

X

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION OF 1961-66

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 26th May, 1964.

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

PRESENT

His Honour J. E. T. BRANCKER, Q.C., (*Speaker*):
Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, (*Minister of Development, Trade, Labour and Social Security*); Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P.; Mr. F. C. GODDARD; Mr. F. E. MILLER; Hon. C. E. TALMA, (*Minister of Communications and Works*); Mr. J. W. CORBIN; Mr. W. R. COWARD; Mr. R. St.C. WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE; Mr. L. A. LYNCH, J.P.; and Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, (*Minister of Health, Housing, Local Government and Community Development*).

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minutes of the meeting of 12th May have been circulated amongst hon. members, and if there is no objection, they will be confirmed.

There being no objection, I declare those Minutes duly to be confirmed.

ABSENCE OF CLERK

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House with regret of the indisposition of the Clerk, Mr. H. O. St.C. Cumberbatch, who for that reason will be unable to attend this afternoon's sitting.

APPOINTMENT OF CLERK

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Clerk of the House, I beg to move that Mr. H. L. Thomas be appointed to act in his place for today's sitting.

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

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

APPOINTMENT OF DEPUTY CLERK

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, for the same reason, I beg to move that Miss Norma Maynard be appointed to act as Deputy Clerk for today's sitting.

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

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

PAPERS LAID

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

Message No. 9/1964 regarding the absence of H.E. the Governor from the Island and the appointment of Senator Sir Grey Massiah, C.B.E., as Governor's Deputy during that absence.

The Customs Duties (Construction and Repair of Ships) Order, 1964.

Statement showing the Net Customs and Excise receipts for the month ended 30th April, 1964.

And on my own behalf, I am commanded to lay the following:-

The Drawback of Duties (Containers) Regulations, 1964.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries, I am commanded to lay the following:-

Statement relating to a Scheme for Incentive payments for agricultural production.

The Statement reads as follows:-

A sum of \$26,500 has been included in the Capital Estimates for 1964/65, under Head 7, Agriculture, Item 9, Farming Incentives Scheme, to finance a scheme to provide incentives to farmers by way of loans and grants to induce them to increase agricultural productivity. The scheme which the Government proposes to institute for providing these incentives is attached for the information of the Legislature.

The purpose of the scheme is to induce a substantial expansion in crops other than sugar cane. It is recognised that any major change in the pattern of farming, especially in the establishment of pangola grass pastures and the production of livestock requires a comparatively heavy initial capital expenditure during which the farmer will be without an income from the particular crop. It is for this reason that incentives based on supervised credit and free grants will be provided to induce the change.

It is proposed that the grants and loans will be paid through the Agricultural Credit Bank after certification and after each phase of the appropriate works has been completed. This will ensure that loans to the farmer are used to the best advantage and for the purposes for which they have been provided. Annual production targets for the

various crops will be determined in consultation with the Barbados Marketing Corporation to ensure that the acreage planted in the various crops conform to the potential demand both for local consumption and for export.

The Scheme will be put into operation on the 15th June, 1964.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES.

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

A Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of a parcel of land situate at Constitution Road and at Martin-dale's Road, St. Michael.

A Resolution to approve of the compulsory acquisition of a parcel of land situate at Murphy's Bottom, St. Andrew.

A Resolution to approve the sale by Public Auction instead of by tender of the house with land attached situate near the Holy Trinity Boys' School, St. Philip.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following:

A Resolution to place the sum of \$2,000 at the disposal of the Cabinet to supplement the Estimates 1964-65 Part I - Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1964-65, No. 5, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

I should like to ask leave of the House to deal with this Resolution in all its stages today as it is a matter of urgency. The papers have already been circulated.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICES

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

To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:

Was the Honourable Premier's visit to London on the most recent occasion a private visit or one on public business?

2. If the latter, will the Honourable Premier say what was the nature of this business, and the outcome of discussions affecting this Island?
2.55 p.m.

To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:

Is it a fact that the Jackson Report on Local Government has been received by the Government?

2. If so, will the Government publish at an early date the findings contained in the Report for the benefit of the people of this Island?

Also,

To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:

Will Government consider the advisability, now that a vast lot of land will be available through the opening up of the East Coast Road, of setting aside a few acres of land in the area of the East Coast Road for erecting a modern building, playfield and Park for the uses of the people in St. Joseph and the Island as a whole, in view of the fact that the Bathsheba Social Centre building, St. Joseph, is in a very bad state of disrepair, and there is no proper place for a playing field?

Mr. COWARD: To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:

Is Government aware of the fact that the Post Box at Mayers Corner in the Parish of St. Joseph has been out of order for some time?

2. If the answer is in the affirmative, will Government cause same to be put in order with as little delay as possible?

Mr. LYNCH: To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:

Is the Minister aware that the ban on the importation of fruit from Florida imposed as a protection against Mediterranean Fruit Fly has been lifted about six months ago?

2. Is the Minister aware that there was a dearth of grapes, apples, plums, peaches, pears etc., both at Easter and Whitsuntide this year, because of the ban on importation?

3. Will the Minister explain why it is that despite the lifting of the temporary ban and the subsequent resumption of exportations of fruit from Florida, not only to the other States but also to countries overseas, no steps have been taken locally to rescind the ban, so that fruit from Florida where it is cheaper because of lower transportation cost might be imported into the Island?

RESOLUTION OF SYMPATHY re PASSING OF Mr. S. C. C. GREENIDGE

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, before the business of the House is commenced, I would like to pay tribute to the passing of two gentlemen of this country - separately of course - one of whom was an honourable member of this House and the other a Librarian.

I should like first to deal with the passing of the late Mr. S. C. C. Greenidge who was a former member of this House. He sat in this Chamber as the junior member for St. John for two years - 1940 to 1942, and then in other capacities he served this country well. He was a very successful planter. He sat in the Vestry of the parish, not only as a Vestryman but as Churchwarden, and from information which I have received he joined the Colours during the First World War and served his King and country during that period.

Sir, he was a very respected member of this House and although he did not speak very often when he was a member of this House, his contributions were listened to with a certain amount of respect, and during his rather short stay in the House, he made some mark on the country concerned.

For a number of years, he was not very active in public life and he succumbed, after a rather trying illness, last night. In view of the fact that he made some contribution to the welfare of this colony, I move that the following Resolution be passed and a copy of it be forwarded to his nearest relatives.

The Resolution reads as follows:-

BE IT RESOLVED that this House place on record its profound sympathy with the relatives of the late Samuel Clyde Clarke Greenidge, a former member of this Assembly, on the occasion of his death;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that a copy of this Resolution be forwarded to his relatives.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I rise to second this Resolution and I must say that we will never get accustomed to death. In seconding this Resolution of Sympathy with respect to the passing of a former member of this House, the late Mr. S. C. C. Greenidge, I would just say that I knew this gentleman for many years and most particularly in his service in Local Government administration. I know that the people of St. John would miss him in this respect and I believe that they are the poorer by his passing. He was familiarly known in that parish and he was a very approachable man. His service in Local Government administration brought him eventually to this House and, as the hon. senior member for St. Philip said, he also joined the Colours and served in the First World War. He was also a planter.

Sir, the late Mr. S. C. C. Greenidge came from a distinguished family. I think most of us are acquainted with the Greenidges. Sir, I understand that he was ill for some

time and I agree with the Hon. Leader of the House that this Resolution of Sympathy should be passed in respect of his services to the country.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I associate myself with the remarks by the other hon. members on the passing of the late Mr. S. C. C. Greenidge. On several occasions, I have sat and discussed matters with him and I gratefully appreciated the interesting way in which he discussed them.

The late Mr. S. C. C. Greenidge has made a name for himself in public life, to say nothing of his private life according to the ideal which he pursued.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my Party, we share the regret at the passing of the late Mr. S. C. C. Greenidge and join the Hon. Leader of the House in this Resolution of sympathy.
3.05 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: Before I put the question for the passing of this Resolution, let me be permitted to associate myself with the remarks and the sentiments which have been expressed by hon. members in relation to the passing of Mr. S. C. C. Greenidge who was a Member of this House for a short period during which I had the privilege of membership of this Chamber. In connection with the passing of this Resolution, I ask hon. members in the usual way to indicate their assent by standing in their places for two minutes.

Hon. members stood in their places for two minutes as requested by His Honour the Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: I shall give instructions that the necessary letters of condolence be sent to the relatives of the late Mr. S. C. C. Greenidge in accordance with this Resolution.

RESOLUTION OF SYMPATHY *re* PASSING OF Mr. A. J. CADDLE

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Another passing to which I am sure hon. members would like me to refer, is that of Mr. Arthur James Caddle, who was the Head Messenger and Librarian of this House from 1911 to 1948 — a span of 37 years. I did not know Mr. Caddle in this House for the entire period during which he served the Assembly, but I knew him for a great part of the period; and I should like to say that he was an extremely capable, loyal and well-informed servant of this House. As a matter of fact, he could be characterised as a walking encyclopaedia on matters relating to this Chamber. There was no subject relating to the history of this Chamber with which Mr. Caddle was not acquainted, and that is saying quite a lot. Furthermore he had a most remarkable memory; he could remember almost every important matter which was discussed during his term of office. Furthermore, he was, I would say, an exceptionally well-informed historian in so far as documents relating to the history of this Chamber were concerned. I would say that he made it a lot easier for every single member of this House, especially the young members who were coming in. If you wanted information on any matter of procedure and what not, you need not go either to the Clerk or to the Speaker; you could consult Mr. Caddle. If you wanted information on any particular debate of historical sequence, if you wanted yourself to be informed as to how you should proceed on certain matters, you could ask Mr. Caddle. I say, without in any way commenting adversely on the service of the present servants of the House, that if they were to serve us no less than how Mr. Caddle served the House in his time, well then, they would have served us exceedingly well.

Hon. members of all shades of political opinion were proud to regard Mr. Caddle as their adviser, their legislative consultant and friend, and when the time came, as it naturally must come to all of us, for him to retire from service, we all felt his going, knowing full well that it would be an exceedingly difficult task to replace Mr. Caddle so long as this Chamber lasts. I have no doubt that

in loyalty of service and in quality of service, that of Mr. Caddle as Head Messenger and Librarian will rank for all time in the records of this House as one of the most outstanding in this particular position. Mr. Caddle's death at the age of 69 or 70 years is sincerely to be regretted, and I hope that all of us will pay tribute here this afternoon to the relatives and those who were close to Mr. Caddle for his devotion and loyalty and outstanding service to this Chamber or to the Legislature of this island. Mr. Caddle's service was deeply appreciated by those who knew him and served with him; the sacrifice which he made, the time which he spent, the energy which he gave and the capacity which he brought to the execution of his duties were deeply appreciated by all who knew him, and we all deeply regret the fact that the passing of the years compelled his retirement when apparently he was still in the full vigour of his manhood. May I say, Sir, that I request the support of hon. members in the passing of this Resolution by their standing? The Resolution reads as follows:-

"BE IT RESOLVED that this House place on record its profound sympathy with the relatives of the late Arthur James Caddle, a former Head Messenger and Librarian of this Assembly, on the occasion of his death;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that a copy of this Resolution be forwarded to his relatives."

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I beg to second that. Mr. Speaker, Arthur Caddle was Librarian of this House, and when he resigned from that post he was indeed, as the Hon. Leader of the House has said, a walking encyclopaedia. It was indeed a pleasure to talk to him; indeed Mr. Caddle, who had just passed his allotted span, was known to those of us in this Chamber before we became members of this Chamber.
3.15 p.m.

As the hon. member said, Mr. Caddle worked for this Assembly from 1911 to 1948, and indeed to me one of the most redeeming features about his service was the fact that here was a man who had been called upon several times by the Marshal to eject persons from the Gallery of the House, whom afterwards he saw sit around the Table of this House; and he was able to adapt himself to the changing circumstances of the times and treat such persons with the same respect that he felt was due to the former members of the House. That to my mind was a great and most redeeming feature about Mr. Caddle, for indeed when I came in here, I happened to have been among those who, when in the Gallery of the House, at times forgot we were only in here on sufferance and cheered and were asked to leave, and Mr. Caddle was among those who would ask us to go. However, when we came in here as members, Mr. Caddle never thought that we were among those who sat in the Gallery, but treated us with the same respect that he had been accustomed to treating members of this House whom he found here from 1911 to 1940, when you yourself, Mr. Speaker, first came to this Chamber. Even the advent of Party politics made no difference to Mr. Arthur Caddle, and you will recall that in 1948 when there were sharp and serious divisions whenever you called upon Mr. Caddle to find something for you or to help you with some debate which had taken place in this Chamber, he was always willing and at your service.

I think, Sir, that Mr. Caddle's devotion to duty could be emulated by many a Government servant, especially in these days of Party politics, for indeed no one could even detect on what side Mr. Caddle would be in the execution of his duty. It is very regrettable that having served for 37 years and retired only in 1948, he has passed on so quickly, because when last I spoke to him it seemed as though Mr. Caddle was still possessed, as the last speaker has said, of his mental faculties and could still discuss with you various debates and who initiated debates on particular subjects. Although you can get men today of the calibre and sometimes even better, I hardly think that Mr. Caddle's devotion and loyalty to duty can be surpassed by anyone in the Service today.

I therefore have much pleasure in seconding this Resolution to his family.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, the passing of Mr. Arthur Caddle will be for us an indelible record. His attention to the duties of his office, and the position sometimes occupied by other people give us a feeling that he was of a rank which you would not want to discard or dismiss and get rid of. As a matter of fact, when I was elected to this Chamber in 1948, Caddle was himself a personality, a man of character; and although simple and modest in things he felt, it was never imposed by practice or even force that he should serve you. I must not refuse to name the greatness in this simple and modest soul. What I do remember was my first contact with Mr. Caddle when I was in search through the archives in this Chamber of information about the stained glass windows, and he was such a capable person in so far as what was taking place in these buildings was concerned, and indeed I remember him with a joy and happiness. That is how I describe his enthusiasm to assist me in the information I required about the stained glass windows. Mr. Caddle, no doubt, has carried with him a lot of memories which various members of this Chamber share. There is much that can be said, but it is not always the best to say all the things you feel about an individual and particularly a great soul such as Caddle, and the contribution he has made to the country through the services to the members and the Chamber generally.

With those few remarks, I share with the other members, the Leader of the House and the Leader of the Opposition, the sentiments which have been expressed on the passing of this Resolution by this Chamber.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Speaker, I too join in this Resolution which has for its object the forwarding of a note of sympathy to the relatives of the late Mr. Arthur Caddle. I cannot pretend to know this gentleman when he served as Messenger of this Chamber, but I certainly saw much of him after he had retired. He was an extremely jovial personality, as I got to know after I entered the House, and I remember his very many excursions here in the outer precincts of the Chamber during debates, and I remember very many of his anecdotes which he used to recite to me regarding his experience as a Messenger of this Chamber. I think Mr. Caddle retired during the time of my predecessor in the Chair, and so I cannot claim that intimate knowledge of him as hon. members who have been here before me are able to claim; but I know from the passing of such a character that we ought to show our sympathetic appreciation of the loss which his family has sustained; and so I join in giving my assent to this Resolution as I know I should. I can appreciate what hon. members who have had personal contact with him as a servant of this House have said, but I cannot speak of him as a Messenger; I must speak of him as a very jovial visitor on occasions to this Chamber.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Speaker, after listening to the various members speaking on behalf of these two deceased persons, I know, Sir, that there must be something good that this House has to record.
3.25 p.m.

There is one of the members whom I do not know, but I would just say "Blessed are those who have not seen but yet believe." After hearing the character of these persons who have passed on, I must say that we are only partaking of the fruit from the tree and we know that every good tree bringeth forth good fruit.

I must say, Mr. Speaker, when I heard that the person who was Messenger was elevated to Librarian, it only shows the character of the man. I am so glad to know that this man has left something good for us to follow. Surely, we are enjoying the fruits of the labours of these two persons today. It is their fruits which are keeping us alive today. Whether or not the other member was a planter, he was a politician and however little was their contribution, by their contribution we are reaping their fruits. I think that lots of boys from Harrison College who are now beginning to

serve must take pattern from persons like these who have passed to the Beyond. They should take in their bosom to do something good for the community as these people have done and who have caused us to be in existence as we are today. I hope that these young boys who are in good positions today would so serve that they leave behind some good mark.

Sir, I am glad for the privilege today to co-operate with the other hon. members who have spoken concerning this Resolution, and I do hope that all of us who are occupied in this House of Assembly, when the time comes, when we may have to retire, some good remark would be said of us. But it all depends on the work which we have done. Our works will follow us. By our fruits we are known. Sir, I wholeheartedly support this Resolution.

Mr. SPEAKER: Before this Resolution is passed, I would crave the opportunity to associate myself with the tribute paid to the late Mr. Arthur James Caddle. I knew him personally. He was an officer of this Chamber and he was always helpful, co-operative, informative and knowledgeable, and because of his attributes, members benefited from his experience and his assistance in matters parliamentary.

In accordance with traditions of this Chamber, I will ask hon. members to signify their assent to this Resolution by standing in their places for two minutes.

After two minutes' silence.

Mr. SPEAKER: Direction will be given for copies of this Resolution to be forwarded to the nearest relatives of the late Mr. Caddle.

RESOLUTION *re* LEGISLATION OF GENERAL COVERAGE FOR WORKERS SEVERED FROM EMPLOYMENT

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day under Private Members' Business, is under the name of the hon. senior member for St. Peter and it is to move the passing of a Resolution *re* legislation of general coverage to ensure that workers, severed from employment through no fault of their own, be adequately compensated.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, in giving notice of this Resolution, I have no apology to make at this time in bringing it to the Chamber because I am satisfied in my mind that in a general way this Island is in need of legislation of this nature to do what this Resolution proposes.

