, which, if caused by a private person, would not render such person liable to an action;
- (d) any damage, not being in the nature of deprivation of or interference with an easement or legal right, which after the time of awarding compensation is likely to be caused by or in consequence of the use to which the land acquired will be put;
- (e) any increase in the value of the land acquired likely to accrue from the use to which the land acquired will be put;
- (f) any outlay or improvement on such land which shall have been made, commenced, or effected, within two years before the publication of the notice of appropriation under section five of this Act, with the intention of enhancing the compensation to be awarded therefor in the event or with the view of such land being required for public purposes."

It means that if you have gone on that land and actually put in roads, that is to say, that you got permission from the Town and Country Planning Officer to develop that land and you put in roads and spent \$10,000 under the 1949 Act, the owner of the land would not have been entitled to any compensation whatsoever if we published a notice of acquiring it within two years. I do not think anyone would dispute that because it is clear.

Now, if the hon. member said that the owner had gone and put in roads and developed the land, we would even be protected by the Act. As a matter of fact, where Government has been acquiring land and the person has expended a sum of money and he had come to some kind of reasonable price for the land by the acre or the square foot, depending on where the land is, invariably my experience has been that the Government's solicitor is instructed to accommodate the person in that respect because we do not want to have anybody saying that somebody spent money on his land so that he would have been able to do something else with it, and then out of the blue the Government came and acquired it. We have never done that, because the law does not prevent us paying for improvements on the land, even if these improvements had been carried out within the two year period.
6.35 p.m.

What the law says is that if we force the owner to go to arbitration, the arbitrators cannot compensate him for the improvements. We can exercise a moral discretion and compensate people, and that is what invariably happens. When people stick out against the Government, you can only come to the conclusion that they want to hold the entire

community up to ransom. In this particular case, this land is in the middle of nowhere. The owner ceased to use it even for agricultural purposes three years ago; the land is not even fit for grazing two heads of sheep, and I see people grazing twenty and thirty sheep on a quarter-acre of land or even less than that. However, as far as these 19 acres of land are concerned, you could not find two sheep grazing there between 1950 and 1961.

Mr. Speaker, let us examine the facts in this case. We are not now dealing with compensation, because that will be fixed by the arbitrators. Anything I say about the value of the land will not be binding on the arbitrators, but since hon. members have spoken in the way they have, I will speak. We came in with a mortgage insurance scheme because people in the lower brackets were having to pay too much for land, and it was impossible for a poor man to own his own house. We must have our workers living near their work; otherwise we will have to take the work to the workers. When you look around the periphery of Bridgetown we are encompassed on the east by the Belle Plantation and you will find that the Government has got a prescribed area all around Waterford up to the end of Codrington which has a total prohibition on building due to the conservation of the water resources. Then you have the area by Cave Hill which includes places like Wanstead, Rock Pleasant, The Mount, Oxnards; Husbands, Thorpes and Holders. Our plan is to house 25,000 people over the years in that area. We have a Land Acquisition Order in respect of Graeme Hall which was on the verge of being exploited. Our reason for the acquisition of Haggatts Factory is not simply because the people wished the factory; but in order to make the people psychologically happy, we bought the estates down there in St. Andrew.

I have never disguised the fact that Haggatts Factory is not an investment and no investor would put his money in that factory; but there are other considerations. I have never seen any landowners in Barbados give up anything out of which they were making money. Far from that, you cannot show me any landowners, people who were firmly entrenched and have their roots deep and their tentacles high in the economy of this country, giving up anything by gift or otherwise that they can make money out of. Must this Government sit down and wait until the whole of the wooden jungle of the New Orleans catches afire on one night and then we find that we have nowhere to put the people? Where are the people of Barbados to go? The average Barbadian has a reputation for being hard-working because he has no other alternative. He cannot go out into the forests and carve out an existence for himself like the homesteaders did in the United States of America. If you were to examine the social and economic structure in this island, you will find that the pattern has not been so radically changed over the past 100 years. Some people have inherited land, some people have won land, some people have been able to speculate and accumulate a little money and buy land and others have used the Courts to expropriate the legitimate owners of land, which is a disgrace to any civilised society.

