

THE House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION 1961 - 66

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT) SECOND SESSION OF 1961-66 HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 22nd June, 1965.

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 12,00 o'clock (noon) today.

PRESENT

His Honour E. L. CARMICHAEL, J.P., (Deputy Speaker); Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P.; Mr. F. C. GODDARD; Mr. E. ST. A. HOLDER, J.P.; Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, (Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries); Mr. R. ST.C. WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE; Mr. N. W. BOXILL; Mr. J. B. YEARWOOD and Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, (Minister of Health, Housing, Local Government and Community Development).

Prayers were read

MINUTES

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

I regret to inform the House that the Minutes of the last meeting are not yet ready for confirmation.

CABLE FROM SPEAKER

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

I have also to inform the House that a Cable has been received from His Honour the Speaker, the text of which I will read now- "I pray assure Honourable Members of receipt by Mr. Speaker Commons of Address from Barbados Legislature and His Honour's formal acknowledgment thereof in House today - Brancker. Deputy Speaker, Assembly, Bridgetown, Barbados,

PAPERS LAID

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Premier and Minister of Finance, I am commanded to lay a Statement showing Net Customs and Excise Receipts for two months ended 31st May, 1965.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Minister of Education, I am commanded to lay the following-

The Film Censorship (Charges) (Amendment) Regulations. 1965;

The Film Censorship (Fees and Travelling Allowances) (Amendment) Regulations, 1965.

Also on behalf of the Hon. Minister of Trade and Labour, I am commanded to lay the Report of the Registrar of Trade Unions for the year 1964-65.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works, I beg to give notice of the following."

Resolution to place the sum of \$2,000 at the disposal of Government to supplement the Estimates 1965-66 under Part I - Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimate No. 5 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution;

Resolution to approve the change in rates of the airmail postage as set out in the Schedule attached to the Resolution.

Also, on behalf of the Hon. Premier and Minister of Finance, I beg to give notice of a Bill to abolish the requirement of diplomatic or consular legalisation for certain foreign public documents;

A Bill to amend the Supreme Court of Judicature Act, 1956.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to give notice of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply at its next meeting to deal with the Resolution of which notice was given today.

QUESTIONS Mr. WEEKES:

To enquire of the Appropriate Minister-

1. Is Government aware that much hardship, inconvenience and expense are suffered by owners of sows through their having to bear the cost of transportation etc. to the several Agricultural Stations in the

Island whenever their sows are being serviced there?

2.

3. If the answer is in the affirmative, will Government initiate a scheme whereby artificial insemination can be done at the homes of owners so as (a) to avoid the hardship and expense abovementioned: (b) to encourage more people to rear sows and (c) to increase the number of piglets in the Island,

4.

Mr. WEEKES:

To enquire of the Appropriate Minister-

Will Government, now that electric current is being installed at the Government Crushing Plant at Mangrove, St. Philip, consider the possibility of assisting the residents of Greaves Hill, near Mangrove in the said parish in the installation of electricity in the said village by extending its service by approximately three electric poles to reach the outskirts of the said village?

Mr. BATSON:

To enquire of the Appropriate Minister-

Is Government aware that the people living in Prout Village and Clifton Hill in the parish of St. Thomas are in dire need of Post Boxes in the said areas?

Will the Minister explore the possibility of having two Post Boxes placed in the said areas to alleviate the plight of the residents who are experiencing much inconvenience to post their mail?

Mr. BATSON:

To enquire of the Appropriate Minister-

Is Government aware of the delay caused by the vehicular traffic in the City of Bridgetown due to the number of vehicles that traverse the roads?

Will the Minister issue a directive to the appropriate Department to have lanes marked out on the roads in order that three vehicles would be able to use the said roads alongside each other?

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

On motion of Hon. C. G. FERGUSON, seconded by Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, the Bill to abolish the requirement of diplomatic or consular legalisation for certain foreign public documents, was read a first time.

On motion of Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, seconded by Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, the Bill to amend the Supreme Court of Judicature Act, 1956, was read a first time.