The text of the Resolution is as follows:-

WHEREAS the workers in Barbados recognise the inevitability of change and progress;

AND WHEREAS the workers know from bitter experience that economic or industrial re-organisation, though perhaps in the long-term interest of the community, may nevertheless work grave hardship upon individual workers who lose their employment as a result;

AND WHEREAS workers are satisfied that by the application of forethought and an enlightened consideration of the needs of the individual some of the worst features of industrial changes may be mitigated;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the House of Assembly request the Government to consider as an urgent requirement of employment policy the enactment of legislation of general coverage to ensure that workers, severed from employment through no fault of their own, be adequately compensated.

Mr. Speaker, when I gave notice of this Resolution at the beginning of this Session and I was prepared at the last meeting of the House to deal with it, I was then informed by the acting Leader of the House that he was not prepared to reply if I proceeded with the Resolution. Sir,

I hope the Government is prepared today to answer, and whether they are or not, I am going to say that in my opinion the facts are inescapable.

Sir, I do not believe in this loose system of unplanned society in which swift economic and technical changes are taking place and no adequate provision is made for the consequences of these swift economic and technical changes. There is a lot of loose thinking and talk about employment figures, and I challenge the accuracy of some of the figures published in relation of people getting jobs and in relation to unemployment, because I am satisfied that with the growth of the population, it is growing faster than the economic growth and the general potentials are not as great as the population growth. When you have a figure, say, of 100 people going into jobs, there is no corresponding figure of how many people have dropped out of old jobs. We have a classic example in the number of people who lost their employment as a result of the construction of the Deep Water Harbour. About 1,800 people lost their jobs. Now, you cannot tell me that the new industries have been able to absorb 1,800 people because the capital formation required for one job is a lot; therefore, it would take a great lot of capital to provide jobs for 1,800 people, notwithstanding any drive which has been made for industrialisation — and here in the context of Barbados' economy the drive for industrialisation cannot be as fast, nor is it going to be as fast as the growth of population.

3.35 p.m.

For that reason we have to give careful consideration to this matter. I am a believer in the fact that the growth of the population cannot be ignored; whether it is irreligious or otherwise, I do not believe that the growth of the population is based on any providential dispensation. I believe that, in many instances, the growth of the population is an act of ignorance, and by the biological processes which produce the growth of population, it does not require any mental effort. To assert that it requires mental effort to produce the growth of population is ignorance, and we are responsible to check the nonsense that that is a divine dispensation, and that anything which deals with this question is an affront to the Divinity. I do not subscribe to that idea and I hope that I will not live long enough to subscribe to that nonsense. People in Barbados who subscribe to that idea will find that they will have to build more churches and places for the delinquent or the mentally deficient. If you believe that any exercise in relation to the growth of population is an affront to the Divinity, then we are not fit to live in this century in which we happen to be living. I therefore, cannot subscribe to the *Laissez faire* attitude which we have existing in the economic forces, and leaving things to chance. The chances are that things are getting worse and not better. For that reason, every man and woman who is working in Barbados and who is making a contribution to society by brain or hand, is entitled as of right to protection so as to be able to remain in his or her job as long as he or she is fit and capable of working.

I do not believe that a man is only entitled to remain in a job as long as someone is prepared to allow him to remain in that job. A man is entitled to remain in a job as long as he is fit and capable of performing the job which he has to perform. This does not mean that there is licence for misconduct, that it becomes the right of a worker never to be dismissed in any circumstances; nor does it mean that even in economic hardships an employer would not be able to reorganize or, in some instances, that economic pressure is likely to force an employer to go out of business. I want to make it clear that the vital aspects of the community cannot be left willy-nilly in the hands of people for their kindness, but that it should be written in the law that persons who work for an employer should have general protection. We have examples of this in that some members of the Public Service are given the protection for which I am now asking. What are the logical reasons by which one can ask that the Public Servants should be given this protection? And they are paid by the community generally, because it is the public purse and the taxation of the community which affords payment to the Public Servants. I do not begrudge the Public Servants this right, and some people in this context would regard it as a privilege which is not spread

over everyone. I think that the idea of job protection should spread to every worker, irrespective of the type of employment which he or she is pursuing.

In my own Organization, the Barbados Workers' Union, we have, to some extent, been pioneering in this field; but just as John Gailbraith in his book on the Affluent Society spoke of the countervailing forces which are not state-owned, we cannot pass legislation for the whole community. Although these countervailing forces have been able to inject into society a protection for workers, we have been able to get in some sectors some employers — for example, the sugar factory workers are not entitled to this sort of treatment for which I am asking, but we want to see coverage given to everyone. We want to see coverage given to the estate worker, the clerk in Bridgetown, the old domestic servant — and if a committee is set up to examine this matter, I would give a lead. Barbados is a developing society; Barbados happens to be among those sectors which fall for the overflow from Asia and Latin America where a great number of people live in poverty. The *per capita* income of the United States is nearly what the West Indian colonies together is, compared with two million people who are within the paltry figure of \$200. When we find this great disparity in the world, we have to examine what is taking place; it is that these under-developed countries will only be developed at the pace and at the rate at which the developed countries will allow and permit them to develop. They will not be developed in a vacuum; they will only develop in relation to what the developed countries will permit.

For that reason, looking at the developing countries and our own country, it is necessary for us to evolve a planned system in consonance with its own peculiar economy and its support for that type of economy. Barbados is a monocultural community; the Government is endeavouring to diversify agriculture, but throughout the world the history of agricultural diversification which took place in a capitalist system is of slow growth because the economy which operates within the territory operates in a private sector; the Government's sector which has not evolved in its economic formation is slow, and therefore the development is of necessity slow.

3.45 p.m.

Moreover, the community seems to regard employment like an endemic disease where we are looking upon 20% unemployment as a norm; but when it reaches 8% in the United States of America, it is coming near a crisis like the 1929 crash. Those are some of the stark realities of our situation that we have to watch. I am submitting, Mr. Speaker, that in our economy where we are endeavouring to move forward, if I give a brutal analysis of the technological and economic changes which have taken place in Barbados, it is faster than the mental development of the total community. And this total community means employers, Government and workers, because I have seen in the last ten years a development which has completely transformed some of the economic life of this community at a rate that the Government, the employers and the workers themselves are standing at the same point that existed before the changes took place. In spite of the number of factory workers today, you hear the ignorance even by politicians challenging the fact that factory workers are more highly paid as a result of the fact that in the last ten years you have lost nearly 50% of the total labour force at that point. You have lost 50% of the total labour force and have increased wages about 25% to 30%, and you hear people ignorantly and with gall compare a man working in a factory for \$2,000 or \$3,000 a year with a cane-cutter where there are some 2,000 of them. The number of cane-cutters have not been reduced, because you have not introduced any mechanical equipment; but you hear the comparison being made where the drop of employment has been 50% and you expect the rates to remain at the same level. The thinking is such that each day of my life I have the monumental task of persuading some hardheaded employers that the level of wages where the sector has changed cannot be compared with the sector that has remained steady, because you must move the sector up considerably in order that the technological change would mean something. I still find that people regard

\$20 or \$25 a week as a wage to look upon as a norm in a swift technologically changing society. If this ignorance persists, it would mean that you would have machinery replacing men without the corresponding increases being given to the workers concerned, so that their purchasing power becomes greater and they can inject in the economy more buying and so that you do not find a lag which you would get from the drop-outs who are forced out through these technological changes.

I state that as a background, Mr. Speaker, because I have found in recent months even in this Chamber that members would agree to some Resolution on the grounds that when it is submitted by the person who moved the Resolution - and we had a classic example some months ago - they did not have the courage to say what they were faced with, but have the brass to say privately that these things are not in the best interest of the community. That is only an indication of the age in which we are living and the leadership we can look forward to if we persist with that unplanned, unthinking attitude at the level which can be regarded as the highest. Some one must break the sound barrier of ignorance at this stage and deal with these matters as he sees them. That is why I say I make no apology for introducing this. I do not put forward this Resolution on the basis of any original thinking. My own organisation passed a Resolution like this last May Day, and I have the honour, being the only Trade Unionist in this Chamber, of so doing now, and without any boast I feel it is more my concern than anyone else here, because I come face to face with these problems every day in my life.

Hundreds of workers in Barbados now are living on the threshold of changes in employment, and the employers themselves sometimes say they do not have the finances to underwrite these changes. I spoke two days ago to an employer who opened a business of his own making, and after four years, now that the workers have asked for an increase, he gave me the startling situation that he wanted a redundancy figure which is greater than the increase he was asked for. In short, if we agreed to his proposal, the position of the worker would be worse than it was before we set forward the proposal, and his mathematics were of such that he was showing he was giving us an increase; but when I took his increase as against the loss in employment and the wages combined, I found that I was asking for \$100, but he was giving me a redundancy that is equivalent to \$150. I will politely have to write him and tell him that his way of counting is different from mine and we cannot agree. That is the situation that we are likely to face here.

In addition to that, there is this question of re-organisation. The question we have to ask ourselves is whether a worker, after working with any employer for any number of years and the employer is no longer in need of him, is entitled to have the protection that this Resolution seeks. If he is not, we will reject the Resolution. If he is, then it should be passed. I will say why he is entitled to this protection. In a normal way, all business is run by having depreciation charges, obsolescent charges; the machinery itself is part of capital, and for economic argument we say that machinery, money and labour form capital within the context of what is capital. In some instances, labour is also capital; not in a political sense, but in the strict economic sense, because you cannot operate a business unless you have capital; you cannot operate unless you have machinery; and you cannot operate unless you have labour; so all these make a basic capital formation.

3.55 p.m.

You have a situation in income tax where it would be unthinkable for business to be run without an allowance given for the replacement of machinery such as obsolescent charges, depreciation and so on. Those allowances must be given if you have to replace machinery. What do you think of the human element? As I have said earlier, the human element is being replaced by biological processes and not the economic process of the businessman; but the system is that the businessman looks forward to the employment of someone at the age of 25 years or 26 years. Do you realise what can be regarded as the *infra* structure that goes to create that 25-year-old product? He has to be sent to school, and the amount of capital which has to be spent

in sending him to school is immense. A lot of other things have to be done also. Roads have to be provided and maintained. All that *infra* structure is taking place to create the human element which the employer is going to utilise at the age of 25 years, 18 years or 19 years, but the employer as such has not paid any capital cost for that human element as he has paid for the mill or the roller which he is going to buy. The Income Tax Commissioner is going to allow him a depreciation tax to replace that machinery, and I think it is time when the human element with its higher cost content, which at the age of 25 years is replaced by another biological process, should be given some consideration. If you want to argue this thing logically, just as a piece of machinery is entitled to obsolescence and depreciation charges, the new thinking is that employers must be called upon to make some contribution to the human element in this respect just as they are prepared to make for the material side.

Sir, that is the basic reason why every worker in a way is entitled to have this kind of protection given him; and in order to do that, you have to write into legislation that people working by the week or the month are entitled to a fixed computation so that at the end of their period of work, they are not left to go cap in hand asking people who have employed them for something.

Mr. Speaker, it does not mean that machinery should be disposed of or regarded as something which should be destroyed. If we are to advance in a technological age, it is impossible to resist completely the techniques which are available. If we are going to resist the techniques which are available to us, well, we will have to close the schools and universities because we cannot in one breath pay \$2 million for the education and advancement of higher learning and then, when the product has attained new skills, you discard them and do not use them, on the altar of having a large labour force.

Mr. Speaker, I have given a lot of thought to this matter and I feel any intelligent man or responsible citizen in any part of the world, even in Asia - just as in India where there is a population of four million people and no room to evolve a system of rationalisation of industry to deal with the economic situation - would have to realise what we are talking about. Some times I hear Barbadians talk about the density of our population. We have a high density, but the density of population of Barbados is infinitesimal when compared with the density of population in Asia. In Pakistan alone, you get nearly one million people to the square mile; therefore, when you talk of the density of the population of Barbados, you have to realise what you are talking about. I feel sure that anyone looking at geography and who looks at Pakistan and its density of population will see that although they have that density of population, yet still they have a steel mill and they have to utilise jute making on a technological basis.

Sir, I feel that this is not an ordinary political Resolution which I am putting forward. This is a Resolution which is put forward at this stage in this place because it is only in this place that you can underwrite laws. I do not think it requires my organisation or myself to go on any longer persuading employers that this is what is required. In England, they have passed a contract law, but in England their laws are not like ours. In England, they have full employment and you will find Barbadians leaving here to go to England for employment. It would take another 500 years for Englishmen to come here to look for jobs, but it did not come about in England as a matter of accident that you have full employment. It came about with planning.

I feel, Mr. Speaker, that we should give every worker job protection. He should get that encouragement now that he is in a country which is moving forward towards independence or from one stage to another. I feel that a country which is thinking in terms of independence must think in terms of setting its house in order, and I feel that the employers in Barbados must come face to face with this problem.

4.05 p.m.

I know some people in the private sector - not members of the Trade Union - I know that managers of businesses

and those who have engaged people in private employment, have sent them home after they have rendered 25 years' service, I never subscribe to the idea that a man who is no good should be kept on for 25 years; if he was not good and you kept him for 25 years, then you are worse than he. I would not say that one was no good, but both of them were no good. We have seen in this country small businesses, comparatively speaking, and Mr. Speaker, if I call names, it is only for the purpose of bringing the position clear to hon. members. I do not believe that the members of this Chamber realise what is going on under their very eyes. You have Challenor and Wilkinson as a business which has just been amalgamated, and you have a joint stock company known as the Barbados Shipping and Trading Company. This is a business group of people - a comparatively small number of people - who are controlling, to some extent, the total economy of this country. Another thing is this; what is taking place here could not take place in the United States of America owing to the Anti-trust Laws. These people control the very lifeblood of the country; they control the main economy. They control shipping which is the main enterprise, and then they control the building of the Supermarkets which you see going up in Barbados. The economic roots of the country reside in a small group of people sitting in Broad Street in this City. Tomorrow a positive decision of that group could nullify anything; it could determine the standard of living in Barbados.

These people set a standard of living for people of a certain category; they set the standard of education which you should have. It is a narrow group of people who are not motivated by the aspirations of the people; they are an ethnic group of people. These people are not exposed to the economies to which the people of this country are exposed or with which they are faced, nor are they involved in the unemployment situation. Because they are not involved in these things, their interest and motivations are not the same as others; they look at matters in an abstract manner and therefore we will always have this situation. I feel, Sir, that it is necessary for any Government which professes Socialist philosophies to begin to plan for these serious inequalities, and for that reason, Mr. Speaker, I am submitting that this Resolution should be supported. A man's job is not part of his income; it is his total income. If you take away a man's job, it is just as if you were to take away man's profession. You take away a man's job without making any consequential changes and you would be taking away his total income, and he will have nothing upon which to exist. That is what we are protecting. The Masters and Servants Act was the most vicious bit of legislation which has ever been passed and it has been completely removed from the Statute Book. You have that sort of legislation where you dismiss a man at will, and these are things which we in the Trade Union positively object to.

I feel, Sir, that every worker within the context of the employment he has should be protected. I hope, Sir, that when this Resolution is passed, the Government will see fit to set up the necessary machinery to deal with it, and people will be given the protection which they deserve. Owing to the casual nature of their employment, there are some people who are not involved in the way in which others are involved. A carpenter is not permanently employed; but this Resolution seeks to give people job protection. You have thousands of people working in Bridgetown. A former manager called me up sometime ago - it is true that some of these managers and some Daniels have come to judgment; they only knew me after they have got kicked out, I say to them: "It is unfortunate that you did not give me any authority to speak on your behalf, but we are not against your getting something." Just as we have been able to get this sort of thing in sugar factories, it should be spread to the plantations. Such workers who work on plantations are entitled to have this sort of treatment.

If for instance, the hon. junior member for Christ Church is employing people, just as you carry insurance, the time must come when that sort of protection should be given in other employment or sections of employment. It is the sort of treatment to which human beings are entitled. On the face of this Resolution, I do not think that anybody could say anything objectionable to it. Far from objecting

to this Resolution, Mr. Speaker, I am submitting that it is a Resolution which injects a helpful atmosphere in this island. I am sure it will not do anything to interfere with the expansion of industry; on the other hand, it will assist in this changing situation where workers have become fully involved in the changing situation - or changing circumstances. I am not any party to make people believe that there are those engaged in industry who employ useless people. You have a construction company operating here now; it is operating on the basis that you can mould certain beams within a short time where a man who is working on the site would take some weeks to mould.
4.15 p.m.

Building in this country is going to come to the point that after you have passed the foundation, no longer are you going to get a woman with a bucket of cement making 99 trips for somebody to pull up. That will be a memory; so when you have these changes taking place, you will get a big concrete mixer. The Government is going to start buildings now. What is it going to cost people if they employ labour on the basis of paying a man like that? The Government will have to employ those people that I talked about, and that is why I talked about the infrastructure. When the Government is building a road, it would have to employ unskilled people. I said some years ago when the last Government was in power that they must employ the unemployed in things like the Constitution Swamp project. They regarded it as wasteful, but it is not, because you create employment at a sphere that can provide something which was not there and remove a nuisance. With the industries that you are bringing in, after you pass the foundation and put up the buildings, you are going to have one messenger or one man driving a van, and the others are clerks, accountants and so on. The days of unskilled, ignorant labour will be a memory, and I will ask where you are going to put those people who are encouraged to leave school in Fourth Standard as in the old-time family days. They will only be fit for almshouses because there will be no employment for them in years to come. They will only be fit for these things or when somebody has a dead animal occasionally to move. Society is not gearing for unskilled labour, and those of us who are living in this age have a grave responsibility on our shoulders for leadership and guidance. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I feel that this Resolution is aimed at protecting the workers in this country and giving a lead to a sector that is very well deserved, and I have the greatest pleasure in moving the passing of this Resolution.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Speaker, I intend to second this Resolution and have listened very carefully to the arguments moved by the proposer. In reading this Resolution, however, I have sought to get to the point as directly as possible, and I think the whole point in the text makes me believe that it can be found at the end of the fourth paragraph in the words "be adequately compensated". When I first read this Resolution, I was thinking that it savours of some national security; it does not. It asks for compensation - and the proposer has used the very word - and it extends to the workers in the agricultural industry. In a way it is protection, but more definitely so it is compensation, and that nonetheless does not destroy the argument or any argument in favour of its being considered by the Government with a view to planning its implementation; but like everything that is worthwhile, the path of implementation will be strewn with many difficulties.