Every member of the Legal Profession knows that that is correct. Any Barbadian who is over the age of 40 years will know what I am talking about. That has been going on within the past five or ten years; that has been going on comparatively recently where the Courts are used for the acquisition of land. Now we are offering a man £300 an acre for land on which we probably have to spend \$50,000 in order to get this land developed; but he is asking \$10,000 an acre for land which did not bring in any income over the past three years and which he acquired at a price which is less than one tenth of what the Government is offering him. Where is the injustice in this matter? The Department of Technical Co-operation has told us that we have \$2 million and you have to tell us by the 31st March whether the Government is providing the land for the site for the College of Arts and Science of the University of the West Indies. The Treasury will forfeit this money; so what are we going to protract negotiations for?
6.45 p.m.

As the hon. junior member for Bridgetown has explained, and he is a co-religionist, cohort and colleague of

the gentleman who feels that he is suffering an injustice — his fellow Councillor — when you are asking one price and the other person is offering another and you are so far apart, there is no point in negotiating at all, and that is why we have the Land Acquisition Act. This Government will withdraw this Resolution to acquire this land compulsorily or at all if any member can establish that the gentleman is getting less than he paid for the land. I do not know what he paid for it, but I will go further and take the risk and say that I will withdraw the Resolution if he is getting less than five times more than what he paid for the land. If he is getting less than five times more, I will have to advise my colleagues, whether or not they accept it, to withdraw the Resolution. So what is this nonsense they are talking about expropriation, 'unfairing' people and that kind of nonsense? There is no foundation for it at all.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to read something to hon. members now which they seem to be blissfully unaware of, and which is relevant to this issue here, because I venture to say that if the arbitrators carried out the letter of the law, the gentleman is not going to get anything like £150 an acre when we have offered him £300 an acre. The reason why I am going to read it is because this amendment passed through this House. The reason why I said that the attack being made today by people like the hon. junior member for St. Joseph, the hon. senior member for Bridgetown and the hon. junior member for Christ Church is purely personal, inquisitive, unjustified and unreasonable is that when this Act went through this House last year, no member of this House spoke. They voted for it and accepted it *in toto*, and no member of the Other Place spoke against it. The only person who spoke, as far as I can remember, is myself, when I got up and moved the passing of the Bill. I explained its implications and there was not one single criticism of it. It was duly seconded, put to the vote, and there was no debate on it at all, and you can check the records. About four or six weeks later it went up to what was then the Legislative Council, which is now the Senate, where all the landed gentry used to sit — and I use the past tense advisedly, because there are less of them in there now, thank God, than before; but when they had the majority of the landed gentry, vested commercial interests and land owner speculators in the Legislative Council, they approved of this Bill, and I am going to read it and show why I say that the gentleman could not get £150 an acre — and we are offering £300 — and they never said a mumbling word. I read where the Act said that no compensation shall be payable in respect of any hypothetical case on what you think you can do with the land, or because the Government needs it in a hurry, because the Government needs it for a University, or because the Government needs it because the Government feels there is a gold mine on it. Even if the Government felt so, if the Government had information that there was gold on that land and that the gold could bring in \$1 million a month, if you were not mining the gold, under the 1949 Act, you could not get any compensation.

I am serving notice, Mr. Speaker, that land owners in this island are very ill advised, when the Government is trying to be reasonable, to take land acquisition matters to arbitration. They had better go and read the law first. Section 3 of the 1953 amendment to the Act amends section 11 to which I referred which talks about no compensation for the use to which it is put, or because you feel it has a special value, and even that section was amended. By amending this Section, I feel that I have saved the Government of Barbados within the next three years about \$5 million. Even Section 11 as it was was not appreciated by members on the other side. They felt that if somebody was selling land in Christ Church and got so much, therefore they should get the same thing. This Section says that "Section 11 of the principal Act is amended by deleting therefrom subsection (1) and substituting therefor the following subsection..." Now subsection (1) said what a willing buyer would pay for that type of land. Let me make this abundantly clear: what I say here today or what we do under the Land Acquisition Act has got nothing whatsoever to do with two people who are negotiating a private contract. In other words, Sir, the Land Acquisition Act does not deal with private negotiations; it is for land acquisition

for public purposes. It could not be land acquisition for domestic reasons, or because somebody wants to put up a bay house and feels that this would be a good piece of land, and so he wants the Government to buy the bay house land and sell it back to him. I do not know if I hear the hon. senior member for Bridgetown murmuring. Maybe he knows of an instance, but I am not referring to any specific instance. Under the old Land Acquisition Act, the market value is what a willing seller would be willing to sell his land at, but they still had this provision that you did not get any special price because your grandson was going to start a housing estate, and industrial building site or build a hotel. In 1963, Section 11 was amended and this is how it reads now:-

"The value of the land shall, subject as hereinafter provided, be taken to be the amount" — I want hon. members to listen to this very carefully — "which the land, in its condition at the material time" — which is the date of the publication of the notice — "might be expected to realise if sold at that time in the open market by a willing seller for the purpose of being put to the same use to which such land was being put at the material time."