12.25 p.m.

LEAVE TO DEAL WITH RESOLUTION

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, in connection with this Resolution to place the sum of \$2,000 at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates, 1965-66, Part I - Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate which forms the Schedule to the Resolution, I am asking leave at this stage to deal with this Resolution at a later stage of today's sitting. The matter is not controversial in the first instance, and in the second instance it is very urgent inasmuch as it affects the health of the community. I understand that copies of this Resolution have already been circulated to hon. members.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

The first Order of the Day is to move the House into Committee of Supply to consider the grant of sums of money for the service of the island.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, 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 while in Committee to deal with the Money Resolution for the sum of \$2,000 of which notice was given earlier today.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON:

I beg to second that.

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

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

Honourables E. W. BARROW and J. C. TUDOR entered the House and took their seats.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1965-66 No. 4

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

The first Resolution, Mr. Chairman, is a Resolution for the sum of \$17,898 under four Heads of the Estimates, which will be taken separately.

HEAD II PENSIONS Head 11 - Pensions - was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, as the Note to this Head sets out, by Resolution No. 15/1964, reinstatement of pension at the rate of \$5.52 per week was made to Mr. G. H. Jackman, formerly Gunner, first H. A. A. Battery (South Caribbean Force) at the rate of 20% Class V rate pension amounting to \$6.52. Mr. Jackman appealed against that 20% disability rate and on the recommendation of the United Kingdom Ministry of Pensions and National Insurance, the rate was increased to 30%. That being the case, the pension was assessed on that basis and it now amounts to \$8.28. I beg to move that Head II stand part of the Schedule.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that. The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division,

HEAD 26 CIVIL AVIATION

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 26 stand part of the Schedule.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that.

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

HEAD 28 MINISTRY OF COMMUNICATIONS TECHNICAL JOURNALS AND PUBLICATIONS

Head 28 - Ministry of Communications - was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, as is set out in the Note to this Item, there are certain technical Journals and publications which were forwarded to the Secretariat, Regional Council of Ministers, by the International Telecommunications Union in 1963 for distribution in the eight territories remaining from the now defunct West Indies Federation. The cost of these Journals and publications is \$2,675.98 and this Government's share of the cost, which amounts to \$401.24, has not yet been met. No provision was made in the current year's estimate to meet this territory's share of the expenses and this supplementary provision of \$402 is now required. This Government will have to pay for its share of the payment for these technical journals and publications supplied by the International Tele-

communication Union. I beg to move that Head 28 stand part of the Schedule.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that.

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

HEAD 38 - THE QUEEN ELIZABETH HOSPITAL PUPIL MIDWIVES

Head 38 - The Queen Elizabeth Hospital -was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 38 stand part of the Schedule.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON:

I beg to second that.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, I am sure that the Hon. Minister under whose portfolio this matter comes, will be able to tell us something about this provision which is required to meet the payment of stipends to 20 pupils midwives consequent upon the closing down of the Maternity Hospital and its integration with the Queen Elizabeth Hospital with effect from 1st April, 1965. I am sure that the Hon. Minister would have some explanation to give us in relation to the Government's policy in this matter. I have been hearing about this matter, but I have not given any heed to it because I would rather take official cognizance of anything which comes from the Minister himself. I would do that rather than follow what somebody else goes around and says. I would like the Hon. Minister to apprise us as to what the situation is in relation to this matter. Has the

policy been changed relative to the payment of stipends and allowances to these pupil midwives? I am sure that the Hon. Minister is aware of the fact that not only is there a shortage of nurses in Barbados, but there is also a shortage of midwives. So much is that so that there is the practice of allowing the old type of midwife to carry on a practice which is not altogether conducive to modern standards of health with regard to the delivery of children in this country. Inasmuch as there is a shortage of trained nurses and there is also a shortage of midwives in this country, we, on this side of the table, would like to have some statement of Government policy in this matter, now that the Hon. Minister is asking for this amount of money for the payment of stipends to these pupil midwives. 12.35 p.m.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