As the Hon. Introducer has said, he has looked through the economic structure of this Island; he knows the vast army of casual and unskilled labour which we have in this country; and when it comes to asking for adequate compensation for such a category of workers, I think it would be well nigh impossible for an employer. There are others who are employed for very many years who give of good quality service and may not even receive compensation at the end of that service. I reiterate that in the absence of national security, in the absence of provision for a very large sector of our workers, adequate compensation at the time of dismissal through no fault of the worker is much a necessity.

I too, Mr. Speaker, have had some Trade Union experience; as a matter of fact no little quantity of it. I do not think that thirteen years can be dispised; it might be called a short time in the Trade Union Movement, but I have gathered much information therefrom, and I feel as strongly as he does, I believe, on this matter, and I am very glad that it is not sectional. This, of course, calls for no controversy. The Hon. Introducer, the hon. senior member for St. Peter, is not today doing anything that one may say he has any sectional interest in. It has a coverage for all categories of workers, organised or unorganised, and in all branches of industry. It is very regrettable that some men who have reached what may be called the top of their careers in business have very much to take the sort of treatment that is meted out to them by employers. Many of them have been competent salesmen, many have been competent departmental managers, and of course many of them are concerned in trade and industry, and after 30 or 40 years such a type of employment cannot be called transitory. It is as permanent as employment one gets as a public servant when the Government is the employer. The worker who is employed privately serves with as much zeal, if not more so, because I think many an employee in private employment knows that he has to give of his best and is much more conscious of his obligations than many another worker who thinks that he has security, and who imagines that he is not bound to be courteous and to give of his best to his patrons who are also the general public.

4.25 p.m.

As I have said, the implementation of such a Resolution on the part of Government is going to call for a lot of thought and planning. As I see it, the only solution is going to be by some intelligent planning. I think it is really incumbent upon the Government, and only the Government who has the power to implement such a Resolution after much planning and after much thought.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER: I am sorry I have to interrupt the hon. member, but it is now 4.30 p.m., therefore, the time for Private Members' Business comes to an end. I take it that the hon. member has not yet concluded his speech.

Under Government Business, the first Item stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Lucy: to move the House into Committee of Supply to consider the grant of sums of money for the service of the Island.

ORDER NO. 6 TAKEN

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, Order No. 6 of Government Business should have been given priority on the fixing of the Order Paper on the last occasion because it seeks obviously to adopt the principle involved in this Resolution; that is to say, now that we have abandoned the acquisition of this land, before we can consider the granting of money to reimburse the owner, we should deal with the principle. Therefore, before Your Honour leaves the Chair, I beg to move that Order No. 6 be 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.

RESOLUTION re ABANDONMENT OF ACQUISITION OF FORDE'S PASTURE ST. PETER

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 6 stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Lucy: To move the passing of a Resolution to approve the publication in the Official Gazette of a notification re the abandonment of the acquisition of Forde's Pasture, St. Peter.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I now ask leave to deal with this Resolution which stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Lucy.

There being no objection, leave was granted the Hon. Minister.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, on the 15th March, 1961, Forde's Pasture, approximately 14 acres, was acquired by compulsory acquisition by the then Government. It was acquired for the purpose of a housing development scheme, a community centre and playing field. This acquisition took place in the face of advice given by the then Director of Medical Services against the acquisition of this property from a health point of view. On no fewer than three occasions, did the then Director of Medical Services advise against the purchase of this swamp.

The Director of Medical Services pointed out on the 25th May, 1960, on the 16th June, 1960 and subsequent to that, that the acquisition of this land would involve serious health problems; therefore, from a health point of view, he could not advise on the purchase of this swamp. The Manager of the Housing Authority pointed out also that it was better to acquire part of Haywoods Plantation and develop it into a housing area, but the then Government refused to take the advice of these two experts. I do not know why, but if high-powered technical advisers advise people who have no knowledge of the health of the community on important health problems and health questions, I think some sort of consideration should have been given to the advice by these technical advisers.

Now, Sir, this land was acquired and then it was a question of saying whether it could be used for this development and I consider that this was putting the cart before the horse. I respectfully suggest that the question of drainage and the question of suitability of the area for this scheme should have been considered before the acquisition. The Director of Medical Services went so far as to advise on the unsuitability of it for a playing field because of the number of crabs in that area, and he also advised that the part where they were selecting for the housing scheme would cause water from those houses to flow into a saucer which was supposed to form the playing field. Then, there was some talk of filling the swamp, and the Director of Medical Services pointed out that it would not be advisable to fill that swamp because the area would then harbour flies which would endanger the health of the community. I am glad that my friend the hon. junior member for St. George is present.

4.35 p.m.

However, Mr. Speaker, this land was acquired, and when we took over we saw that it would cost, if not hundreds of thousands of dollars, it would cost thousands of dollars to develop this land into a housing scheme. We did not see why this amount of money should be spent on this swamp when land could be acquired elsewhere if we really wanted a housing project in this area. On the other hand, if you are providing a playing field for an area, you have to provide a playing field such that when on Friday evening you begin to prepare a cricket pitch, you will not go back on Saturday morning and find that there is a hole in it.

In 1959 the hon. senior member for St. Peter brought a Resolution to this House declaring that this site was unsuitable for a playing field and for housing. No attention was paid to the hon. member's Resolution because he was not in the Government. Despite the advice of the Manager of the Housing Authority and the advice of the Director of Medical Services, the then Government negotiated for the acquisition of this land. This Government is not interested in wasting the taxpayers' money; we are interested in spending money where it should be spent, giving the community the best service for their money. In these circumstances we have abandoned the idea of developing Forde's pasture. We have gone to the site on more than one occasion and we were advised — and this time the advice was taken — that it was uneconomical to develop Forde's pasture. We were advised by the Director of Medical Services, and we are now here asking that the Houses of the Legislature approve of the abandonment of the acquisition of this fourteen-acre site.

Mr. Speaker, I have never in my life seen a Government so silly as to negotiate for the acquisition of this land. The

owner of this swamp, Mr. Whitehead, from the beginning of the negotiations, saw how stupid the then Government was. He even refused to talk business with them. They wrote him on several occasions and he himself thought that they were throwing away the taxpayers' money. He was trying to help them; he saw that they lacked the initiative, drive and intelligence which a Government should possess and he refused to negotiate with them. This is a man in whose lap the then Government was going to throw money, but this was a man who knew that when they threw away the taxpayers' money in one direction his money would also be involved. They then began to work with his wife; she could not get them over on her side that this land should not be acquired, yet the then Government agreed to purchase this fourteen acres of swamp.

The Director of Medical Services pointed out that because of the fact that the land was much below sea level there would be no success in digging pits or suck wells because it would still be a swampy area. They visited the site when we had two years of dry weather, and they thought that they could purchase it because of what they saw at that time. The Director of Medical Services pointed out the facts to them and every word of what I am saying is here before me; I could quote some of it if it is necessary to do so. The Director of Medical Services pointed out that he knew the area, having worked in Speightstown for some time, and that they should not be guided by what they saw at the time of the dry weather when they visited the site, because at any time when there is any sort of heavy rain, the swamp will be there and they would only be throwing away the taxpayers' money. Yet, Mr. Speaker, in their ignorance, they decided to purchase this site; they bowed down to wood and stone.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that there are other hon. members who would like to have the opportunity to say something on this matter; I therefore await the comments of hon. members after which I shall reply. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, we have listened to some debate and rambling discussion, without the material which is so important to make out a case, coming from the other side of the Table, sometimes under the adornment of the name of Minister. This Resolution arises out of the question of the acquisition of Forde's pasture. Some time ago we wanted to give money for compensation.....

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. We are now dealing with a Resolution in connection with legislative approval being given for the abandonment of the acquisition of a property; we are not dealing with any Resolution for compensation.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, it is true that this Resolution deals with the question of the abandonment of the acquisition of Forde's pasture, but this abandonment must be tied up with another Resolution which is one for compensation.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution is not tied up with any Resolution for compensation; it is something to do with the abandonment of the acquisition of a swamp.

Mr. MILLER: We must wait for the money Resolution to be discussed. However, Sir, the Hon. Minister did attempt to discuss the money for compensation because he said that they wanted to buy this property and the man refused to discuss the matter with them.
4.45 p.m.

We discussed money and cost and.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I would suggest to the hon. member that it would be more appropriate to deal with the money when we come to that Resolution which we will in due course.

Mr. MILLER: I am prepared to do that if that is the standard procedure, but you cannot deal with money and say

you refuse to take taxpayers' money when you have a Resolution for compensation. It was really a discretion of the Speaker to allow the Minister in charge of the Resolution to discuss the cost and negotiations with the owners and the spending of Government funds, because that was not set out in the Resolution. We are discussing the Resolution where the Government does not consider the land suitable for housing. With the greatest respect to the Chair, if you permit funds to be discussed by one individual, you cannot then set that aside; but I want to follow the directions of the Chair.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the hon. member deal with the question of abandonment, and then later deal with the other matter.

Mr. MILLER: There is no question, Mr. Speaker, for any argument in this. We have heard of the discussion, but a Minister in a Ministry must have a soul and a mind of his own. That was the position occupied by the last Government. You must follow the dictates that are persistent with the Department and not fall under the rule of the leader of a dictatorship which conforms to a single pattern. That was not the case of the Labour Party. It was not the policy of the then Government to take land out of cultivation and out of crops to use for housing purposes. Only marginal lands are used for such purposes, and that was the policy of the Government with the Pine and Grazettes. I can think of the discussion which took place in Cabinet re the land now used by the factory for the manufacture of tobacco. We only gave consideration to what we regarded as marginal or secondary lands. We have got reasons to believe that you never take land out of cultivation when you know that in another 25 or 30 years you are bound to get an increased population and you have got to reduce lands suitable for cultivation for roads, housing, parks, commercial buildings, the expansion of the Airport and even the Harbour. What are we to do? If we are in trouble with a quarter of a million souls to support, how are we in another 30 years to think of feeding half a million souls and providing schools playing fields, roads etc. on the same little island?

Mr. Speaker, now Speightstown is a town with a history, a culture and all the arts, and you can look at the buildings in Speightstown and see a display of deep thought and Gothic art in the structures - something unknown in St. Michael - because it was done by the Jews, a township with all the secondary crafts and trades. That is where you have the tailor shop and the baker. Speightstown is a township with a church with a steeple and all that goes to make a shrine, and it has a harbour with a jetty and several bridges. All this is still intact; and if you are thinking of a park or playing field, and knowing the size of Speightstown, you must think of a park where fathers and guardians can take the little children. You want to have a place for quiet contemplation. How can you deny contemplation when the older folk want to go under the flowering trees? Listening to the Minister and the remarks of his folly, he is bound to be a twin.

Mr. SPEAKER: I take it the hon. member is not attempting to refer to any hon. member by that name. I just want it to be clear lest it be misunderstood.

Mr. MILLER: You are thinking of a playing field in a town where you have a health centre, hospital, two secondary schools and all that has grown for more than 200 years before we had anything to say. Look at the Old Jewish structures with those galleries. You are not talking about St. Paul's Cathedral where you form fours and salute and sing "God Save the Queen"; you are talking about Speights-town, a place with a heritage. Go and look at it and see it at twilight! Go and look at Speightstown noozing as it is with antiquity, culture and art and compare it with our Bridge-town.
4.55 p.m.

You want a park. You do not want to turn it into a playing field where it is restricted to one use. The reason why you want it as a park is because it was marginal, and above all, because its site was in the heart of the City where you get the shopkeeper and the shoemaker around the corner. Then again, you have a park near where you have the steeple

and the bell. You want a park near where you can go and worship and say a little word. But you are dealing with a playing field in an agricultural centre. Why do you think the Alexandra School was sited there? Why do you have the cobbler shops along there? Do all this mean nothing to you? Is it nothing to you? Why should you want to come in here and abandon this? Why do you think the late Lady Carter devoted her life to the beautifying of Queen's Park? I am sorry to say that it has now fallen on bad days. It is because the public can go there and watch the lake. Sir, do you remember the Drakes who devoted their time on Friday mornings and Friday evenings to go to Queen's Park? That is what we wanted to do with Forde's Pasture in St. Peter. These people decorated Queen's Park and put flowers about it and they did it with joy. You cannot change this; you can imagine what is twinkling in his heart. (A VOICE: What has that to do with the matter before us?)

Sir, I remember when the hon. senior member for St. Peter spoke on this matter he said that you should go to Heywoods and put your housing scheme and playing field. I was never against the idea of a playing field being put there if he was thinking of a cricket or football field, but what we were thinking of was the need of the population there — most of whom lived in poverty — the density of the area, the place where the people lived their whole lives and died. That is why we said Forde's Pasture.

Sir, I could not be closer to any man; I could not be a greater friend with any man than Dr. Byer. He was an earnest, conscientious, honest man, a man dedicated to public health. Dr. Byer said that the land was below sea level, but it had nearly one hundred coconut trees on it. We got him together with the engineers who said that if the sand bar was removed, we would get drainage of the land. Let the Minister bring the file and he would see that. As regards the other issue, I had nothing to do with that at all. Look at the files and you will see all of that. It was then decided that we buy the land generally for the purpose of a park, which is a different thing from a playing field. We intended that it would form a nice little area for nurses and mothers to go, where there will be little cribs placed for the children. It would be an area where adults could go to hear lectures and discussions, to say nothing of the other things which would be there, such as the animals and the birds.

I read in some English newspapers that some change was taking place in the London Zoo and that they were abandoning some of the huge cages. We were going to ask for one of those cages so as to put birds in it. We formed a Committee and discussed the matter. We got hold of the Churchwarden and discussed the matter and were promised all types of birds from British Guiana. I pointed out that I would see to it to get the cage and the birds, but after the erection took place, it was the responsibility of the parish to handle the scheme. This idea was thrown down. These are the things which we are up against. You will see that it was decided that the houses should be put on the high part of the land. And it was a matter that the houses would be taken to the other side. The Health Authorities recommended that we would have to get a sewage system for the area. Let the Minister look at the files and he would see all of that. Let the Minister look at the files and he would see what was the cost of Heywoods.

The Hon. Minister talked about the ownership of this land. In the normal circumstances we asked the owner of this land to come in, and he came in and discussed the matter with the Ministry. Let the Minister look on the file and he would see all of that. This man did not own the land; he did not have the papers. It might be a matter between himself and his wife. However, we wanted to acquire that land and we made several attempts to acquire it. It was not suitable to him for the growing of crops, but you come now and you are paying compensation for it.
5.05 p.m.

Plans were drawn up including the area for an engineering project, and we have passed money in here. All the engineers indicated that they were taking all the soundings and the engineers could decide on this matter. We had the advice of the Director of Medical Services who would have to state a case. It has been said that this land is below sea

level, but you cannot have this land below sea level; anybody will realise that water will find its level. You could decide whether land would remain below sea level. However, Sir, there was a sand bank; there was a Government school with a playing field under the coconut trees in the area. In Speightstown there was a big school which had for a playing field something which was not as large as the size of this paper which I am holding in my hand; that was the size of the playing field. We had planned to get a right of way where the Speaker — I mean the former Speaker — used to live. Mr. Speaker, I am thinking of the party which is still remembered by you.

We wanted to build a park because a park is something which is needed in a capital city. You have a number of churches, you have a Cathedral and I must say that it is a pity that we cannot bring back William Booth. This is an area which is outside the heart of the City and the hon. junior member for St. Andrew would tell us that in that area you have a town. You look at the structure some of which should be preserved, and here you have a feeble Minister telling us about this land being unsuitable for a playing field. I had a meeting with the two representatives and they went to the site with me on one occasion. There was some land there and I made the position quite clear. My friend the Trade Unionist was pressing for open spaces. I told him that my idea was to have a park; as a matter of fact, that was my first consideration. This property could be bought, but that does not in any way remove the fact that in every city there is always the need for a park. It all comes with community growth and community development and this is something which is needed, the more so with a society which is emerging such as ours.

Mr. Speaker, we did not toy with this idea. I must say, Sir, that the Minister is not even treating me with the courtesy with which I should be treated, that is to say, that the Minister should be listening to my speech. It is too much for one fool to be saddled with this whole idea. Somebody must develop this area in the heart of the town. This man had his pious ideas and he did not want to disturb the negotiations on behalf of the community. He did not want to treat with the Government in the sale of this land; that is what we were told. Now we have been bending under the yoke and load of over taxation; we want to give compensation to the owner of this land, the acquisition of which has been abandoned and the land has to be returned.

Mr. Speaker, this is a wonderful act. The Government will still have to see after the development even if it is for simple health reasons, if for no other reason. You will have to bring about an expensive reclamation and that is under the pretext that the last Government was feeling happy to develop some land. This land abuts and bounds Government school. (ASIDES). Do you not know the Police Station in Speightstown? I think that the Hon. Minister had better get his information properly. There are fourteen acres of land there; I do not know the comments about the Housing Authority; I would only know about the comments which have been made when the matter reached Cabinet Level.