Let us therefore examine The Mount. The nineteen acres of rab land was being put to the use of rab land when the notice was published. As rab land, you could not raise two sheep on it; therefore of what value is that to anybody in this community? That is the only price the law will allow the arbitrators to award. That is only one section, but there are more coming. We go to people and say we do not want to invoke the Land Acquisition Act nor do we want them to lose money. We do not ask them how much they have paid for the land; we value it at the existing use value. We are not concerned with what you were going to do with it or what your grandson is going to do with it. We are concerned with what you are doing with it now, and what kind of returns you are getting from it. We say that we will pay you a reasonable amount of money so that if you invested that money you would get at least the equivalent income you are deriving from the land now. 6.55 p.m.

Now, let us take a plantation, for instance. If it is in the black soil area, you will get 20 to 25 tons of canes per acre. The highest average net profit made in Barbados over the past 25 years is \$5.04 on a ton of canes. Let us say that you have an acre of arable land. You can expect a net profit of \$125 from that acre of land per annum. Of course, that is if that land is efficiently farmed and the maximum possible use is being put to it. That is not for land which is lying down. You also have land which has given 40 tons of canes to the acre, but that is land in the red soil district; therefore, you get the highest return on land in the red soil district. You get more canes although you still get the same average net profit of \$5.04 per ton. Do not think that because you are in the red soil district, your profit on a ton of canes is going to be more than that of the person who has canes in the black soil district. Your special position is due to your tonnage — that is to say, the number of tons per acre and not the profit you get on the ton. The reason why I have gone to the red soil district is because you are not going to get \$125 per acre net profit; it should be in the vicinity of \$200 net profit per acre. One should not offer a sum of money which invested at the normal rates of interest would give you a lower return than your land at its existing use; therefore, anyone reading this amendment which I introduced would come to the conclusion that there is nothing iniquitous in it and that it was a fair amendment.

Now, let us say that you should get \$200 profit from an acre of land. Anybody in Barbados knows that land in St. George is worth \$2,500 an acre; therefore, the Government normally would go up to an owner of land in the red soil district and could not expect to offer that person less than £520 16s. 8d. for an acre of land, because if you did otherwise than that you would be actually causing a hardship on that man if he had to buy the equivalent somewhere else. That is the basis on which we place a ceiling.

These are the principles of the Land Acquisition Act as they exist today. Now, the owner of this land stopped farm-

ing this land, may be, because he found that he was losing money — and I say that, because he is one of the better agriculturists in this Island. If anybody knows how to get something out of land, I take it that he would know. Anyhow, he stopped farming this land. This is the policy as known as the "Slough of Despond."

The hon. member said that we were doing nothing to help; but under the Land Acquisition Act, if this Government were hard on people, we could have gone at Dover and got 40 acres at £300 per acre. We wanted it for a hotel and we could have gone there and taken over the whole area for less than £12,000 because of the existing use of it.

Now, the Act does not stop there. It goes on to say: "in ascertaining the value of such land regard shall be had to the net amount of any income derived from that land at the material time, and where no income is derived therefrom at that time, to the rent at which the land might, at the material time reasonably be expected to be let from year to year for the purpose of being put to the same use to which it was being put at that time;....."

How much rent would you get for the 18 acres at "The Mount" or how much would you get out of it if you kept it in the same condition? That is what the arbitrator has to ask himself. It is rab land now. If it were turned back to grazing sheep, what rent would a person get if he lived on it and wanted a little breathing space or if he wanted to keep a few chickens, sheep, pigs or goats grazing on it? What rent would he pay the owner per acre to keep it in the same condition in which it is now? Nothing. I only want to show hon. members how unreasonable people can be in Barbados. This land is without any electricity, any road or any single service near to it. It cannot be even rented out for a chattel house to put on it because there is better land close by, land where the people can get water and so on. This land is so inaccessible that you cannot even get it rented out in house spots at eight cents a week.