Mr. Chairman, in the establishment of the old Maternity Hospital which is now closed down, there was provision for the payment of a fixed stipend to those twenty midwives. The work of the old Maternity Hospital is now done at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, and there was nothing on the Establishment from which these stipends could be paid. What provision we have on the Establishment of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital is for the payment of Student Nurses. These pupil midwives are not considered as Student Nurses, and hence they could not be paid a stipend from the vote for Student Nurses, and this is the reason why we are asking for this \$5,040 for the payment of stipends to the midwives.

The hon. senior member for Bridgetown made reference to a change of policy. The policy is more in keeping with the policy in the United Kingdom where after a nurse has got her training in general nursing, she is then eligible to do a course in midwifery for which she gets the S.C.M. That is what is desirable and what we hope to do in the future, but it does not mean that we will not continue the training of those people whom we are training now. It does not mean that the trainees from the almshouses will not be seconded to the Hospital to undergo their training, because we are aware of the fact that there is a need

for midwives as against being trained as nurses from being trained at the Hospital. What we hope to do in the future is to have so many of these trained people in the country that we can limit the training at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital to nurses who have already qualified as Registered Nurses, This change in policy does not come into effect immediately; this is just a consideration which we are discussing. We would like to see all our midwives as trained nurses, but this is not practical at the moment. As a matter of fact, the untrained midwives have been making representation to the Ministry for recognition, and we are considering providing certain six months courses for them so that they can have expert guidance, and then we will have a special type of registration for them.

We have had, Mr. Chairman, to depend on untrained midwives over the years. It is true we would like to have trained midwives, but we have not reached the stage where we can have all trained midwives. It is a question of not having the personnel, and therefore we cannot do away with those trained midwives. Instead of having a non-registered midwife, as she has been practising as a midwife, we plan to provide a six months course, and if she is satisfactory in this course, we will give her a sort of registration.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, the Hon. Minister seems au fait with the situation, but there is one point I would like to have clarified. The Minister made it clear that the ultimate aim is to follow the practice and custom of the United Kingdom, where after persons are qualified as nurses they go on to qualify as midwives, and he has agreed, like all of us, that that cannot be put into operation now. That is what I understand and what the general public wanted to understand. This practice of our having untrained but practical midwives in the country districts and at the infirmaries still exists, and my reason for asking about the change of policy is because this amount of money is required to meet the payment of stipends to 2G pupil midwives. If you have this class for twenty pupil midwives, I think it is rather limited from the point of view that originally you did accept from the several infirm-

aries in the Island persons who had been doing this work, but who had no sort of training under any medical or specialised person. On the other hand, you formerly advertised for a number of young girls who did not do practical nursing but who wanted to do midwifery, and I think that after these girls were trained, they were engaged at the Hospital and at the District Hospitals,

If the ultimate aim is to have District Hospitals throughout the island, Mr. Chairman, the point which I have not got clarified fully, although the Hon. Minister does seem au fait with the entire situation, is whether or not your training would merely be confined at present to nurses who want to qualify as midwives, or nurses who have been working as practical nurses at infirmaries and can go on in this respect and be trained as midwives, and thirdly persons who have never worked at all that would take so many from the Hospital operating as trained nurses, so many from the infirmaries who are practical people doing midwifery without any special training, and so many persons from the general public who want to apply and who can sit an entrance test to qualify them to take the examination. The point I want to get clarified is whether persons from the general public will be admitted for training after taking the test to do a course in midwifery without (a) having practical experience or (b) having been trained as nurses. I appreciate the fact that you have these practical nannies - as they are colloquially referred to in Barbados - who deliver children, because although Barbados is a small place, a number of persons employed as domestics and labourers in this island wait until the last minute and engage an old lady in the district to deliver their children, and only if something happens would you find that a doctor, is called in. I think the Hon. Minister will agree with me that of the 2,000 births in Barbados every year

and the number of infirmaries and hospitals, the majority is delivered by the nannies, and I must say that those of us who have been accustomed to dealing with this matter, appreciate the fact that steps are being taken to give a six months course in the sanitary technique and what is necessary for the preservation of health to those persons who have had the practical experience. 12.45 p.m.