Mr. Speaker, we have several monuments, and the very last thing which I think the Minister should do is to bow his head. If a Ministry has elected to buy land with the assent of the Planning Engineer, how dare anybody to say otherwise? How do we know that the money which is spent on the matter of the reclamation of land in the Scotland area would not go down the drain? Now you say that in the heart of a City we could buy a swamp. You want to develop this land and sell it to somebody else.
5.15 p.m.

I know, Sir, that I may have to appeal to you to say something further from what may be developed in the debate, but what I say is conscientious and from my knowledge of the files three or four years ago. The question, however, is whether Government should use marginal land first or develop it for somebody else to use for commercial purposes, and also whether there should be a park in preference to a playing field in the heart of the City as a prerequisite to anything. As soon as we get to the other Resolution for dollars and cents and the Minister permits me

and you in a mood to allow me, I will discuss the matter further.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am always in a mood, according to the Standing Orders, to allow debate.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Speaker, I do not hope at the outset to be as poetic as the hon. member who has just sat down, because I will fall very short of the mark of a poet. Here we are today, Sir, faced with a Resolution which has for its purpose the abandonment of a certain portion of land known as Forde's Pasture. From the Addendum to this Resolution, we are told from the information that the former Government agreed to buy this land for certain purposes and that agreement has been entered into with the *de jure* or *de facto* owner who is known to us as Mr. Percy Whitehead. At the time Government decided to buy the land compulsorily. Now the former Government, I can reasonably assume, had the benefit of its engineers or could have had the opinion of engineers as to the advisability of using the land for the purposes mentioned, that of a playing field and of a small housing scheme. I remember being told by someone who was very knowledgeable in an official capacity that the southern portion of Forde's Plantation - it was a Plantation but since it was not cultivated year after year in recent times, it has fallen into pasture land - could be used for housing, and that the danger of having the area flooded would have been obviated when Golden Shores Company undertook the development of their scheme at Heywoods Plantation which is the adjoining land, and I think I have heard that mentioned by the hon. member who has just sat down.

Hearing from him. Sir, reminds me of what I heard about four years ago. Now I must say there are engineers and engineers, and I cannot blame this Government for taking the advice of engineers at their disposal. If one set of engineers told one Government one thing, and the same or another set of engineers told a succeeding Government a different thing, I am in a quandary, because I am just a politician. I suppose very good reasons were offered by the engineers who gave the previous Government advice as to the suitability of developing Forde's Plantation as a playing field and housing site, and I suppose that another set or the same set of engineers with equal force advised the present Government of the unsuitability of developing Forde's Plantation as a housing site and playing field. That is the sort of quandary I am in.

I was not in time to hear those on the Ministerial benches give their addresses on this particular Resolution, but it is no fault of theirs that I was not in my place. The Resolution says that the Government considers the land unsuitable for housing and development as a playing field since it is too much below sea level and the cost of development would be excessive. Those are very good grounds indeed if you take them at their face value, and if the Government has been honestly advised. I am not in a position to criticise the opinion of the engineers. The most I can do is to hear, and what I have heard from someone who himself is not an engineer but who told me he had the opinion of engineers is quite conflicting from the opinion which this Government seems to have had on this issue. Things have gone a long way and I do not want to anticipate another Resolution which is a money Resolution on this same matter, but if agreement now has been entered into with the *de facto* owner, I do not think I have anything to complain about. I know that very recently the Government has had a bit of a headache in resiting residents of what is known as Dragoon's Alley which is just west of Forde's Pasture, because Government is about to develop the land adjoining Dragoon's Alley which faces Sand Street. There is a lot of difficulty on the part of residents in Speightstown who do not own their own property and who occasionally are served notices of ejectment by their landlords. 5.25 p.m.

As I have said, that has been done quite recently, and Government has had to have some people resited on what is now known as Church Street Gardens which is a parcel of land which was formerly part of Heywoods Plantation. So, I can see now that this scheme has to be abandoned that it is not going to solve the housing problem in Speightstown in any way.

If I were to give this House what I know of the attitude of the people in Speightstown to moving on land further out of Speightstown, I would say that many of these people are hawkers and they sell their wares in Speightstown. I am speaking of the land at Maynards. I understand that the land there is soon to be developed and there is much hesitancy on the part of hawkers in Speightstown to move out of Speightstown. One can understand, when people have lived at one place for a long time, that they like to remain in the area; they do not like to be removed from there.

I cannot blame the Government for bringing in this Resolution because I have no doubt that this advice has been given them in good faith by their experts; but I would say that it is an amazing thing to me to find that the mentality of the body of experts who have been advising the Government on this particular development is such that within the space of less than four years you get another body of experts giving contrary advice to that which was given at first. In a small country like Barbados where there is a scarcity of land and where the population is widening, you get a situation which cannot give us now a sense of responsibility.

I have no axe to grind as far as this decision of Government is concerned. I am not in the position of a former Minister of Government who probably hoped to see his plans carried out, who probably knew what the plans of his Government were. What I do know is that land which is not continually developed deteriorates in pasture. I knew the time when Forde's Pasture was being developed. I knew it for a long time. It was once owned by the father of the late Judge Williams, the Chandlers, then the late Mr. E. C. Jemmott and now of course, it is owned by Mr. Percy Whitehead. I knew the time when Forde's Pasture was very productive land and, as a matter of fact, it was more productive than Heywoods. It is approximately of the size of fourteen acres and I believe that even now, if it is cultivated again, it would produce better crops than Heywoods does - and Heywoods is producing some good crops now.

As I have said, I have found myself in the position where I cannot disagree with the reasons stated in the Addendum to this Resolution, because if I were a member of this Government and I were advised by experts who told me that this land is very unsuitable for development and if I attempted to develop it that I would be running the Island into bankruptcy, I would obey their advice. However, I am saying that the matter is regrettable in that two conflicting types of advice were given the Government, one given to the former Government and another given to this Government which succeeded the other in the space of two years. I know that the development of land adjacent to Forde's Pasture has given the Government some headaches. Fortunately, something has been done so that it could be altered. I hope this Government has scrutinised the advice from their experts and that which was at their disposal very carefully and I hope that they have come to this decision in the interest of this community.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I think this Government has done this country a service by bringing in this Resolution for the abandonment of the development of Forde's Pasture. The hon. junior member for St. George is quite near to Coney Island and I would say that just as I would ask the Government to abandon the acquisition of Forde's Pasture, I think that they want an abandonment of this nonsense which has been set up in Bridgetown; it seems to have some effect on members of this Parliament because the behaviour which you get from a clown is what you find you are getting in here, as was exhibited by the hon. junior member for St. George. You have got all this mediaeval buffoonery and antiquated ideas from the hon. member every time you are dealing with serious matters. It is not fitting to a Legislature. This is the sort of thing which you get at circus shows. We have this classic example of the hon. member referring to a historical age which has no relation to the age in which we live. He is comparing something which took place in ancient Greek history with something which took place in Speightstown. What nonsense is all of that! You get this superficial nonsense exhibited here, and I think the hon. junior member for St. George should be ashamed of himself to rise in a debate like this

and say the things he said after it was stated what were the reasons for the abandonment.

Of course, even a fool has a mind of his own. No one who has a knowledge of the Constitution would accuse the Minister of ignoring the advice which his technical advisers gave him. We know that the technical advisers gave members of the last Government certain advice and they ignored it. The technical experts advised against siting a market in a residential district because when you site a market in a residential district like that, you are only asking everybody there to move out. But, ignoring the advice given them has not proved as bad as it was thought to be, that is why a Town Planner would not put a market there. Do you think the Town Planner would advise your putting a market near to Government House because it would be near to the Governor?

The hon. member said that the Minister ignored the advice given him. What is the advice which the Minister ignored? So far as I am concerned, everyone knows that Forde's Pasture was unsuitable for the development which the last Government acquired it for. The hon. junior member for St. George talked of a park there and someone sitting on a bench. Now, the hon. member was a Minister of the last Government which disagreed with the sale of Heywoods. 5.35 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, I have debated this matter many times in here as to how development is going to take place in Speightstown. They will remain in a little place like that even when the population is doubled. It is a fact that you are looking for something out of Speightstown to be developed in consonance with what you expect your population growth to be. You would ignore anybody's advice. I submitted some years ago that Forde's pasture was unsuitable for acquisition as a playing field but that Heywoods was suitable, and now we find that Heywoods has been sold. They did not have the positive imagination to do the planning which this country deserves to enjoy.

You have to re-site that area; you have one of the most dangerous bends going along there. One of the most beautiful sites you have there is Market Square. I ask! What is the use of allowing people to erect their houses there? I am saying, Sir, you will have to build some groynes or something like that as a protection for workers so that you have a city with which nature has blessed you. When you allow people to put their houses there, every time you have high seas then the place is flooded. I see that the Minister of Agriculture went down there sometime ago. People have lost their fish pots. I will ask: when are you going to save the people from themselves? Our thinking must be far beyond the thinking of the people whom we are leading. We cannot await the evil day as the five foolish Virgins did; this country is in need of development. Imagine the hon. member, in a developing country, asking us to preserve a pier when we have built a Deep Water Harbour which has cost us \$30 million? You are just like some old woman who would like to keep old relics and has not got a penny with which to buy a bread. These things will be memories anyhow.

The hon. member along with others has given the House the impression that they were advised. The hon. member read the advice which was given to that Government. The hon. junior member for St. Peter spoke as if two sets of advice were given. The Hon. Minister said: "I was the Minister; I take full control; it was my decision." When you hear the hon. member say that in one breath and you remember the Hospital debate, you will remember that the Minister said that they were advised to do this and that. Whenever it suits the Ministers, they say: "I am advised". They work on advice, but when they are proved to be wrong, they say "I am the Minister." They are responsible anyhow, and that is why they are called Ministers. You are responsible for the advice which you accept or that which you do not accept.

The hon. junior member for St. George was responsible for bringing down the Resolution for the acquisition of

Forde's Pasture and anybody could see that Forde's pasture was unsuitable for a playing field. The whole thing is this; if I had said that Forde's pasture was suitable they would have said: "Look, you want to give the people a swamp." You had Heywoods which is agricultural land and now the hon. member is talking about marginal land. Heywoods becomes a marginal land now.

Mr. MILLER: On a point of order, I never said that Heywoods was marginal land; I could not have thought so. I said that if you are buying land for a playing field or housing, marginal land is second thought. I had nothing to do with Heywoods; all I said was that the hon. member was pressing for Heywoods, but it would have a secondary place as against a place in the City. We were told that this land was unsuitable marginal land.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has completed his point of elucidation. It was not really a point of order.

Mr. WALCOTT: The hon. member has forgotten what he said, (*ASIDES*). You cannot talk about marginal land when you are buying land for a playing field. 5.45 p.m.

A plantation in Barbados which is regarded as a big plantation is only 200 acres of land; so when you have 14 acres, can you talk about marginal? A playing field only requires 5 acres; so what nonsense am I hearing today about marginal land? Do you realise that Kensington is 14 acres? The Coleridge-Parry School is 10 acres of land with a school and a playing field and residence, Sandy Lane as a plantation and factory was sold out during the former Government's regime, and the land is now being cut up and sold as building sites. All I have said is that Forde's Plantation was never a suitable place for the purposes, and medical advice was tendered to that effect. I am not an engineer, but the whole problem was that they believed that anything I proposed during the time they were members of the Government must be rejected. They rejected the plans for displaced workers, and then had the effrontery to talk about them. I said that Forde's Plantation was not a suitable site, but they forgot that Heywoods was going to be sold, and you will remember the substance of the debate. I would say that they made a mistake and they have been treated like anyone in a Government who makes these mistakes; they have been rejected; so what I say now to the Government is this: let them stay where they are and proceed from there on to build on their mistakes. Forde's Plantation was always unsuitable.

My colleague, Mr. Speaker, said that the people in Speightstown live in these areas. Speightstown is a small area of land, but do not let us make people in our constituencies believe that the development of this country is going to be done around their backyards; there has to be development within the context of the development of this country. We had the same problem when we bought land at the Pine. I was in this Chamber in 1945 when land was bought at the Pine and you heard the nonsense that people were not going to leave town and go to the Pine, but were going to live in their dirty little shacks in town in preference to going and living in something decent. I will ask how many houses there are available in the Pine now. The same thing was said about Grazettes. Housing in this country is deplorable and we are only beginning to touch the fringe. I took a drive down through Black Rock and it was pitiable to see the type of houses existing that this community is still living in.

Mr. Speaker, I always felt that Heywoods was a site for development by an imaginative Government. Within the context of Barbados, what is more suitable? A park or the development of something that is near the sea-shore? When you have these natural things on one side, the other side will be developed. You cannot develop a town within the modern context around what is there in Speightstown. You have a big salt pond, and sometimes you have to challenge that just as you challenged the Constitution swamp; and a lot of mosquitoes breed there. To remind one of the things of beauty in Speightstown is an old fancy idea. Some of the buildings in Speightstown are tumbling down. Some people

find it difficult to get out of the wood and shingle idea, but here where you have a city running north you should try to beautify it by running some boulevard. You should get some architect to advise you on how to prevent the encroachment of the sea. Are you going to wait every year until the sea encroaches and the damage becomes greater for somebody to know that something should be done?

It is true that there should be private development; but when Government begins with any project, it stimulates private people to do something. People have begun to put businesses in Speightstown. Do you think Speightstown is going to be developed around as a church? There will be development outside the church and further away. A burnt-out area gave Speightstown an esplanade, and if there had never been a burnt-out area, there would be no esplanade because people would resist it. You cannot burn out people or hope for disasters like fires for these things to take place. The Golden Shores people have come here now to develop the place, and if private people develop Heywoods, automatically the town is going to move and the majority of things will shift. If you have a nice thing like an arcade, where do you believe the people will go at night? Do you think they will go up Queen Street, down to the cemetery or the gasoline station or the almshouse? This is what happens in Barbados now. You have built a Deep Water Harbour and if you take a census of the traffic, you will find that the majority of people leaving Bridgetown and going north swing down the Harbour road. Do you think a person would bring somebody from the cemetery and not give him the opportunity of a drive across the Harbour road? I do not know, therefore, how the hon. member can talk about the beauty in these things at Speightstown.

Mr. Speaker, what the infliction of his Government has put on this country is that we are faced now with rectifying their mistakes at a cost. It is impossible to do this without having to realise some inconvenience to yourself. The hon. member has said that the Minister must have a mind of his own, but the hon. member has demonstrated the kind of his own that he possesses, and I would say that if the mind he has demonstrated here today is the mind that is indicative of a Minister, we are very pleased indeed he is where he is and not on the Ministerial benches.
5.55 p.m.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I think at this stage hon. members would like to have an adjournment and I am going to move the motion that further consideration of this matter be postponed.

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

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

STANDING ORDERS SUSPENDED

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I am going to make a motion for a short adjournment, but I would like to tell hon. members that after this adjournment and we come back in, we would like to go on for a little time more in order that we can conclude some more items on the Order Paper.

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Standing Orders, Nos. 5, 14, 16, 18, 40 and 45 be suspended for the remainder of today's sitting.

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

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

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker I beg to move that this Sitting be now suspended for half an hour.

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

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

6.02 p.m.

On resumption,

Mr. SPEAKER: Before the Sitting was suspended, I think the hon. senior member for St. Peter had completed his address.

Mr. WALCOTT: Yes, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: If there is no other hon. member desirous of contributing to this debate, the Hon. Introducer of the Resolution may make his concluding remarks. *(A Pause).*

It appears that there is no other hon. member desirous of speaking, and so the hon. junior member for St. Andrew if he so desires, may now reply.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that the hon. junior member for St. George is not in his place because he made certain observations which I should like to comment on. He said that a Minister should have a mind of his own and he also spoke of the friendliness between himself and Dr. Byer and said that Dr. Byer was an earnest, conscientious and honest adviser. In the face of all that, the hon. member for St. Peter mentioned the question of the housing and he did not associate himself with the remarks made by the hon. junior member for St. George; but in the light of the conscientious, earnest and honest advice given by Dr. Byer, yet dictatorship by that member displays itself in the fact that this hon. gentleman who has a mind of his own completely ignored the advice given by that earnest, conscientious and honest Director of Medical Services. The hon. junior member for St. George failed to acknowledge the fact that in the advice given by Dr. Byer he was told that even if Forde's pasture was used, because it was a dumping ground it would take a minimum of about six years before it could be used for the particular development which they wanted to carry out there.

The hon. member also said that the arrangements or the negotiations as regards the part for housing was handled by another Ministry. This, I think, is pure, unadulterated nonsense because throughout the negotiations, there was a Committee set up and the Committee consisted of people like the Chief Medical Officer, the Manager of the Housing Authority, the Director of Public Works, the Town and Country Planning Officer, the Director of Medical Services and other experts. In those negotiations, you found regular minutes sent by the Ministry of Social Services for the comment of the Manager of the Housing Authority. In no less than two or three of those minutes, it was pointed out emphatically by the Manager of the Housing Authority to the Ministry of Social Services that it was not advisable to purchase Forde's Pasture. The Manager of the Housing Authority in two separate minutes on the file advised the purchase of part of Heywoods Plantation. The Hon. Ex-Minister of Social Services pointed out that he did not consider it advisable to use agricultural land for playing fields. What has happened at Trents? What has happened at Belleplaine? What has happened in other areas of the country where there are playing fields? They used agricultural land for the purpose. While they did not want to use agricultural land at the same Heywoods for a playing field, they permitted the entire estate to be purchased ostensibly for housing. Of course, that was for a different type of housing. That was not the sort of housing which was for poor and underprivileged people.