What are you going to pay for land in Barbados? Any hon. member here can ask the hon. senior member for St. Peter this, The Sugar Producers' Federation brought down here one of the most renowned economists in Canada. He was a man who has been Professor of Economics at the University of New Brunswick and at McGill and his name was Dr. Petrie. Giving evidence, not for the Barbados Workers' Union, or the Government of Barbados, but giving evidence for the Sugar Producers' Federation of Barbados, he said that the price of £200 paid for an arable acre of land in Barbados was too high and an uneconomic investment at the price. Now \$960 per acre was the fair price which other witnesses for the Sugar Producers' had given in evidence.
7.05 p.m.

That is before this Government started development in this country, before people saw the economy begin to move and the plans being drawn up for the benefit of the island. This Government is putting terrific pressure on landowners because we want living space for the people of this island. They are not talking about selling estates by the arable acre; they decide that on one of these days they will sell their sour grass acreage for building whereas before it was thrown in for nothing. There are more people who are working now than have ever worked before in the history of this island, and we are not going to allow three hundred and sixty people who own 80% of the land to exploit the other 230,000. I do not want to include Your Honour because that would be 85%. You do not do anything which is unjust to a person; but on the other hand, you have to make sure that this Government is here to stop the exploitation of anyone.

Mr. Speaker, you only hear about exploitation when somebody's corns are getting crushed; you do not hear about exploitation in other circumstances. There are people who feel that if a man is born in a house 16' x 9' no Government is to give him the opportunity of having a little more expansion, because he is a man living in a house 16' x 9', while they are the 300-acre men. The last Government reduced the size of a house spot from 2,400 square

feet to 1,600 or 1,800 square feet. They said that a house spot of the size of 1,600 or 1,800 square feet is quite enough for a man, now that was when the Labour Government was in power. You have an institution called a pit closet, and the Labour Government started a housing scheme and gave people pit closets because they are pit closet men. I would not use an expression which the hon. senior member for the City would use. (ASIDES) I have attacked the then Minister of Communications and Works and I told him that because he does not aspire to something it did not mean that other people in Barbados did not want to aspire to it; but if he gave that to the hon. junior member for St. Joseph, he would be happy. Politics is a question of what is the basic philosophy, but some people have not got any philosophy at all. Some of us have basic philosophies, and there are people who have a lot of money but no philosophy at all; those are the ones who do not want to hear of anything which challenges the sacred institution of private property. It does not matter how covetous you are; you can drive a man to commit suicide by putting him in a bad financial position, and that is regarded as good business ethics; but whenever you have to interfere with the sacred institutions, you hear this talk about robbing a poor man. I have never owned 18 acres of land in all my life; but I do not consider myself to be a poor man when I see how 200,000 people in Barbados have to live. I have been able to work and, by the sweat of my brow, to earn enough to pay for the ordinary necessities of life. Hon. members of this House cannot always pay a bill at the end of the month, but that does not mean that they are poor or that they are wealthy. It means that you have been able to keep your head above water in the peculiar circumstances in which we find ourselves in this country. How can you get a person who is representing Labour saying that because you give a man five times as much or more than what he paid for land, you are robbing him? I have already pointed out the provisions of the Land Acquisition Act, and at the time when the Act was being passed in 1949, not one of their colleagues on that side said anything against the Act. When we come to the amending Act of 1963 at Chapter 7 we find Section 11 of the principal Act is amended by deleting therefrom subsection (1) and substituting therefor the following sub-section:-

"The value of the land shall, subject as hereinafter provided, be taken to be the amount which the land, in its condition at the material time, might be expected to realise if sold at that time in the open market by a willing seller for the purpose of being put to the same use to which such land was being put at the material time;"

Sub-section (b) of the amendment reads as follows:-

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

We have to make these things clear. You have somebody asking for \$1 million for 21 acres of land! What is the use to which that land is now being put? The use to which that land is now being put is that it has coconut trees and crab holes. If, for instance, a coconut tree yielded him an income of \$30 provided it was bearing — and he had 200 coconut trees, that would be 200 coconut trees multiplied by thirty which would be an amount of \$6,000.
7.15 p.m.