The only point which I would like the Hon. Minister to clear up is this, whether as has been the custom the general public would be allowed so many of these midwives. The Hon. Minister is quite aware that these nurses were distributed between the Hospital and the St. Michael's Infirmary. I want to know if these other institutions would still have the same benefit. In other words, I want to know if the custom has been changed.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS Mr. Deputy Speaker, in reply to the hon. member, we have given serious consideration to this matter. While we would prefer to have these young ladies coming in to be trained as midwives being trained as nurses first, the policy has not yet been changed: but we are considering a change in the policy because, as I have said, we prefer them to be trained as nurses.

It is true that the infant mortality rate has been lowered, but we still have a mortality rate of just over fifty per thousand. We will like that infant mortality rate reduced to nothing, and you can only do that if you have trained midwives. Midwives should not be only trained as midwives but also as nurses.

We are changing the policy of admission to the Nursing School. We have to cater to the persons in the Infirmary, but we are trying to encourage the young girl to do a course of nursing first and then the course on midwifery. In order to step up the training of midwives, Mr. Chairman, you will notice that we have added two more posts to the Hospital Tutor. We intend to train more student Nurses. As it stands now, we are training 120 per annum, but we are making provision to train 200 per annum. When we reach that standard, it means that we would be turning out as many nurses as we can draw from to deal with midwifery and we would be able in the process of time to reduce our infant mortality rate to a very low figure. Those are our aspira-

tions. However, at the present there is no change in policy, but it is being considered.

The question that Head 38 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to move that this Resolution for the sum of \$17,898 do now pass.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE, 1965-66 No. 5 HIRE OF PLANT

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, this next Resolution for the sum of \$2,000.00 is to supplement the sum of \$600.00

which was voted in the Estimate for hire of Plant.

As the Addendum set out:-

"Provision of \$600 is included in the current Estimates under Head 32, Item 59, to meet expenditure in connection with the hire of plant belonging to the Department of Highways and Transport. This expenditure is recoverable."

"Equipment was hired to the Bridgetown City Council for work on the dumping site aback of the Mental Hospital."

"As a result the provision is now exhausted and supplementary provision in the sum of \$2,000 is required to meet expenditure to the end of the Financial year."

The position, Mr. Chairman, is that there are certain reclamation work and dumping operations taking place aback of the Mental Hospital on low lying land, which work, if and when completed, would reclaim between 15 and 18 acres of land, and at the same time provide a good means of disposal of refuse under proper sanitary conditions.

The City Council owns a traxcavator for levelling off this work, but that piece of equipment has broken down and cannot be repaired very quickly; so the City Council has hired two traxcavators and another piece of equipment from the Department of Highways and Transport in order to carry on with this work.

This money is to pay the wages and so on for the people who work on this tractor, and this work is done in the interest of the people of this community. But while this work is proceeding, the vote has been exhausted. It is just that this heavy equipment of the Department of Highways and Transport is not usually rented out for such lengthy periods, with the result that the provision made, which is a nominal one, has run out. Owing to this extensive work being continued aback of the Mental Hospital, and which has run into many weeks, and which is likely to run into many more weeks, we are forced to come in with this Resolution.

The money which is paid for the hire of this equipment will be paid into the Public Treasury, and this money which we are voting is to replenish the particular item under the Head. It is for this reason that we have to come for this money.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass. Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, I think I will be lacking in my duty and responsibility if I did not say how much we do appreciate the speed with which the Hon. Minister in charge of this port-folio has acted in this matter. This is a matter of great importance. When we discovered that we could not go on with the work which we were doing down there because our traxacavator needed some urgent repairs, we requested the use of the Government's traxacava-

tor and they helped us in the matter, along with their driver and so on.