Sir, I do not want to say more on that, but they knew why they permitted the whole of Heywoods Plantation to be purchased for that type of housing as against that type for the poor people of Speightstown. Forde's Pasture was only fourteen acres, but Heywoods was 200 acres. On the other hand, there was a site on the same Heywoods Plantation which was excellent for the purpose of a playing field and this is what was recommended by the experts who were advising the Government; but, of course, Government had other uses for Heywoods and they did not want to put the poor and underprivileged people there.

Sir, I will not worry to comment on what the hon. junior member for St. George said about a town and cathedral in Speightstown. I would like him to show me where this cathedral is. I do not want to say that he was talking nonsense, but you would understand.

Sir, I will now reply to the comments made by the hon. junior member for St. Peter. He talked of conflicting advice. I spoke of no conflicting advice. The advice which was given to the last Government was the advice given to this Government, but the difference between this Government and that one is like chalk and cheese.
6.40 p.m.

I see no place in this file — and this is a very large file — where one of the engineers told the Government: "Yes, go ahead and buy this land." What I see is that the Engineers said "You may" or "you might". The engineers said that you may do so-and-so but it will cost you a large sum of money to develop it. I need not point out that the negotiations started somewhere in the vicinity of £75,000 and in the face of that, it would take about the same amount of money to develop this site. In the face of all that, we found the Government putting down one playing field and providing houses for the people. It would have cost as much to put down a drainage as it would have taken if you had to pay the amount at which the negotiations for the compulsory acquisition of this land started.

Another thing is this, Mr. Speaker; there was no proper plan drawn up for the use of this fourteen-acre swamp after the acquisition of it. It was only after the acquisition of this swamp that they thought about asking the experts for plans. That is the sort of nonsense which happened under the regime of that Government. There were no concrete proposals or plans for the area. The plans were to come in after they had committed the taxpayers to throwing away money in a swamp. That is the sort of mentality of the members of the former Government, and now you hear the hon. junior member for St. George talking this nonsense. After they were committed to acquiring or after they had acquired the swamp then they began to think of plans. They then asked the Town and Country Planning Officer to produce the plans for the area and it took the Town and Country Planning Officer a year before he could tell them: "You might do so-and-so, but you will have to do this and that." Mr. Whitehead even refused to have any discussion with them. As I said, Sir, it took the Town and Country Planning Officer a whole year for him to tell them what he did. I do not want to say that they browbeat him to come to any decision, but it took him a whole year before he advised them to purchase this land.

Mr. Speaker, I may also point out that the Director of Public Works and the Chief Engineer of the Waterworks Department, had given advice to the then Government pointing out that there was a lot in the advice which was given by the Director of Medical Services and that that advice should be taken. It is all here in this file; the Chief Engineer of the the Waterworks Department said that they could get water there, but they should take the advice of the Director of Medical Services. The Director of Public Works said that drainage could be carried out, but even then it would not be satisfactory. He also thought that they should accept the advice of the Director of Medical Services, but they did not do that; yet the Director was a conscientious and honest adviser to the Government. The former Minister of Social Services did not take the advice of the Director of Medical Services; he used his own ideas.

I was saying earlier, Sir, that the former Government had no proper plans. The whole idea of the acquisition of Forde's pasture emanated from the fact that they were looking for a playing field and the then Vestry suggested Forde's pasture for the purpose. The then Government jumped headlong into the matter without examining the proposals in order to see what would be the implications or the result of the acquisition of this land. They did not consider the amount of money which would have to be spent in developing this land; they would have to see about paying away vast sums of money for a place which was worth little or nothing.

Mr. Speaker, on the Resolution which deals with the question of compensation to be made to Mr. Whitehead, the former owner of this land, I may have more to say.

The question that this Resolution do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, Mr. SPEAKER declaring "I think the 'Ayes' have it."

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 1 be taken as the next Order of the Day.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think that that motion is necessary because the hon. member has explained that Order No. 6 on the Order Paper should have been placed as the first Order of the Day instead of Order No. 1, because it has precedence over that Order.

The next Order of the Day therefore stands in the name of the Hon. Leader of the House:— To move the House into Committee of Supply to consider the grant of sums of money for the service of the Island.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to move that your honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply, and that it be an instruction to the House when in Committee of Supply to deal with the Resolution for the sum of \$2,000 of which notice was given earlier today and of which copies have been circulated.

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

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

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

6.50 p.m.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE, 1964-65 No. 4

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution became necessary owing to the lack of intelligence on the part of the Government running this country prior to December 4, 1961. It results from the fact that the then Government on the 15th March, 1959 compulsorily acquiring a portion of land known as Forde's pasture in the parish of St. Peter, and at that time not accepting the advice of their experts. After this land was acquired, it was discovered that in the light of the present economic situation of the country, and owing to the fact that it would cost a mammoth sum of money to develop this area, the plans or the idea — I cannot say "plans" because there were no plans — of developing this area for housing and community centre and playingfield should be dropped. The owner of this property sought compensation for the time that he was deprived of the possession of the property, and the compensation proposed for that is \$4,000. Again we see the lack of vision and foresight of the last Government in having acquired a property, having no supervision over it, and now that compensation has been asked for as a result of the owner of the property being deprived of possession of the property for some time, it has been disclosed that a watermill is missing which is valued at \$240, four brass pumps are missing at a value of \$48, two 2-inch brass check valves are missing valued at \$24, and thirty-five cocoanut trees are missing valued at \$10 each, making a total of \$350. I may point out here that there were supposed to be over 100 cocoanut trees on this property.

The hon. member talked about the production of this property where cocoanut trees were concerned. He mentioned that there were many cocoanut trees on the property, and therefore the land could not be considered marginal land. In the face of all that, Mr. Chairman, he did not see it fit to have a watchman placed there. What has

it resulted in? The loss of about thirty-five cocoanut trees at \$10 each, the loss of a Watermill, the loss of four brass pumps, the loss of two 2-inch brass check valves which amounts to \$862. If we considered paying any attention to what the hon. junior member for St. George said, what more have we lost? What about the cocoanuts from over 100 plus cocoanut trees? Not one cocoanut was sold; so there was no benefit to accrue from the possession of this land, because the Government has not sold one water cocoanut from the trees. This shows you the lack of foresight and nothing but narrow-sightedness on the part of the last Government. Yet the then Minister had a mind of his own. We also have got to pay taxes for 1961-62 amounting to \$91.38, taxes for 1962-63 amounting to \$108.49, plus the fees for three appraisers at \$60 each which is \$180 and the legal expenses of \$1,200. This is the plight that the members of the last Government committed on the community of Barbados. The taxpayers tonight, Mr. Chairman, are asked to pay \$6,241.87 as a result of the ineptitude of the last Government. This money could have been spent in the development of sport or something like that. There is a lot more to be exposed, Mr. Chairman, but it will come in due course. This is the sort of thing that they have done to the country. Instead of having to spend these funds on community development, you have to spend it in compensation. If you do not want to get burnt, do not play with fire. They have been playing with fire.

The owner of the land, Mr. Chairman, did not want to sell the property and refused to negotiate with them. They wrote him several letters to which he paid no attention; so they were begging to squander the taxpayers' money. I am sorry the hon. ex-Minister of Social Services is not here to answer, because I would like to hear what his defence to this would be. He tried to defend the acquisition of it and talked absolute nonsense. Now how is he going to face the people tomorrow? How can he go to St. George and face his electorate? All they have to ask him is where has the \$6,241.87 gone that could have been spent on their children. They need milk, day nurseries and all sorts of help, and when this money has got to be spent for compensation through their ignorance, how are they going to answer for it? Yet they walk around talking nonsense. 7.00 p.m.

In the circumstances, Mr. Chairman, a Government is responsible for the commitments of a former Government, and you can see clearly what this country would have gone to if they had sat in the seats of Government for another year. They had run bankrupt of ideas and this is the result today. We have brought it at the proper time.

I, therefore, beg to move that this Resolution for \$6,042 do now pass.

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I remember well, when this matter came to this House, and I am not surprised that this Resolution has come before us as a result of that. However, with all that the Hon. Minister has said and done, it is clear that something has been left undone. Let me ask, how has the Government arrived at this compensation? Just tell me that.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, the solicitors of Mr. Percy Whitehead made certain representations on 31st July, 1963. In those representations, they claimed compensations of \$4,000 for being deprived of possession of the land. Of course, following that, the Government would not accept the claim before it had put its experts to work and the matter was referred to the legal adviser of the Government who in turn advised that the Chief Agricultural Officer and the Director of Public Works visit the site and advise as to whether this compensation was adequate. Both the Chief Agricultural Officer and the Director of Public Works advised that it was reasonable in the light that there were 190 cocoanut trees on this site. After all, Mr. Whitehead would expect something from his cocoanut and mango trees. I will also say that on the site were also three ackee trees and a mango tree. In the light of what it was on the property, the Government was advised that the compensation asked for was reasonable.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I quite agree as regards the cocoanut trees and the \$4,000 which the solicitors claimed as compensation. 7.10 p.m.

You have given \$4,000 which the Solicitors asked for and I am quite satisfied that you have taken every precaution in order to see that you had competent people to deal with this matter. But what about the other \$2,000? The hon. member said that \$4,000 was asked for.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, I gave the hon. member the breakdown of the Resolution and I pointed out that 35 of the cocoanut trees were missing. I also mentioned that it was due to the lack of vision on the part of the then Government that there was no watchman stationed there to take care of this property. Mr. Whitehead, in his representation to the Government claimed that 35 cocoanut trees were lost. There was a watermill valued at \$240.00, four pumps valued at \$48 and two two-inch brass valves valued at \$24 together with the Solicitor's fees.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, before the question is put, I should like to make a few remarks on this Resolution. I do not know Forde or his pasture, and therefore I cannot defend this matter in any way whatsoever. However, Sir, taking it now from what the Hon. Minister has said, the Minister said that it would take a mammoth sum of money in order to develop the area. I would like to know what is this mammoth amount of money, as the Hon. Minister has said it will be too costly to develop this land; however the amount of money for development has not been mentioned in this Resolution. Suppose it would take \$5,000 to develop it! We are paying out \$6,000. I do not know what is this mammoth amount. I would expect the hon. member to tell me how much is this mammoth amount for developing this area. By just saying that it would take a mammoth amount to develop this land is not sufficient; we should be told that the land would have cost so much and it would have taken so much to develop it. That is what should be set out in this Resolution.

The hon. member said that this was a swamp. Mr. Chairman, I do not know if it is a swamp or a water hole, but I understand that a pump was on it. Cocoanut trees were there but this land was fourteen acres of swamp. I believe that the Hon. Minister must have paid a visit to this area. The hon. junior member for St. Peter said that this land used to produce canes. Well, Sir, canes cannot be produced in a swamp. The Minister is putting before this Chamber that this is fourteen acres of swamp. The hon. senior member for St. Peter would know Forde and his pasture better than any of us in here would know them. The hon. senior member for St. Peter was always against the acquisition of this land by the Government. I have never investigated this matter; I know nothing about this land because I only pass along the main road. On the other hand, the Hon. Minister should let us know what is the purchase price and what it would cost to develop this site so as to clear the air. The public should know what the sum of money for developing this land is rather than the Minister just saying that it would cost a mammoth sum of money to develop it. The Resolution states that it would be too costly to develop this land and that is why the Government has had to abandon it.

The last Government went out in 1961 and the present Government came in soon afterwards. I would like to know when these things were taken away; I would like to know if it was during the regime of the last Government or whether it was during the regime of this present Government. These things could have been taken away during the present Government's regime. The Hon. Minister said that the last Government did not have the sense to secure the services of a watchman but, at the same time, the present Government did not have the sense of employing a watchman there either. When they took over in 1961 without a watchman, in my opinion, they are more bankrupt of ideas and more foolish in this particular case than the last Government was. Who is there in order to prove that these things were taken away or that they were there at all? The Hon. Minister in trying to flog a dead horse is attacking the last Gov-

ernment, (A MEMBER: We know that it is a dead horse.) (Laughter). The last Government is not here now and therefore what are we worrying about? This \$6,000, it can be said, would do this or that; it would do everything. I will tell the Minister later on, I will tell him and his Government how much money was thrown away with which they could buy milk; I will tell them that if I do not die and go to Heaven. It is of no use trying to make the people of this country believe that the last Government threw away \$6,000. I would say, comparatively speaking, that nothing has been thrown away, but I will not say now where more than that has been thrown away.

The last Government went out of office in 1961. This is now 1964, and I am saying that the present Government is more ignorant than the last Government in this instance. That is all I want to say. I want to tell the Hon. Minister that he is young and he does not know the ropes as we know them. The way in which the Minister has been talking would make one believe that we took over this pasture last month; but they are spending this money now, it is not the last Government which is spending it. If they think that this money would give milk to the children, they have the money to pay for the milk now. I do not know what is the agreed price for this land.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Hon. Minister will answer that question.

Mr. SMITH: I hope he will answer it. We are still in the dark; the public does not know and I do not know what is the agreed price. I say that we should know what is the agreed price, if anything was paid out at all or what. I am asking for the cost price of this land, how much money was paid out, how long both parties had possession of the land and when these things were taken away; what was the month and what was the year in which they were taken away? I did not know that you could steal a cocoanut tree. Well, Sir, something miraculous is taking place at Forde's. Did I understand the Minister to say that somebody went down there and carried away these trees?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. junior member for St. George had slapped the hon. junior member for St. Joseph, he would not have got up here now and talked as he has talked. The hon. member told me that his colleague did not take his advice and now he is trying to represent him.

Mr. SMITH: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, the Hon. Minister says that I told him that my colleague would not take my advice. I was sitting in this chair and my colleague was talking.
7.20 p.m.

How could I advise him? The Speaker would not allow two of us to speak at the same time; so the Minister had better behave himself and not try to make things look funny, because I want to know when I admitted to him that my colleague would not take my advice. When you are joking, you are joking; but this is Parliament and the hon. member must not try to make me look ridiculous before this Honourable House. I have not asked the Hon. Minister anything about my colleague. I asked him about this Resolution, and I take it he should reply to the Resolution and not worry about my colleague.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Now, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member seemed not to have been listening when I was introducing this Resolution. I pointed out where the negotiations started, and I further pointed out that the Government was advised that it would take just as much to develop this area especially with the sewage disposal problem and the question of drainage. The only satisfactory type of drainage would be to pump the sewage out to sea. We have got to pump the sewage from the new Hospital out to sea, and that is taking thousands of dollars.

The hon. member mentioned the question of a watchman and tried to refute my argument, but I want him to understand this. As early as 1962 this Government expressed its lack of interest in any project which we considered a

waste of taxpayers' money, and in particular this project. We visited the site and saw that it was unsuitable. We were advised again that it was unsuitable and I make bold to say that with a new Government it is a question of getting *au fait* with your files, and as soon as we become *au fait* with these files, we began to take the necessary action. We would not have known immediately that there was no supervision; we had to find that out from the files. Now there are hundreds of files with which a Minister has to deal, and this Government took the reins of this country in December 1961. In 1962 we began to act on this, and we expressed, as I said, our lack of interest in it as early as August, 1962. There were several files we had to deal with, but this file was drawn to our attention in August 1962 and it took some time to go through. It takes some time to have things implemented, and negotiations were carried out between all concerned; so it was absolutely impossible between the time of the acquisition of this property and the time we became *au fait* with this file to know what provision was made for supervision; and when we started the negotiations for the abandonment of this idea, we were presented with this number of trees that was missing, the pump, etc. The hon. member can rest assured that we never had any interest in developing this area, and as soon as it was drawn to our attention and we got to that file, we began to give it active consideration and expressed our lack of interest in the scheme. By the time that we began to carry out negotiations for the abandonment of the scheme, it was reported that the trees were gone, the mill and other items.

Now the hon. member asked how much money the Government paid down on this property. It was not a question of paying down money on it, because the owner of the property refused to talk money with the Government and they had to go to arbitration, because to acquire it compulsorily, you would have to go to arbitration to know how much you would have to pay for it. We know that the owner quoted a figure, but he refused to have further negotiations; so it was not a question of paying down any part of the money. A Government does not operate that way. As a matter of fact, we did not even go to arbitration because we abandoned the scheme immediately. After paying visits to the site, we abandoned the scheme; hence we could not pay any money. I do not know if that satisfies the hon. member, but I think it should.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, that could never satisfy me. The Hon. Minister said that it is not their Government's intention to throw away taxpayers' money. I agree with him on that. I would not blame the Minister for not knowing about this scheme because he was not in the House at the time, but there were members of his Cabinet who were in the House from the beginning of the selection, negotiation and introduction of Forde's Pasture. Now it is not their intention to use it, but when they took over, should they not have had an inventory from the man or somebody of what was on the property, how many cocoanut trees, how many mills.....

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I specifically pointed out that when the file was drawn to our attention we went through it and immediately expressed our lack of interest, and we were then presented with this list from the owner that there were 35 trees missing, a water mill, pumps and so on. Where would it have become necessary for us to have an inventory when immediately this matter was drawn to our attention we expressed our lack of interest in it and were presented with this?
7.30 p.m.

Mr. SMITH: But it was drawn to their attention. It was in 1962 that it was drawn to their attention. If it was not drawn to their attention, nothing would have been done.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Sir, I rise on a point of order. The hon. member does not understand what I am saying. What I pointed out to the hon. member is that it was in August when we expressed our lack of interest in it, and this was expressed to the owners and solicitors. Representations were then made to us that these were the things which were taken away.