I happen to know that the gentleman did not derive much income from the coconut trees at all. If he had planted 200 coconut trees, you could say he was getting an income of \$30 x 200, and that would bring \$6,000 per year. Now the amount you would have to invest at 8 per cent to give \$6,000 would be \$75,000. Now what use was the land being put to? There were some 30 or 40 coconut trees, a few crab holes and a few casuarinas, and he probably picked the coconuts for his own domestic use. Compare that with \$1 million in a small place like Barbados. What we will have to introduce here shortly are developed valuation taxes. We will have to value the land and say that if you

were using it properly, employing people and so on, you would be getting such and such an income, and therefore this is the tax which you would have to pay on it. Then you will see people develop land — and not only develop it, but when the Government came in to acquire, they could not have any quarrel on getting a realistic value.

Mr. Speaker, too many people sit down and look through the jealousies waiting for somebody to drop out of a plane and award a big lot of money for land which they are not putting to any economic use. We cannot afford to have land not being put to economic use in a small island like Barbados where we have to use all the resources at our disposal; so the Act is very fair, because if you put land to economic use and get the best possible return, under the Act the arbitrators cannot award you any sum inferior to the economic rate of return over the investment you were getting for the land. However you look at it, you cannot accuse the Government of trying to victimise anyone. I have read paragraph (a) where in the first place compensation is based on the existing use of the land, and paragraph (b) which explains about the net amount of income derived from that land as a safeguard for the land owner, and now I come to paragraph (c) which says "for the purposes of this subsection, land shall be deemed to be used for agricultural purpose unless the party claiming compensation proves to the satisfaction of the appropriate authority that at the material time such land was being used for a purpose other than agricultural purposes."

Now let us examine the present subject matter of the debate. We say that we are going to compensate you for land on the basis that it is agricultural land. I want to ask any Barbadian in this Chamber a simple rhetorical question. In Barbados you can have land either with a building on it, or you can have land which is agricultural land, or what we call rab land. Which is more valuable, the rab land or the agricultural land? The answer is the agricultural land. So what do we say? We say we will consider that all land is agricultural land; but if you want more than what we would normally pay for agricultural land, — and this is where it does not pay them to challenge the Government's offer — you would have to establish to us that you had a gold mine or manjak mine or a quarry or something like that on this land and then we will compensate on its existing use as other than agricultural land. But we will give you the benefit of the doubt and say the land is agricultural land. You have to prove to us that it was not agricultural land. If the owner of this property is going to prove to the Government that it was not agricultural land, he is going to be worse off than if he sits back and accepts the £300 an acre that we paid within the past two months. We have taken over 400 acres of land completely surrounding this area. It was good agricultural land yielding a profit for its owner, including dwelling houses in a good state of repair. We paid £300 an acre for the land with dwelling houses thereon, but we were not concerned about that. It may have been worth £10,000, but that was a freely negotiated sale by people who work hard on their land and were getting an income, with a whole family living out of that land. But a man who is drawing a pension, although he paid about \$50 an acre for the land, wrote that nonsense in the newspaper!

It is a pity, Mr. Speaker, that the newspapers in this country only take an interest in the Legislature since some of their leader writers are in the Senate, and you would believe they are the only people who make speeches in the Senate. But you can talk from now until tomorrow morning, and unless you have the influence of the hon. senior member for Bridgetown where you can tell them to see that this thing gets in the newspaper, you could be speaking in Outer Mongolia to some peasants about sheep farming with no radio, sea or air communication between the two countries 17,000 miles apart; but I will get on the records what our principles are, and I do not care whether they publish them or not. For instance you will find that a Messenger to one of the lawyers in Bridgetown, a man working for \$7 a week is given prominence as a columnist in one of the daily papers at least three or four times a week, but not the people who are representing the people in this country when they have to speak on philosophical and economic issues confronting this country. People like the hon. senior mem-

ber for St. Peter and all the members on this side have something to contribute. The Chief Justice of Barbados would make pronouncements on the Bench — not in the course of trial, but at the time when members are called to the Bar — on the legal issues confronting the country, and what he thinks should be done about them. In any civilised country, in a place like the United Kingdom, all the national dailies would carry what the Chief Justice had to say about law reform and would give it prominence for a week, and all the weekly papers of importance would come out and say something about this, unless he is a congenital idiot, it is worthwhile paying some attention to what that person said. The Chief Justice can go unheard and unread, but a \$7 a week messenger gets a column four times a week!

7.25 p.m.