As a matter of fact, most people will recall how much trouble we have been having in recent years relative to the disposal of garbage in this country. This had been given serious study by the Ministry in charge of this affair. This work is being done at the Mental Hospital on low lying land, and when it is finished there would be a certain amount of reclaimed land. It is something like what we did at the Biscuit Factory.

Imagine what it would be for this work to come to a stand-still. We have 22 lorries dumping refuse on this land and each lorry carries about five loads per day. The one traxacavator which we have, worked continually draining and covering this stuff at the same time. It broke down and we have now hired two from the Department of Highways and Transport because the work was more than what one traxacavator could do. 12.55 p.m.

About eight or nine years ago when we acquired a traxcavator we were told that we were spending a lot of money unnecessarily, but we found that we would take all three from the Government. We had to work all day and night so as to cover the mould and in places like Bank Hall and Bush Hall it took some time to repair that. It is impossible for one traxcavator to do this work. This work is carried out constantly from 5 o'clock in the morning until 6 o'clock in the afternoon. We appreciate the step which the Government has taken in this respect, that is, to come down with this Resolution so soon. When we were told that the men would not work, all we could say to them was that they should go back to work and we would get this money from some place. With 200 loads of stuff being deposited every day, we would be in the same position as that in which we were three or four weeks ago. As I have said, Sir, we appreciate the step which the Government has taken in bringing down this Resolution so quickly so that we will be able to pay this money next week. We hope we will be able to come to the Government and reimburse them for the money which has been paid. The amount of 90 cents an hour was paid for these traxcavator drivers. The loan of the traxcavator would be free, but the oil and the work of the traxcavator drivers will have to be paid for.

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that you do now report the passing of two Resolutions in Committee of Supply.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that. The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

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

On motions of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSON in each case, the Resolutions passed in Committee were read a first and second time and agreed to.

ORDER POSTPONED

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Premier; To move the second reading of a Bill to provide for the control and development of tenancies.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 3 be taken as the next Order of the Day.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am asking leave to take charge of this Order which stands in the name of the Honourable and Learned Premier.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

The Hon. Minister of Education is asking the leave of the House to take charge of this Order which stand in the name of the Hon. and Learned Premier, and unless there be any objection, leave will be granted. (After a pause.) Hearing no objection, leave is granted.

The next Order of the Day now stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Education:- To move the second reading of a Bill to amend the law relating to the liability of occupiers and others for injury or damage resulting to persons or goods lawfully on any land or other property from dangers due to the state of the property or to things done or omitted to be done there.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, This is a Bill the Objects and Reasons of which are as follows. As is well known in Barbados, the common law at present determines the liability of an occupier for the injuries caused to those who come upon his land. These Rules are extremely complicated and the law in this respect is a veritable jungle. So complicated are these results that it is difficult to draw comparisons between different categories of land users, and these comparisons have to be drawn. Further, both in the United Kingdom and to New Zealand there has been considerable re-thinking with respect to this kind of law. In the United Kingdom, for instance, there was a Law Reform Committee set up and that Committee published a very valuable Report. In consequence of that Report of the Law Reform Committee, the Occupiers' Liability Act, 1957, was passed by the United Kingdom Parliament in an attempt to clarify the law. In New Zealand much more recently, as recently as three years ago, the Occupiers' Liability Act was passed and what we are hoping to do is to simplify the provisions in the law in Barbados by this amendment.

I would also like to draw this matter to the attention of the House. The arrangement of the Sections will show the matters with which we will deal. In clause 5 there is the effect of contract and occupier's liability to third party; in Clause 6 there is the contribution between landlord and tenant as Joint tortfeasors; in Clause 7 there is the occupier's duty to contractual visitors; in Clause 8 there is the landlord's liability in virtue of obligation to repair; in Clause 9 there is provision that the Act is not to

apply to certain contracts of hire or carriage etc.; and in Clause 10 there is a provision that the Act should bind the Crown.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would also like to draw the Interpretation Clause to the attention of the House. That Clause is Clause 2 which reads as follows:-

"In this Act, unless the context otherwise requires -

"premises" includes land;

"structure" includes any vessel, vehicle or aircraft."