Mr. SMITH: The Hon. Minister said that I do not seem to understand, but he does not seem to understand either. He said that negotiations were going on with these people. Well then, the last Government must have had possession of the land and had taken it over pending its acquisition. I take it that with this land acquisition, or however they do it, values would have to be gone into, and a recommendation made to the Government even before they start to take away the land from the people. Do you mean to say that you take away a man's land without knowing the value or having a valuation of any sort? That is what I would like to find out from the Hon. Minister. I would like to find out if the last people who had taken this land from the people took it away and then started to get a valuation of it?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: When land is being acquired compulsorily under the Land Acquisition Act, the land is taken over after the notices have appeared in the Official Gazette and the question of compensation is settled afterwards. Therefore, what the hon. member is saying is not the practice. It takes months, probably a whole year, before the price is settled; so the price is left over and settled by arbitration and, as you will understand, that takes months afterwards. The acquisition of Graeme Hall is a case in point and that of the other plantations which are taken over. The price is left over pending settlement by way of arbitration.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE, 1964-65, No. 5

DEVELOPMENT OF SPORT

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, some time during last month, the Manager of the British American Tobacco Company informed the Ministry of Community Development that his company was sponsoring a tour of the Chelsea and Wolverhampton Football teams to certain countries of the West Indies — Barbados, Trinidad and Jamaica — and asked the Government for its co-operation in this venture. At the time when the Manager made representations to the Ministry, we discussed the possibility of having one of the experts who was accompanying these teams to assist us with coaching here. We did this because of our attitude towards sport in Barbados.

Mr. Chairman, you will remember that it was only last year that we took the decision to have a separate Sports Section in the Ministry and at the time we made provision for an Athletic Coach, an Assistant Sports Officer, a Sports Assistant and so on. I remember in that debate that strong representation was made that we should consider the proposition of having the services of an experienced coach in football if we were to push football along. At that time, I entirely agreed with the hon. senior member for St. Peter who was strong in his representation and, as a matter of fact, he made a similar representation in 1962 or around that time when we were discussing the Estimates and again when we were discussing assistance to the Olympic Association for the team which they were sending abroad. Not only did the hon. senior member for St. Peter make this representation, but similar representation was made by the hon. junior member for the City of Bridgetown who is always strong in his representation where sports are concerned.

I entirely agreed with both hon. members on what they had said, but in the light of the economy of the country at the time we could not then staff a permanent football coach. It is to be noticed, however, that this Government is interested in pushing all forms of sport and much has already been done for cricket. We have tried to push athletics and we are trying to promote lawn tennis. It is here that I should like to express the Government's appreciation of the assistance given to our community by the Barbados Amateur Lawn Tennis Association. They have co-operated in pushing lawn tennis; and although we do not have the experts, those members of the Barbados Lawn Tennis Association, who have experience have tried to give of their experience to this country.

If I may pause for one moment, Mr. Chairman, I may say this. We like representations made like this to us such as the representations made by the hon. senior member for St. Peter and the hon. junior member for the City of Bridgetown; but when one is going to take up the Manifesto of this Democratic Labour Party or of this Government and is going to bring in a Resolution or a question according to what is in the Manifesto of the Government, one is left to wonder what is coming next.
7.40 p.m.

It was only on the 16th May that I had a Press Conference in my Ministry, and at that Press Conference it was stated that the Government had appointed a Committee to advise on the best ways and means of providing recreational centres in certain areas of the country. Mr. Chairman, it is only today that we had a question tabled by the hon. junior member for St. Joseph. That is his pattern; he likes to read the Manifesto of the Government Party and then bring forward questions out of it. He likes to listen to Government policy and then bring things out of the Manifesto so as to steal our thunder.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order. Mr. Chairman, the Hon. Minister has made reference to the fact that he had a Press Conference in his Ministry and that he had appointed a Committee to go into the matter to advise ways and means of providing these recreational centres in certain areas of the country. The Hon. Minister went on to say that people follow what is happening at these Press Conferences and then bring questions in here. I hope that the Hon. Minister is not referring to me.

Mr. SMITH: On a point of order. Mr. Chairman, the Hon. Minister called my name and he said that I am stealing their thunder. He says that I read their Manifesto and then steal their thunder. (ASIDES.) All right, Sir, I will reply when the hon. member has finished speaking.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: To be a little more specific, Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that I was not at all referring to anything which the hon. senior member for the City has said or done. I said that I had a Press Conference at which I dealt with some sport issue and that Conference was held on the 16th May. At that Conference I pointed out that a Committee had been appointed to advise the Government on the form of recreational facilities which would be provided at certain sites. I mentioned specifically the East Coast Road; and only today the hon. junior member for St. Joseph, in his usual style of going through the Manifesto of the Government Party and taking out parts of the Government's policy and bring it to the House so as to steal out thunder, did the same thing. I was not referring to anything which the hon. senior member for the City said or did; I was referring to the East Coast Road and to the Press Conference I had about the employment of people and giving the community of Barbados something of the Government's policy and attitude towards sport. I was giving information on that matter. Mr. Chairman, after having discussions with the Manager of the British American Tobacco Company, I explored the possibilities of having one of those gentlemen whom we understood was an expert Coach, one of those professionals who had long experience in playing football, to remain over to assist our Association here as a football coach so that our standard of football would be raised. I am sure that hon. members, especially those who have watched the football matches at Kensington Oval played by the two English teams namely, Wolverhampton and Chelsea, will agree with me that we can gain much from the experience of these players. The Government took a decision to have one of these players return to us on the 8th of next month when the Tour has been completed, to give us his services. That gentleman, whose name is Mr. John Mortimore, is an experienced and qualified Coach; he plays at centre half for Chelsea and has played in over 180 Test Matches. He has also represented England as an amateur on more than one occasion. He has been described by the Manager of the Team as a first-class Coach, and he has willingly consented to come out here and give us of his services freely.

We do not have to pay him a salary. He came down here on the excursion ticket rate and therefore the Government

will have to pay the excess amount over the excursion rate. We have to pay his hotel accommodation and he must have a subsistence allowance, transportation allowance and there is an amount of \$100 in the Estimates for incidentals. We might even be asked to shoulder certain other responsibilities; for example for the time during which he will be here his wife will have to be present and therefore she is coming down here. B. W. I. A. has been nice enough to us as to bring down this gentleman's wife and little daughter free of charge. That is why we have brought down this Resolution for the sum of \$2,000 in order to cover the expenses of this football Coach. Our football players have much to gain from the presence of this Coach here and we are hoping that next year through the instrumentality of the same team and the Football Association here we will have another English Coach to assist us.

7.50 p.m.

Now someone may say that a month is not long enough, but these people are professionals and have got to get back to England to continue their work. This is how they earn their living, and this is the maximum amount of time we could have got him to stay. You may wonder how we are going to use his services. I will say that they will be used in schools, and he will be coaching the leading players of the B.A.F.A. and the coaches of our clubs who in turn will do the coaching when he has gone.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I hope I will not have to speak as long as the Minister on this Resolution, but what I am going to say is going to be surprising. I am the senior Vice-President of the Football Association, and I have a longer association with the Association than even the President of the Association. Now I want to warn the Government. I do not know who is advising the Government, but with all the compliments I want to pay to the British American Tobacco Company, I want to say to the Minister that the British American Tobacco Company does not run football in Barbados. Somebody is under the hazy idea that because a cigarette company for purposes of advertising "Rothmans" has done this, or because oil companies do these things, they run the games. For the games to be run there is an association to run them and keep them going. I want to warn the Hon. Minister that these teams came here and the Council of the Football Association knew nothing about any of these arrangements, and you may get a rude shock if a Council meeting is called and the whole thing is rejected. We are not going to reject it out of spite, but we are going to make people understand, whether they come down from Chelsea or Wolverhampton, that wherever authority resides, it has to be respected and treated accordingly. If I am going to deal with the President of the Olympic Association who is the hon. junior member for Bridgetown, no amount of gifts or grants-in-aid are going to prevent me, and I want to say that I can galvanise a lot of support in the Football Association to make it very embarrassing. You cannot meet the President and say you have met the Association. The Council of the Association is the ruling body in Barbados, and no football team can leave the Island without the permission of the Football Association. I have read about this coach in the newspaper, but the Council of the Association does not know on what basis he will be employed. We want to know if it is Mr. John Mortimore, because the Football Association is one of the Associations in Barbados that pays its way. We were asking on one occasion for a coach, and we were going to ask to what extent the Government would assist. I want to say here and now that we would not challenge Mr. John Mortimore, nor would we say that because Chelsea and Wolverhampton brought people here we would not use someone, but not with BAT deciding. The British American Tobacco Company does not run football. If we have some weaklings in our Association, I cannot blame the Minister; but the Football Association does not know on what basis this coaching is going to take place. The Council has not met nor do I want to call an emergency meeting.

Mr. Chairman, I have refused to go to any of these football matches as a matter of principle, because as senior Vice-President of the Council I had not been informed about them; but I saw in an interview that the President of my Association is grossly incompetent, that is an internal problem and I am not going to blame outsiders for that; but I must make it known publicly that I would resign from the Association before I would have this sort of treatment to the Council of the Association. I am sure that members in here are members of bodies and realise what it means. The hon. junior member for Bridgetown has been a sportsman for as long as I have been, and we have respect for these bodies. Could you, for example, envisage having anything in an Association with your Olympic Games and not asking the appropriate Council body? I know that these people went to Trinidad and it was done on a different basis. The Trinidad people even had a referee for a match. This sort of inferiority that Barbados is going to exhibit in these matters is something I do not indulge in.

I should like to say to the Minister, Mr. Chairman, that \$2,000 is no money for a coach. He is in Barbados and you are using him. The hon. member spoke about next year, but let me make what I said on the last occasion clear. We have a player here in his own way. Reggie Haynes in football is equal to what Garfield Sobers and Frank Worrell are in cricket. He does not possess some of their qualities in other fields; but when we meet in Council I have to express what I know, because when we have a coach coming here, we want to see who are the people who will be coached. You have to give these people physical training and let them go through the paces, and I consider that with this young chap greater use can be made of his athletic potential in the field for which he has ability, and I feel sure that I am expressing the views of people who go to football and know something about football. I would say that if there is an attempt to deal with athletics, I consider that the Athletic Association of Barbados would know most about it and it is not for the Permanent Secretary, the Minister and a few individuals to call some persons to the Ministry and ask them their views. You should consult the Council; otherwise you are wasting your time and money, because if you do not get their support and co-operation, you will fail.

I am not going to do anything now, Mr. Chairman, to embarrass this situation that has been created. We want a coach, but the organising of a coach must be dealt with through the appropriate sources, and that is the Council of the Football Association, and you must be sure that any person who speaks speaks for that; otherwise you will have a rebellious atmosphere. I will let members know today that if a Council meeting is called tomorrow, it is going to be a rebellious affair, because people were brought here to play football, and members of the Council of the Association did not have an opportunity of knowing whether the prices they were charging would be suitable to Barbados. They took a few people that are on Committees and talked with them, and they had the rude situation that in Barbados they were charging \$1, \$2 and \$3 while the charge was \$1 and \$2 in Trinidad with a higher economy. You got this sort of monstrosity of somebody advising that you could fill Kensington at \$2, and at the Barbados-Chelsea match you did not have as many people as you would have had if Everton was playing New South Wales.

8.00 p.m.

That was an indication that people did not know. Anybody who knows something about football would know that it is positively stupid to ask the Chelsea team to play Barbados because when you take five of the best players in Barbados and put them to play a match against a team like Chelsea, it is just the same as taking a runner and putting him to run against an Olympic runner. Somebody said when Barbados was beaten 7 - 0, by the Chelsea team that we were not disgraced, which means as much as you must get beaten 50 - 0 to be disgraced. There were 90 minutes of play: so they wanted Chelsea to score 90 goals in that time to say that we were disgraced.

I am a sportsman, I would like to see the Government supporting these sports. I have no charge to make against the Government for what it is doing now, but I am warning the Government that in its paying too much enthusiasm, it may fail. That is why I am saying that the Government would be well advised when it has got down to these things not to make any Ministerial decisions because you are the Government before having a consultation with all the people in sport. That is why I say that if you build a stadium outside of Bridgetown, nobody is going to use it. As soon as you build a stadium outside the City of Bridgetown, it would be only used for other things at night, but not for sport.

I will not talk about athletics; I leave that to the hon. junior member for the City of Bridgetown. However, I feel, as regards your marking out the track for runners, that it is measured incorrectly because anyone who runs on the outside runs a greater distance than the one who is on the inside. As a matter of fact, when you mark out a track with a piece of chalk and white lime, that is a far different thing from when you have a track marked with precision instruments. I do not know if you have the right tools to measure these tracks.

Sir, when you come to sport, deal with the people in a general way. If you are going to bring down an athletic coach, do not get an athletic coach because he is the best athlete in England. Find out what the coach would be able to teach your athletes. The Hon. Minister said that this football coach is to coach our footballers for one month. I do not know what he will be able to teach them. He has come after the football season and when the grounds are getting ready for cricket; therefore, it appears to me that you will have to improvise in some other way. Having a football coach coming at this time has no real meaning because I do not see to what extent would be the effectiveness of having a football coach at the end of the football season. I may be ignorant of the matter, but you do not train a racehorse after the races are finished. Are you having a football coach now to coach a footballer in putting up his shoes? I think you train a racehorse to run a race, and you train him before the races take place. You do not train a racehorse to send him to the stud. I do not know if you are having a football coach now to start to train our boys in drinking rum. I think the effectiveness of his training would be immediately before the football season begins so that at least what is taught would be practised in a competitive game. The best thing about training in this way is that you compete against one another, too. When you are running by yourself, you can feel that you are running fast enough to beat anybody; it is only when you are competing against somebody that you know if you are running fast enough.

Sir, I am going to support the Resolution, but I am only pointing out to the Hon. Minister some of these flaws. I am giving this as an advice to the Hon. Minister. In all things make sure that you are getting the best advice. I am not going to pressurise the Government into doing something. I am in an Association and I feel that you should pay for some of the things which you want. I feel that one of the best encouragements you can get from sport like this is to have a central ground because it will make the young athletes who have just left school continue to pursue sport. We have to rely on Kensington Oval too much; and as long as that situation remains, as long as that is the only ground, you are going to have sport stultified in the Island.

Mr. LYNCH: Sir, I have to support the last speaker in several of the things which he has said. However, he was misinformed when he referred to a person who runs on the outside track as running a greater distance than the athlete on the inside track. I am speaking now to correct the misinformation of the last speaker. (A VOICE: What has that to do with the matter before us?) Those who know about the subject which I am discussing would appreciate what I am saying.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. I do not think this is a forum on football technology; we are here to discuss the matter before the House.

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Chairman, I am sure that you would appreciate that when one mentions something about the

track and you know something about it, you would reply to the matter if the person has been misinformed. However, to continue, it might not be generally known that the Association to which the hon. senior member for St. Peter belongs happens to be a subsidiary to the Association of which I have the honour to be President. Therefore, any invitation of a football team here cannot be given unless we give them the consent; therefore, it is to be expected that the Olympic Association would be consulted in matters of this sort.
8.10 p.m.

The Hon. Minister might not know this, but there are three teams which will be coming here in the near future — one basket ball team from Canada for which I have to find a sponsor, another from the United Kingdom for which I also have to find a sponsor and also an athlete from Great Britain for whom I have to find a sponsor. For none of these have I approached the Government; I have been thinking of the possibility of finding sponsors in the private sector. I may have to ask the Hon. Minister for a vote to support the teams in this island, all of whom have promised to give teaching at the end of the games.

The point I want to make is this, and it will go a long way in training a coach for footballers. I would prefer that Mr. Reggie Haynes be selected for training as one of the few Barbadians who showed any kind of kinship to the real footballer, but it is decidedly problematical as to how much a man can do in a single month during the cricket season, to curb the interest and national exuberance of the Barbadian footballer to indulge in ballooning and other Barbadian pursuits. It might be very much better if the Government were to think of sending the gentleman whom I have mentioned abroad to be trained so that he will be here as a permanent coach for the assistance of those who would like to play football.

I congratulate the Government in assisting in this scheme, but perhaps in future they will consult other people before they make their decision. It is true to say that those young men who came here and played are in receipt of high stipends; these eighteen and nineteen-year-old people are in receipt of a minimum remuneration of £5,000 a year. One of them who plays in the position of inside right was transferred for the sum of \$24,000 so that we are very fortunate in having Mr. Mortimore out here; but the way in which the matter was gone about was wrong. Those who are concerned in this matter ought to be consulted before these decisions are arrived at. The gain from having so illustrious a coach like Mr. Mortimore for a single month is problematical, because when he goes away and without makeshift arrangements, who is to say that those who have received the benefit of this training will not revert to the former practice? I have had the experience of going to Rome with a West Indies Team and we had the benefit of a coach, Mr. Johnson, who tried to instruct our athletes in starting and probably they were worse off in starting than they were before. I must point out that I am not in any way attempting to criticise the bona fides of the Government in this matter; I am merely suggesting that consultation be had with those who know most of this matter before they yield to the blandishments of people who would like their support in matters of this kind.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, in reply to both hon. members who spoke on this Resolution and who have contended that the Government should have consulted people who know most about this particular form of sport before making our decision, I should like to point out that we have had discussions with representatives from the Barbados Amateur Football Association. We have had discussions with the President, the Secretary and Treasurer on this matter and in this file which I have here, there is a note to the effect that the Ministry discussed the scheme with these representatives and they all agreed to recommend that we should make full use of this coach's time. In this matter there was a limited time at our disposal. These arrangements were made a little time before the football team came here. We got in touch with the President, the Secretary and Treasurer of the Football Association and we discussed the matter with the Government's advisers in this form of sport; we thought therefore that we were doing what was in the best interest of the community.