You take up the newspaper and you see the headlines of "Conductress pays \$2.50" stretched right across it, and they think that that is something which appeals to the people of this country.

As I have said, Sir, I do not want to prolong this debate, but I consider this as one of the most important debates which has ever taken place in this Chamber in relation to the basic social and economic philosophies of the several political parties in this Island. This is a speech which normally I should have been making last year because I should be expecting the criticism on the Land Acquisition Bill then; but you get this today because a land owner decided to write to the newspaper. It is more over contemptuous for any person who is dealing with a matter such as this, which can be said to be *sub judice* in the loose sense of the term, to try to whip up support in the columns of the daily Press when the particular matter has to be discussed in the Legislature on the same day. If he wants to confide in his colleague and they have certain points where they can charge the Government with corrupt conduct, he can tell them those points. It is the duty of representatives of the people to expose these matters. But you should not get up and say, as the hon. junior member for St. Joseph was heard to expound, that to offer £300 for land in Barbados which is five or ten times that which was paid for it a few years ago is robbing the poor man. That is cheap politics which no man in Barbados should support. The whole fact of the matter is that the hon. member will break all the existing laws relating to Sunday closing of shops and he is not concerned with the poor man. As a matter of fact, he has sold his estate already. But what about the thousands of people who want to buy land, the people who have over 2,000 applications at the Housing Authority, the middle-class man, the Civil Servant, the man who is working land for a contractor? What is reasonable for him? That is the test. What is it for the man who has to look for books for his children at least once every year. What chance has he got under this system of ever owning a stake in the soil of Barbados? How is it going to happen if a man has rab land and gets no income from it — and it is doubtful whether he did not lose money on it before — says that the Government is unreasonable if they offer him the same price which they offered a large plantation? This is an important debate from that angle because it highlights the different approach of the members on this side from the members on that side. We are not here to conserve any institution; we are here to conserve in essence the rule of law, and nothing else.

I am going to say this: a lot of people do not realise how lucky they are to be living in Barbados because the same thing would not be tolerated in certain countries which hold themselves to be more democratic than we are. Do you think that the hon. junior member for St. George, if he was in the United States of America, which is supposed to be God's own country, or even if he were in England, Belgium, or France, would get up in a Legislative Chamber, and say, what he said about burning down the island without the security guards escorting him out of the Place? There is a limit to that kind of thing in other countries. Have you ever heard of anybody in Barbados going to jail for 99 years for not paying income tax? That is the sort of thing which happens in America. If that is so, you must realise that we are living in one of the most democratic countries of the world and you must realise that this Government is extremely

tolerant. If some of those members were in some of those States which want to get on in a hurry, they would not get away in their trying to sabotage the Government. A million acres of land was taken over by the Government of Kenya from the white settlers. That is land which I saw myself. When I first saw the land in Kenya, I said to other people that I now understand why the Europeans do not want to get out of Kenya. There is no fertile land in Barbados when you compare our land with that. We are living on land with only two feet six inches of top soil. What did the Government of Kenya with the approval of Her Majesty's Government pay for that land? They paid \$120 for an acre, and that land is land which produces eighty times as much as any sort of land in Barbados.
7.35 p.m.

They do not want them to own a Radio Station or anything like that; these people are not the property-owning type; they are the 16' x 9' house-renting type. Neither directly or indirectly are they supposed to aspire to these things. This Government is purchasing 1,000 acres of land for Barbadians; we have purchased a sugar factory for the people of Barbados. When we took over Graeme Hall Estate you could not find space even to walk up there far less to purchase unless you were going to see the hon. junior member for Christ Church. For the time being, we will leave out the Belle Estate, but I would serve notice on the Hon. Gerald Lascelles that if the Belle Estate were suitable for University purposes we would have gone there. If the Chief Engineer of the Waterworks Department and the Town and Country Planning Officer had allowed anybody to develop the area around there, the Belle Estate would have been taken over; but I would say that the Belle would not pay us to take over because we cannot even build one house on it. We are serving notice on these people now that they had better deal with the Government on proper terms. We cannot spread in the direction of the Belle, and therefore we had to go to Grazettes and the Pine and such areas because the people must be given an opportunity to acquire something, and they must have the knowledge and satisfaction that they are owning something for themselves at a reasonable cost.

Mr. Speaker, I ask this question: Which working man in Barbados can afford to pay 60c a square foot for land which is situated anywhere in Bridgetown? If the owner of this land had constructed a road on it, in that instance he would not be asking for 24 cents a square foot, but he would be asking for sixty cents a square foot. He is now asking for 24 cents a square foot for this land because he has not developed it. He is like the man who hid his talent and then went and buried it and now he wants us to tell him: "Well done, thou good and faithful servant, enter thou into the Kingdom of heaven".

Section 3 of the Land Acquisition (Amendment) Act of 1963 which amends Section 1 of the Principal Act says this in Sub-section (1) (c) (11) --

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

Mr. Speaker, I will not worry hon. members with all the provisions of the Land Acquisition Act. The reason why I dealt with it at all is because I heard the hon. junior member for Christ Church say what the gentleman intended to do with the land. He was being deprived of something hypothetical; if he sat down on this land for another fifty years you could never tell what he would be able to do with it. We have to relate compensation to the conditions which exist in 1964, and nobody has any reason to be perturbed by this newspaper irritation. We have had some portions of land which we have acquired and we are coming down here next week for more. In this particular instance, quite apart from a few filling stations and a refuse dump for the Bridgetown City Council, what has the owner of this land done with it?

We do welcome the Canadians as visitors to this island, but we do not welcome them to drive Barbadians to the

interior of the land and to set artificial prices for land. A man will have one hundred acres of land and he may have gas stations and God knows what else, but what is this land being used for? As I said, Sir, it is being used for a refuse dump for the Bridgetown City Council to breed flies and they are being fed with concentrated foods. That is what is being done, and therefore do not let us hear any nonsense next week about this Government robbing the poor people when we come here with a Resolution for the acquisition of "Wanstead" and "Rock Pleasant". Barbados should be proud of having the University of the Eastern Caribbean here and our contribution is 10% of the total contributions which will be made towards this University.

In the United Kingdom there is no agricultural land which is sold for more than one hundred and fifty pounds an acre; that is the price of agricultural land in the United Kingdom and we have a number of cases of that. In Kenya some one million acres of land have been taken over and the Conservative Government paid \$120 an acre for land; and now we are being criticised when we, in Barbados, have not got the natural resources which other places have got. We have never received a gift of £25 million from the United Kingdom. We are offering people £300 an acre for land and we are being accused of robbing poor people who have estates of 100 acres. We are paying this gentleman more than six times as much as what he paid for this land.
7.45 p.m.

We are paying him more than six times what he paid for it ten years ago, and all he has done is to be the receptacle for scavenging trucks. We offered him £300 and he refused. Must we go on to negotiate? Those are the facts behind the Government's actions. Must this Government sit down here and see the whole community held up to ransom because we have inherited a certain system of land tenure and land ownership in this country, and people who do not push a stroke of work and who would like to have a little money to invest now expect us to pay the same as a Canadian investor would pay? If we had to pay \$1.00 a square foot, we would never be able to put up a public building in this place. If a man cannot save \$1.00 a week for a meeting turn or get a Civic card, how is he going to own anything in a country like this unless Government uses its powers to make sure that there is some kind of distribution that people would have a stake in this country? You either have to choose this, or when we may not be here you will get a situation such as you have in some other countries. You have to choose the democratic way where you are protected by the law. It is not a complicated issue as far as we are concerned.

Mr. Speaker, I very much regret that this debate has lasted such a long time, but as I said before, I would have expected an argument on the principle of land acquisition last year, but not after both Houses of the Legislature have unanimously agreed to the principles. You will see that perhaps we are not a zealous enough custodian of the public purse, because we should be imposing the letter of the law; but the same people whom you hear fulminating against the Government for robbing poor people, when we managed to get a property, not rabland, at a price which was less than what the owner of this land wants, said that we were paying too much money for what is now the Regional Headquarters of the Eastern Caribbean which is one mile from Bridgetown. The amount of land at Sherbourne was 7 1/2 acres including dwelling houses, out buildings, lawns, gardens and everything, and when we acquired it for something like \$67,000, they said that we were paying too much money for it. That is the price we paid just over two years ago, and prices have not risen in the meantime. The price which we paid for that is less than this gentleman is asking, and we were criticised then for paying too much for that. If we paid too much for Sherbourne when we paid \$67,000 for over 300,000 square feet of land, what should we pay for the Mount? The Mount is hardly worth a sermon.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I think that any speech on this matter will be in the nature of an anticlimax, and therefore I do not propose to say anything much. As a matter of fact, it is unnecessary so to do for the simple reason that the basic concepts underlying the proposals