The hon. junior member for the City has said that it may be problematical as to whether this one month of coaching by Mr. Mortimore will be of any great benefit to the island. I should like to say that I have seen and witnessed the same hon. member encourage short training courses by utilising the services of a U.S. Athletic Coach for training athletes in Barbados when we did not have the services of a coach. That was a few years ago. This United States Coach was here and he carried out coaching programmes at Weymouth. That was all done through the instrumentality of the hon. junior member for the City. We all know that training for a month perhaps would not be as helpful as a course of training for six months or a year; but the fact is, as I have explained, we would have liked to have been able to obtain the services of this gentleman for a longer period if those services were available. 8.20 p.m.

We have taken the view that this gentleman will give of his experience to people who are most knowledgeable by Barbadian standards, who in turn, would instruct members of their clubs, the children in the schools, and Games masters who play an active part in football. That is the type of person that the football coach will give a considerable amount of time to.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I should like to inform the House that there is no quorum.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I should like to point out, Mr. Chairman, that a considerable amount of time will be spent with the senior players who have to represent the island; so the maximum amount of use will be made of Mr. Mortimore during his short stay.

Mr. WALCOTT: I should like the hon. member to bear in mind that the hon. junior member for Bridgetown did not make any criticism of the Minister, because he said he called the President, Secretary and Treasurer. We are not making any quarrel with them. What I was pointing out to him is that when he talks about the Secretary, our Secretary is a Sunday School teacher. He is, therefore, a Sunday school joke when it comes to these things I am talking about. When you are talking about deep matters of policy such as having a coach for a month, do not call him and expect he is going to tell you anything, because he is the sort of man that if you invite the Governor he is going to disobey. Such people might not be able to advise the Minister. If you are going to bring Mr. Mortimore, some of them will get so excited because this is an Englishman from Chelsea who is coming for a month, that they will tell the Minister "yes".

Mr. Chairman, I feel you are going to waste \$2,000 on Mr. Mortimore training footballers in June to play football next February. The next football season will begin in February 1965, and you will train footballers for a month in June. Who other than a Sunday school idiot would advise that? You had better spend the \$2,000 in sending Mr. Haynes to England for the next six months in their off season to get some idea. I want to tell the hon. member also that these schools do not have people in clubs apart from school clubs. Notre Dame is not a school and the players have no certificates apart from baptismal certificates, but those are the ones that beat the schools you are talking about. Everton has been winning the cup; Spartan has been relegated, and the nearest time Empire has come to winning the cup is this year — after five years. Carlton scraped through and won on one occasion. In football in Barbados the masses are the ones who control the football technique, and if you have to train, those are the people to train; not the ones going to Richmond or these other schools which have playgrounds, but the ones who have no good pasture to play on and kick about a stocking or a salmon tot. The names you hear today are "Gas", "Pretty", and "Pow-pow". These are fellows who have to hustle every day for a living. I am asking the Minister therefore not to take what we have said as any criticism of the Government. I would say that the Minister did it in good faith, and that is why I said I congratulated the Government and pointed these things out, because those of us who have a deep interest in these things do not feel that we have asked for them for the sake of asking. We want the best use to be made of the money spent.

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to prolong the debate, but I want to point out to the Minister that I was offering advice and not criticism. If people had been consulted as well as they might have been, they would have offered better advice. When Jamaica wanted a football coach, they did not go to England; they went to the home of football, Brazil.

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

On the motion of Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of two Resolutions in Committee of Supply, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On the separate motions of Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, seconded in each case by Hon. C. E. TALMA, the Resolutions were read a first and second time and agreed to.

8.30 p.m.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT SPENCERS, CHRIST CHURCH

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

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Premier: To move the passing of a Resolution to approve of the compulsory acquisition of land at Spencers, Christ Church.

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

There being no objection, leave was granted the Hon. Minister.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution seeks to get the approval of the Legislature for the compulsory acquisition by the Government of ninety acres, two roods, four perches of land at Spencers Plantation in the parish of Christ Church.

You will see from the Addendum that the land abuts and bounds on the West on lands of Seawell Plantation, the property of the Barbados Government, on the North on other lands of the said Seawell Plantation, on the North-east on lands of Spencers Plantation, on the East on lands of Oldbury Plantation and on the South on the sea or however else the same may abut and bound.

The Government seeks to acquire this land for three reasons. The first is to provide security for work on the high altitude project known as HARP and the Brace Experiment Project. It is also for the purpose of providing additional area for the Regional Police Training School and to assure planned development of the Seawell and Paragon areas.

With the purpose of providing public security and public safety along the region where these 90 acres are situated, the Government commenced negotiations with the owners of the land, but these negotiations have proved unsuccessful and no agreement has been reached with regard to the purchase price and acquisition. The Government, therefore, had no other alternative than to invoke the Land Acquisition Act, 1949, in order to acquire the land pending settlement of the matters outlined by the Minister.

Sir, I am sure that hon. members would not want the Government to pay more than what the land is reasonably

worth, and I am sure that hon. members know that the Government would not desire to pay the owners less than what the land is worth; and since it has been found that there is no agreement, the only manner in which the matter can be resolved is to resort to compulsory acquisition. Apart from the interest of having proper areas of land for the continuance of the Brace Experiment Project, it is also imperative to have the area in which these experiments are to be conducted surrounded in order to ensure public safety and public security of the experiments.

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

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say to the Hon. Leader of the House that I quite agree with him that no one would expect that the Government would pay less for the land, and no hon. member would expect that the taxpayers would be fleeced; but the Hon. Minister made mention of something which I am afraid I do not accept as correct.

As you read the Resolution, you will see that this land is being bought so as to provide for the Brace Experiment Project, as well as the Regional Police Training School and, in short, public safety and also to ensure planned development for the Seawell-Paragon area.

Now, Sir, what do hon. members understand about the Brace Experiment Project and High Altitude Experiment? I would like to sit down and ask other than Government members, if they understand what this is. In other words, we are being asked to acquire this land, I know the entire area and it does seem reasonable to believe that there is need for this land; but I am going to say what I believe every other hon. member in here believes and, that is, do we really understand all that this is about? The Hon. Minister said that it is for the purpose of security for the Brace Experiment Project and I would be confessing to something which I know nothing about if I said that I know something about it. (A VOICE: Or is it that you are not interested in that?)

The Hon. Minister said that we know of it. What we know of it is that Canadians, or whoever they are, have come down here to carry on this project and we know that when members of the Government were in the Opposition, we were told when the station was to be put in St. Lucy — and that is a long time ago; and then we saw what the various periodicals and other magazines said about what it was and, of course, we were told certain things in this House. I do appreciate that there must be top secrets in respect of security which cannot be broadcast for certain reasons, but I do not accept the statement made by the Hon. Minister that all members understand and know.

8.40 p.m.

Therefore, are we to understand that the Barbados Government..... (ASIDES) I am serious about this matter. You are buying land and this is no suggestion that you should pay more for land than what it is worth. (ASIDES) I say so.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would ask the hon. senior member for St. Peter not to think aloud.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I was saying, Sir, that this is not any suggestion that the Government should pay more for this land or that the owners of the land should get less for it than what it is really worth. We know that we have Seawell as an international Airport. If for public safety it becomes necessary, on the advice of the experts, that we must acquire this land possibly having regard to the new type of aircraft which you will have in a year or so, that is a matter for Barbados. If it becomes necessary for the expansion of the Regional Police Training School that we should acquire this land, because the Training School is connected directly with the inhabitants of Barbados, I would say "Yes" immediately; but, Sir, I cannot sit here today and just vote blindly on this matter and say that I understand all about the Brace Experiment Project and what it is all about. Mr. Speaker, I do not know what it is all about.

If we acquire this land compulsorily, all that means is that a price cannot be agreed upon between the Government and the vendors of the land, and that the Government will acquire it and then a Board of Arbitration will be set up and you will go through the usual procedure which is set out in the Act. We will therefore be taking money from Barbados for the purpose of acquiring land for the Brace Experiment Project.

Mr. Speaker, I am not saying whether it is right or wrong, but the Hon. Minister has assured us that we know all about it. What I want to know from the Hon. Minister is whether the Barbados Government will be compensated for any such portion of land which will be used by Canadians or whoever they are in this High Altitude Research Project or this Brace Experiment. If we acquire this land, I would like to know what portion of it goes to the Regional Police Training School, what portion goes to the extension of the Seawell International Airport and what portion of it goes to this Brace Experiment Project which the hon. member says or assumes that the members of this House know all about. Surely, Mr. Speaker, you, like most of us, may not be interested to know what is going to happen about this High Altitude Research Project, but you would be interested in how much money we are spending in the interest of Barbados. In my opinion, if this is for the public safety as the hon. member has explained, then he must tell us what is behind it all. If this 90 acres of land is costing \$40,000 or \$50,000, what portion goes for the use of the inhabitants of Barbados and what portion goes to the use of this Brace Experimental Project? We want to know that because we do not want this Brace Experiment Project to be acquiring this land and be using Barbadians to negotiate for it for them. We should know something about this matter because the time will come when we will have to pay. You may acquire and take over land, but the day must come to pay for it.

The question which I have posed to the hon. member, I think he should be able to answer. It may be that hon. members may be able to fool themselves that they know all about this project; but, as far as I am concerned, I confess my ignorance about it. While I am not opposed to the passing of this Resolution, I certainly would like to have a greater clarification of the points which I have raised before I vote on this matter. This is a question of 90 acres of land which will have to be paid for at some time or other. I want to know what portion of this land will be used for the benefit of Barbadians.

Mr. SPEAKER: Does any other hon. member want to contribute to this debate before the Hon. Minister exercises his right of final reply? (After a Pause.) It does not seem as if any other hon. member wants to contribute to the debate and therefore the Hon. Minister may exercise his right of final reply.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, this High Altitude Research Project has been going on in Barbados for a number of years, and therefore one felt reasonably safe in assuming that hon. members of this House had, during this period, acquired some detailed information as to the project. Knowing the technical and scientific turn of mind of the Opposition, what I did was to prepare in very simple language a summary of what it was all about. I will give it to the hon. member shortly, but the area of land required for the High Altitude Research Project is not 90 acres; they want something like 65,000 square feet of land — which is less than one and a half acres — and they want another two acres at another point. I also said that some of the land is required for the Regional Police Training School and the remainder is required to ensure planned development of the entire acreage of land at Paragon and Seawell.

8.50 p.m.

With regard to the price, Sir, the Government Standing Valuation Committee assessed the value of the land and their recommendation was roughly one-sixth of what the owners wanted. The Government was prepared to go as far as to pay \$60 per acre more than what the Standing Valuation Committee recommended, but it could not pay six times as much, and therefore there was no alternative but to

resort to the provisions of the Land Acquisition Act to acquire the land at what might be considered a reasonable price. There is a tremendous difference between one-sixth the assessed value of the land and six times the assessed value which the owners were asking. I am sure that the hon. member would not like to think that the Government Standing Valuation Committee, comprised as it is of responsible people with a host of detail and accurate knowledge of land values as that possessed by the hon. senior member for the City himself would recommend paying six times the value of what they said the land was actually worth.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member would give way, I should like to make my position clear in the matter. I should not like to feel that the Government would suffer in a matter of this sort, and that is the point I raised. The real important point which the hon. member started to answer but drifted off on to this question of the price of land, was the division of the land and the usage to which it was to be put, and whether the people would be compensating the Government for that portion which the Government included in the 90 acres they would buy. I appreciate what has been said about the Regional Training School but I know nothing about the other part. If other members know about it, I am willing to sit down and learn; but I want to know if they are going to pay for that. Did I hear some voice saying he cannot tell me that? I really wonder if I heard some voice like a wolf in the wilderness saying that.

Mr. SPEAKER: Obviously that voice could not come from a member of the House.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Not at all, Sir. There are no wolves in the House. The hon. member started to answer me and I saw the water he was swimming in when he was doing so. I wanted to know if the Canadian Government will be paying for that portion you are buying for the use of HARP and so on.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, the land is actually leased to the HARP project. The HARP authorities themselves endeavoured to rent the 65,000 square feet and the two acres from the owners of the plantation, and would go so far as to rent 9.4 acres, all told, at what they considered to be a reasonable rent; but the price charged for it was so exorbitant in their opinion that they could not afford to pay it, and the Government stepped in and we are going to acquire the area, and then we will lease to McGill University for the specific period at a fixed rental the land which they want for this project. Hon. members must not underestimate the value of these two projects to the Island. The research work done by the Brace Experiment Station and the Bellairs Institute are of considerable value to the country, and the HARP project itself, apart from providing a considerable amount of employment, attracts a number of scientists and technologists here from time to time, and it results in the spending of a lot of money in the country. If and when the project folds naturally they will not be taking the land with them when they go back; it will remain the property of the Government. Now as I said earlier, I have a technical summary of what the project involves, and if the hon. senior member for Bridgetown is concerned with scientific development and progress and wants this information, I can give it to him.

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

RESOLUTION re CONSTRUCTION OF ROAD AT CLIFTON HALL PLANTATION

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

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 3 stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to deal with this Order which stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. senior member for Christ Church is seeking leave of the House to deal with the Resolution in the name of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries to approve the grant by the Minister to owners of Clifton Hall Plantation in the parish of St. John of a right of way over a road 14 feet wide and 1,136.2 feet long over lands owned by the Crown, and if there is no objection, leave will be granted.

There being no objection, leave is granted. Let the hon. senior member for Christ Church proceed.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, this is a Resolution which seeks the approval of this Chamber of the grant by the Minister to the owners of Clifton Hall Plantation of a right of way over a road 14 feet wide and 1,136.2 feet long running in an easterly direction from Clifton Hall Plantation in the said parish of St. John over lands owned by the Crown in right of the Government of this Island. The Addendum sets out that the Resolution seeks, in accordance with the provisions of the Executive Committee (Vesting Property and Transfer of Functions) Act, 1964, the approval of the Legislature to the grant of this right of way as I have just mentioned under a rent of \$5.00. The purpose of the grant of the right of way is to facilitate tenants of the above-named plantation in reaping their canes.
9.00 p.m.

The Conditions under which permission is granted to the owners of Clifton Hall Plantation to construct the road over which the right of way will be granted are as follows:-

- (i) The road shall not exceed 14 feet in width;
- (ii) The road surface shall not be treated with bitumenous material;
- (iii) that no peasant or other person be permitted to move his or her house into this area;
- (iv) that gates are provided and that the road is only used for crop reaping purposes;
- (v) that no livestock grazing privileges are granted in the area;
- (vi) that the owners of the plantation accept liability for any damage to Government property caused by any persons using the road (other than Government servants).

As the Addendum to the Resolution sets out, it is for the purpose of the grant of a right of way over this bit of Government's land to enable canes to be reaped by the peasants and owners of land in the area. I do not think this needs any long explanation. It is necessary to come here in order to have approval of the grant of the right of way.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, now, I take it that Clifton Hall Plantation has land somewhere in the area. This gate-to-a-road business has been done away with ever since. This does not exist anymore. That was in the old time slavery days when a particular person owned land and did not want even a fowl to pass over it. Now, Sir, this is land where people have canes growing and this is the Government's road. What example is the Government setting when it is calling on these people to put up gates to this road. Does this Government want to carry us backward? If this land bears canes and so on, I cannot see why the Government cannot acquire this land for the people from the plantation and you would not have to be building a gate to the land or renting the land to the owners of Clifton Hall Plantation. I cannot understand it at all. As far as I have read,

- (i) The road shall not exceed 14 feet in width;
- (ii) the road surface shall not be treated with bitumenous material;
- (iii) that no peasant or other person be permitted to move his or her house into this area;

Now, do you mean to say that these people at Clifton Hall Plantation are not to allow any of their workers to move on this land and that gates are to be provided and the road is only to be used for crop reaping purposes?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member give way, I would just like to say that this land is in Zone I where no building can take place. The Chief Engineer of the Waterworks Department says that the land lies in Zone 1, and according to the Government's water protection policy, no new buildings are permitted and it should be kept from human habitation. There is however no restriction on growing sugar canes in such areas. This road is only to assist the people there is getting out their canes.

Mr. SMITH: It is not suitable to live on, but canes are to be grown there and they are allowing the people to get out their canes. However, I cannot see why the road should not be free at all times for these people to get in and out of the land and not beyond the land, because I take it that the land must be the Government's property. I take it that you get to the land before you get to the Government's property, that is to say, where this water supply is supposed to be. The Government, rather than stopping these people or preventing these people from heading their canes a long distance, are allowing the owners of Clifton Hall Plantation to use this road and pay rent for it and things of that sort. But if the land there is arable land, I cannot understand why the Government could not buy the land for these people.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is it a point of order or is it that the Hon. Minister is asking the hon. member to give way?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I am asking the hon. member to give way. The owners of Clifton Hall Plantation have asked Government's permission to construct this road through the Government's land which abuts and bounds with lands at Clifton Hall. These people are renters and tenants of Clifton Hall, and the owners of Clifton Hall Plantation are asking for permission to construct a road over this land belonging to the Government which adjoins their land. The Government has given permission for this right of way to be cut through the Government's land under certain conditions and the conditions have been imposed in the interest of public health. By virtue of the fact that all of this land is situated in Zone I, it is forbidden to build there and for that reason these restrictions have been imposed.

It is not a question of buying the land. The land on which these tenants are is the property of Clifton Hall Plantation and representations have been made by the owners of Clifton Hall Plantation on behalf of the tenants or renters. Therefore, it is not a question of the Government buying Clifton Hall Plantation. The Government is doing something to help these people in getting out their canes. It is as simple as all that. What is the reason for all this talk? I cannot understand it.
9.10 p.m.

MR. MOTTLEY and MR. SMITH rose to speak.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. junior member for St. Joseph gave way to the Hon. Minister so that he could explain a point.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, if the Hon. Minister had explained the matter when he was introducing this Resolution as he has explained it now, then he would not have had any cause to be wondering what type of opposition they had today.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order. The information is there on the Resolution which the hon. member has. He is suggesting that the Government should acquire land which is already theirs.