of the Government and demonstrated in the Resolution before the House have been ably set out by the hon. senior member for St. John. But before the matter goes to the vote, I do feel that I should express my complete dissatisfaction over the implication made by the hon. junior member for St. Joseph earlier today to the effect that the decision compulsorily to acquire this land was the result of some personal hostility against the owner. As a matter of fact, the hon. junior member for St. Joseph went so far as to say that in another Resolution similarly compulsorily to acquire land the name of the owner of the land was mentioned, whereas in this one we did not mention the name of the owner, and there was an ulterior motive for so doing. Hon. members, I am sure, are aware that the Government is not activated by any personal hostility to Mr. Haynes. As an individual, we respect Mr. Haynes. As a matter of fact, we have appointed him as a member of an important Government Committee. He is a member of our Committee investigating the social security proposals; but when it comes to a matter of acquiring land for this purpose, it is an entirely different matter, and the hon. junior member for St. Joseph would just be up to his usual unsavoury tricks in accusing the Government for acting in a manner like this, because they were particularly hostile to the owner of the land. The basic principles so far as the Land Acquisition Act is concerned have, as I said, been set out by the Premier in his speech which has just come to an end; but if the facts were as simple as this, for over four years over 1,000 acres of land had been frozen in this area. The Government had made it clear in no uncertain terms that this land would be required for housing and other development purposes. We acquired a considerable portion at a price of around £300 an acre. Had we gone and paid more than this for any portion of the remainder, the hon. junior member for St. Joseph would have been the first man to come in here and accuse the Government of partiality - or even worse - when we acquired some of the land at a given figure and then gone and paid more for the remainder or some part of the remainder.

What makes the matter even worse, Sir, from many points of view is that he got in here today thinking that he was getting somewhere and accused us of trying to rob somebody and resorting to the Land Acquisition Act to squeeze land out of somebody's hand, and he went so far as to call a member of this Chamber a suckling thing for opposing the logicity of his remarks.

Mr. SPEAKER: May I point out that that remark was withdrawn?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I am glad it was withdrawn because we are not concerned with little sucklings pigs on this side of the Chamber or big sow pigs on the other side. 7.55 p.m.

When we come in here, we want to come and judge the matter really on an impartial basis, and I do suggest that in the future the hon. junior member for St. Joseph desist from these malicious, unfounded and unfair accusations against the Government and endeavour to ascertain the facts of the case and the facts of the laws of this Island.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the House does not mean to say that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph has made malicious statements.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I do not think that I can be interpreted to mean to say that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph is malicious.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am sure that the Hon. Leader of the House is experienced enough not to make that accusation but he may be misunderstood.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Some of the inferences drawn by the hon. member seem to have some malicious intent. Added to that, the hon. junior member for St. Joseph has displayed such woeful ignorance of the 1949 Land Acquisition Act, to say nothing of the amendment of 1963 to it, that it is time to question where would the people be if they did not make this change. If you heard the hon. member today, you would not think that he had a single thing to do with the introduction of this 1949 Land Acquisition Act. You would have thought that it was brought in by some external source.

Sir, I think enough has been said on this matter and that nothing more needs to be said. The House, I am sure, will be grateful to the hon. senior member for St. John for the able manner in which he has taken up the case and for the proper attention being paid to the location of land at a price commensurate with what the average person in the Island is capable of paying for land.

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

THE ADJOURNMENT

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, that brings Government Business to an end for today, and I now beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next, 30th June, 1964, at 2.30 p.m.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I second the motion. I think that I ought to mention that it is my desire to try and get the financial proposals for the year presented to the Legislature before the end of June and therefore, since next Tuesday is the end of June, I propose to deliver my budget Speech on that day.

I was under the impression that the Hon. Leader of the House had made the adjournment for an earlier time than 2.30 p.m. In view of what I have just said, the hon. member is willing to accept an amendment of his motion for 12.00 o'clock (noon).

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the Hon. Leader of the House asking leave to substitute "12.00 o'clock (noon) for 2.30 o'clock" to his motion?

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

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

The question that the House do now adjourn until Tuesday next, 30th June, 1964, at 12.00 o'clock (noon) was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

8.05 p.m.