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

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Leader of the House wants to dictate to me what I want to say. He says that I want the Government to buy their own land.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order. I am not dictating anything to the hon. member; he asked why does the Government not buy this land so that the tenants can get out their canes? In reply to that I said that the land was already the property of the Government.

Mr. SMITH: I meant that they should buy the land which they are renting from Clifton Hall. That is what I was submitting. The hon. member must have been sleeping.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order. I object to the hon. member saying that. He says that I was sleeping and that what he said was that the Government should have acquired the land on which the tenants are residing. That does not arise in this Resolution at all.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I am a very strong supporter in not yielding one inch as far as zoning the areas in Barbados for the purpose of public health and more especially for the water supply of this island is concerned. I am not yielding one inch in this important matter; I am prepared to stick to that. A long time ago I raised this question with the late Dr. Browne who drew to my attention the fact that we were resting on a volcano if we were to go on using sewerage system and we would possibly find ourselves being attacked by typhoid fever or some other disease. I would like the Hon. Minister just to answer this question. I appreciate that he has said that no houses must be put there. If you put houses there you would provide in that area not the type of house to which the agricultural labourer is accustomed; they would still use the earth pits and therein would lie the danger. I would like to know for what reason the road surface shall not be treated with bituminous material; would that be detrimental to the zone? The hon. member must be careful in answering that question because I deal with these matters every Friday morning. You cannot ask that this road surface must not be treated with this bituminous material and then say in a similar zone in another area where you are sinking another well, that it can be done. I am just drawing these points to the attention of the hon. member. There is a danger of bacteria going through the surface and getting into the wells.

I seldom agree with the hon. junior member for St. Joseph but, frankly, I cannot see the necessity for this condition. You are allowing 27 tenants to use this land for the purpose of getting out their canes and I do not see why any gates should be provided on this road. I can remember when gates used to be placed on private roads; sometimes you went through these roads and then you found that you could not get back out. This is a most important matter. The Government has 70 acres of land in this area and would the Hon. Minister be prepared to say that on this land there is no livestock grazing now? Is he asking me to accept that livestock grazing now is different from livestock grazing when you construct a road and that this leads to the pollution of the water? I do not agree with that; I say that as long as you have Government land people are going to graze their livestock. There is this condition attached to the granting of this right of way that no livestock must be allowed to graze there, and I am suggesting that this is something which will be honoured more in the breach than in the observance.

Nobody worries about who owns this land. You are saying that you are now using it with livestock, but if you cut a road there, no livestock grazing will be allowed to be carried on there. You are not penalising the people of Clifton Hall. You have a condition that in the granting of this right of way.....

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order. Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member would give way, I would like to bring this matter to his attention. There are 27 tenants who rent land from Clifton Hall Plantation but they do not live there.
9.20 p.m.

The owners of the plantation proposed to bulldoze and widen the narrow track which leads into Newcastle Plantation to a width of fourteen feet. There are no houses on the land. All the land is under cane. The Government's land at Clifton Hall Plantation is approximately 50 acres and it is under cane and sour grass. A Waterworks system is also on the land.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has a very sound knowledge of the law. The Addendum states that there will be no livestock grazing privileges granted in the area. What area? This means that the 27 tenants living there cannot graze their stock.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member would give way, I should like to point out that we are granting a right of way for a road for the purpose of ingress and egress to get canes out, and it is for that reason that we have set out specifically that it is for the purpose of grazing.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The hon. member knows that he is not talking to a fool. You are leasing the road, and you should have said "in the surrounding area."

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order, the hon. member is arguing against himself. He said that the Minister should have said "in the surrounding area", but that would have been wrong. If you say the surrounding area, it means the entire Clifton Hall Plantation and the entire Government owned land, which would be absolutely stupid. What we are saying is that no livestock will be allowed to graze in the area of the 14ft. road when we give permission to construct it.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Let the Minister wait until this goes to the Senate. The Addendum says that no livestock grazing privileges will be granted in the area. Now the Minister in charge talked about this 14ft. wide road and of a length of 1,136.2 feet running in an easterly direction. Is that the area you are leasing?

Mr. SPEAKER: This is not exactly a question-and-answer occasion.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I know. This is the area you are renting and you are saying that no livestock grazing privileges are granted in the area, but you should try and put it right.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: If the hon. member would give way, Mr. Speaker, all it means is this: you are cutting a road through land which is now cultivated merely to facilitate some peasants in getting their canes three-quarters of a mile out. At the end of the road we will construct a gate. It is not a public highway, and only during the crop season it will be used, and you prohibit people from going through this road and grazing their stock on the edges of the road. You had no road before. The moment you have a road to permit ingress and egress, people will be tempted to use it and graze their cattle on the edge of the road. You are only allowing the road to be cut for bringing out canes, but cutting the road does not allow people to use this road for grazing. They must stay on the highway and graze their stock, because the land is under cultivation with canes and sour grass. It is as simple as kissing your hand.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am going to challenge the hon. member. You are cutting this road through your 70 acres of land to let the 27 people living there bring out their canes. I agree with you that no house should be built in this area when you grant the right to build this road. You do not have to put this in here because you can prohibit the erection of houses within the zone, since no one can erect a house in this particular zone without the permission of the Town and Country Planning Officer. The question about erecting gates is all well and good if that is how you feel about it. When you come, however, to the part which says that no livestock grazing privileges are granted in this area and you take refuge in the fact that all you mean is the area around the new road, that is what it does not say. You say

that the owners of the plantation must accept liability for any damage to Government property caused by any person using the road other than Government servants. I suppose that is the normal thing if you want to rent land.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to know quite honestly who advised the hon. member that treating the road with bituminous material would be detrimental to the health of the people. However, I do not accept the particular section about livestock grazing in the area. You cannot prevent this, and argue as you like, you know I am right. The 27 people who are now living in the area will now be told that they cannot carry stock in this area for the purpose of grazing, and that is how it will be interpreted. I will counsel the hon. member to put this as clear as a pike-staff so that it would not work a hardship on those 27 people whom you are trying to help. You say in paragraph 6 of this Agreement that the owners of Clifton Hall Plantation are responsible for any damage to Government property, and in paragraph 5 that there will be no livestock grazing privileges in the area. If the plantation owners go to a solicitor, he can only tell them that this means no grazing in the entire area. Are you asking me with my experience to take it that you mean the 14ft. wide road which will be 1,136 ft. long? Take that back to the solicitors and tell them that it is nonsense.
9.30 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: May I point out and remind hon. members that the Addendum is not part of the Resolution?

Mr. MOTTLEY: While it is not part of the Resolution, it is a guide to hon. members. What other guide do we have? When you say: "no livestock grazing privileges are granted in the area", what do you mean? It is no use fooling yourself.

(Sotto voce remarks by the hon. junior member for St. Thomas).

Mr. MOTTLEY: Shut up your mouth or go outside. You all have a bad habit of trying to push your mouths in everything. I am not going to have it in this House.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is approximating to grave disorder.

Mr. MOTTLEY: It is not grave disorder.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is in my opinion quite unsavoury and I hope every hon. member realises that.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, if you call it grave disorder, I apologise. I am serious. They must set an example. Let us be serious about this matter. If I went to either one of the Crown Law Officers and talked about this, what do you think they would say? You are telling me that there are 27 labourers there. When you talk of no livestock grazing privileges are granted in the area, it means that you cannot go down in the road at all. Do you think that the Managers are going to say that you can go down the road and graze, that you can go down the road with your calf, sheep or jack-ass and go over your land and graze that animal? No, he is going to say that you have no right to use that area and that you have to keep within the area of your land. He is going to say that you have no right within the area, "even the area over by your land which I got the right of way for you to bring over your canes." (A VOICE: How can that mean that?)

Sir, I am not going to waste any more time. You are bound to amend this because when you think that you are helping people, you will find out that you are helping them down.

Mr. WALCOTT: Sir, I had no intention of entering this debate, but I must say that debates in this House are getting very small-timish. This Resolution reads as follows:-

This Resolution seeks in accordance with the provisions of the Executive Committee (Vesting Property and Transfer of Functions) Act, 1964, the approval of the Legislature to the grant of a right of way to the owners of Clifton

Hall Plantation over a road 14 feet wide by 1,136.2 feet long running in an Easterly direction from Clifton Hall Plantation to Newcastle Plantation in the parish of St. John at an annual rental of \$5.00.

The purpose of the grant of the right of way is to facilitate tenants of the abovenamed plantation in reaping their canes.

Sir, I do not see why is it that all this chat is being made that the people have no right over this land and you are not giving them a right of way over that road when you are putting in a covenant the conditions which you want and which you have a right to do. I do not like this talk that none of the 27 agricultural labourers has any right to cross on the land. We cannot tell them so. What more right do they want to cross this land than for the purpose of having their canes reaped?

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I never suggested that people should be given the right to cross on the land at all. What I said was that right now, they rent this land and they actually cross over it now.

Mr. WALCOTT: They have no right now to cross over the Government's land. They do not rent it; therefore, you are not taking away any right from them. I am no lawyer, but I cannot see from this explanation how the people can have it both ways. I do not see how the Government has no right to prevent you from crossing on their land. I cannot see how the Government is taking away the right of anybody. The hon. member is reading something into this. It is fantastic how you or any solicitor can read into this what the hon. member is saying. A solicitor cannot substitute law for commonsense. How is it that a solicitor would read into this that you have a right to cross over this land? I have said that I give you the right to cross over there when you are reaping your canes and to go there; but do not bring a cow. Do not bring your dog. I have not told you not to keep your cow or your dog. All I have said is do not cross over this 14 feet road which I give you the right of way with your livestock for grazing privileges. All that the Resolution says is that we are renting Clifton Hall Plantation a road which shall not exceed 14 feet in width. The hon. senior member for the City of Bridgetown is too much lawyer for me. It is purely a matter of commonsense. If you carry this to Court, the Judge who says what the hon. member is saying should be sent to the Mental Hospital.

Sir, I believe the hon. junior member for St. Joseph was confused over the matter. As a matter of fact, I do not believe the hon. member read the Addendum because he talked of moving the peoples' houses and he asked why did not the Government buy the land for the people.

I am no gateman myself, but this is not a public road. The hon. member has asked what are the reasons that the road surface should not be treated with bitumenous material. I do not set out to answer the question.
9.40 p.m.

In normal circumstances if this discussion had taken place before somebody gave you the right to have the use of a right of way, then he would not give you that right. He would say: "If I will have all of this chat in granting you a privilege to get out your canes, well then you must get them out as you can." There are many people who do not even give you a right of way to the beach. I feel that the Government is giving these people a right of way for the purpose of getting out their canes; the Government is giving them the privilege of earning money.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I rise on a point of elucidation.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member can only elucidate a point which he made in his own speech.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I want to ask a question of the hon. senior member for the City.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member may want to elucidate on some matter raised by the hon. senior member for

the City, but I would regard his speeches as his having said: "I beg to second that."

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I admit that I seconded the motion for the passing of this Resolution, but I was under the impression that the hon. member was not referring to livestock grazing on the sides of the road. What I want to ask the hon. member is this:

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not recall the hon. member having asked for leave to speak again after he had formally seconded the motion.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I would like to ask leave to pose a question.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would advise that the hon. member put that point to the Hon. Minister of Communications who has not yet spoken in this debate.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I can well understand the apprehension which is feared by the hon. senior member for the City in that his interpretation of this Clause would seem to be that no livestock grazing privileges are granted in the area, which would deprive these twenty-seven tenants of the privileges of grazing their stock in the area. It is not intended that the tenants should not be allowed to graze their stock, but what is intended is that no livestock is to be allowed to cross over the road for the purpose of grazing.

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order. No addendum to any Resolution can become an Act of Parliament. Because something is written in the Addendum to this Resolution, that does not give the Government any right that they can tell the tenants at Clifton Hall that they cannot graze their livestock in the area.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. senior member for Christ Church has explained that there is an unfortunate ambiguity in the phraseology in the Addendum to the Resolution, but that what he said is what was intended.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, these conditions were imposed on the advice of the Chief Engineer of the Waterworks Department who said that there would be no objection to the road being constructed provided that the following conditions are observed:-

(a) that the road service shall not be treated with bitumenous materials which would be detrimental to the whole land;

(b) that no peasant or other person be permitted to move his or her house into this area;

(c) that gates are provided and that the road is only used for crop reaping purposes;

(d) that no livestock grazing privileges are granted in the area;

(e) that the owners of the plantation accept liability for any damage to Government property caused by any persons using the road (other than Government servants).

That is on the advice of the Chief Engineer of the Waterworks Department and those are the conditions which are attached to the construction of this road. The right of way is for the purpose of peasants passing and repassing for the purpose of getting their canes out from the area.
(Asides).

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the hon. senior member for Christ Church continue his remarks?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I will give the hon. member the assurance that the true meaning of Clause (d) as set out in the Addendum to this Resolution will be drawn to the attention of the appropriate authorities so as to erase the ambiguity which is there.

POST OFFICE (AMENDMENT) BILL

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Premier:- To move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Post Office Act, 1911.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, this Bill stands in the name of the Hon. Premier when in truth and in fact I gave notice of it. Anyhow, Sir, I am asking leave to take charge of this Order which now stands in the name of the Honourable and Learned Premier.

Mr. SPEAKER: This seems to have been an error on the part of the Government Printer, because it states on the Bill that it is a Bill intituled an Act to amend the Post Office Act, 1911, and that notice of this Bill was given by the hon. senior member for Christ Church on 12th May, 1964. There has been an error on the Order Paper for which I express regret. Let the hon. senior member for Christ Church proceed.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, as is set out in the Objects and Reasons of this Bill, "At the request of the Vice Chancellor of the University of the West Indies the Government has agreed to exempt from the payment of inland postage all letters and communications sent through the post by the University.

This Bill, therefore, seeks to amend the Post Office Act, 1911 to grant the necessary exemption. At the same time the opportunity has been taken to revise the provisions at present contained in section 16 of the Act relating to letters 'On Service'."

This matter is not in any way controversial. It merely sets out the position with regard to inland postage and especially with regard to the University of the West Indies. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I beg to second that. 9.50 p.m.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I am in favour of this Bill, but it gives me an opportunity to raise a matter with the Minister that I have raised in here already. I think the time has come in Barbados when membership of this Chamber should be regarded in its official capacity. In some Chambers in the world these franking privileges are granted to hon. members, and I feel that the Post Office Act should be so amended that members of the House of Assembly and the Senate are granted these franking privileges. I see here in Section 2 (c) that you have said "such other bodies or officials as the Cabinet may from time to time by notice published in the *Official Gazette* declare to the approved bodies and officials for the purposes of this section."

I should like to ask the Minister what "such other bodies or officials as the Cabinet may from time to time by notice published in the *Official Gazette*" means. I take it that it has not been done before, but it should be done. I think that members in their official capacities as members of this Chamber are entitled to it. It is a privilege that a Senator in the United States of America possesses and I think the same should be extended to members of this Chamber. I hope that the Minister is prepared to introduce this to the Cabinet. I believe I know what they mean by "such other bodies", but as a member of this House I feel that members other than Ministers or officials of Government should have a privilege such as this, and I throw it out to the Minister to hear what he has to say.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is there any other member who is desirous of speaking before the Hon. Minister exercises his right of final reply?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I assure the hon. member that I will bring the matter to the attention of the Cabinet so far as the members of this Chamber are concerned.

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

On the motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, MR. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, MR. BATSON in the Chair.

Clauses 1 and 2 were called and passed.

On the motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, MR. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee, and MR. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On the separate motions of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded in each case by Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

LEAVE TO GIVE NOTICES

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I think that we have concluded Government Business for today.

I am now asking leave of the House to give notice of two Resolutions which I could not do earlier today because in the first place I was not in my place, and secondly the drafts of the Resolutions did not arrive at the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Education is craving the indulgence of the House to give notice of two Resolutions of which he was unable to give notice at the appropriate time today. I gather that he is not seeking leave to proceed with these Resolutions, and if there is no objection, leave will be granted. Hearing no objection, leave is granted. The hon. member may proceed. 10.00 p.m.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I rise to give notice of the following Resolutions:-

RESOLVED that the House of Assembly under the provisions of section 14 of the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation Act, 1963, as amended by Section 9 of the Executive Committee (Vesting of Property and Transfer of Functions) Act, 1964, approve the guarantee by the Government of the payment of the principal and of interest on authorised borrowings of the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation not exceeding \$650,000 in the aggregate, comprising \$375,000 for the Radio and \$275,000 for the Television Service, to be borrowed by the Corporation on the following terms for the purpose of meeting their obligations and discharging their functions under the said Act: the interest to be paid by the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation on such borrowings to be at a rate of one half of one per cent below the finest commercial rate quoted to the public from time to time whether the said borrowings be taken by way of fluctuating overdraft and/or by way of loan account; the principal of the loan for the Radio service to be repaid not later than 19th November, 1966 and that of the loan for the Television service to be repaid within three years; and that the Senate be invited to concur herein and, if concurred in,

RESOLVED that His Excellency the Governor be asked to assent and take the necessary steps to give effect to this Resolution.

Also,

RESOLVED that the House of Assembly approve the guarantee by Government of the payment by the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation of an amount not exceeding \$510,000 for the purchase and supply of Transmitter and Studio equipment for the establishment of a Television Service by the said Corporation, and that the Senate be invited to concur therein, and if concurred therein,

RESOLVED that His Excellency the Governor be asked to assent and take the necessary steps to give effect to this Resolution.

THE ADJOURNMENT

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, that brings Government Business to an end for today.

I now beg to move that this House do now adjourn until next Tuesday, 2nd June, 1964, at 12.00 o'clock (noon).

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and MR. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

10.07 p.m.