As I said, Mr. Deputy Speaker, both in the United Kingdom and in New Zealand, there has been some difficulty in clarifying the law which they have managed to do in recent years, and this draft Bill is an attempt on our part to bring the current law on this matter up to date in Barbados. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

The question that this Bill be now read a second time was put and resolved in the affirmative without division. 1.05 p.m.

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

Clauses I to 10 inclusive were called and passed.

On the motion of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one. Bill in Committee, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

THE ACCIDENTAL FIRES ACT, 1965.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Order No. 4 stands in the name of the Hon. and Learned Premier to move the passing of a Bill to provide protection to persons in respect of fires accidentally beginning on their premises.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am asking leave to take charge of this Order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

The Hon. Minister of Education is asking leave to take charge of this Order, and unless there is any objection, leave will be granted.

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think hon. members will agree that this Bill is self-explanatory. It seeks to provide that certain immunities should be given to anyone on whose premises a fire accidentally begins. It does not, of course, give protection to any person who is negligible in causing a fire or allows a fire to spread; it covers entirely the case of fire accidentally starting, and is on the line of section 86 of the Fires Prevention (Metro- polis) Act, 1774 of the United Kingdom. This bit of United Kingdom legislation, though very old, still has application today.

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

On the motion of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee, Mr. BATSON in the Chair.

Clauses I and 2 were called and passed\'' On the motion of Hon. J. C. TUDOR seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

THE TENANTRIES (CONTROL AND DEVELOP- MENT) ACT, 1965.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 2 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.

1.15 p.m.

TENANTRIES (CONTROL AND DEVELOP- MENT) BILL, 1965.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

The next order of the day stands in the name of the Hon. and learned Premier Second reading of a Bill to provide for the control and development of tenancies.

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we now live in a place known as the Island of Barbados, which is part of the British Commonwealth. This island was granted to a certain number of people by Royal Charter to hold as plantations, and to have absolute Jurisdiction and to preside over the destinies of the other group of people who were in this country in 1725. In process of time the small farmers who had originated from European settlers who used to grow tobacco, arrowroot and maize and raise what we describe as stock, not the kind of stock on the exchange but the kind which you get at the Public Market, were displaced and emigrated to a place like Virginia, the Capital of which is Jamestown and other parts of the North American continent. Because the plantation system was instituted in this island, sugar became the turning point in the island's economy.

Unless we understand the origin of the land-owners of Barbados, members of this House and the general public would not be able to appreciate the full social significance of this Bill which this Government unsuccessfully tried to move the consideration of the House on last week, and which we intend to pass during today's sitting for the benefit of the majority of the people who live in the country over whose destinies we have the honour to preside.

As you know, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the plantation system did not predicate that there should be any ownership of land as existed in the United Kingdom right up to the late eighteenth century and certainly before the enclosure system came about, by the masses of people because the institution of slavery existed in this island and other British territories.

The small farmers having been dispossessed of their holdings, the plantation owners enjoyed a large and free labour force for the cultivation of sugar cane. The size of the holding in this island have increased because of the economies from sugar cane production being made through large scale cultivation.

Now, Sir, the people who were responsible for the reaping of canes, the bringing in of the crops and the cultivation of land never had any legal status in this country; they merely lived on the plantations as serfs; their servitude was only for the land owners of the country. I say all this because this is the historical development of the iniquitous system of tenancies of plantations which we have in this country. This is an institution which is a disgrace to any Christian country. Slavery was brought to its end in the 1830's in the British territories, although it did survive for many years afterward in North America and still longer in the Spanish Colonies. In some territories, Mr. Deputy Speaker, there being large areas of land to which the freed men could migrate other than the geographical confines of the territories which they lived -and I refer to such countries as Jamaica, Trinidad and British Guiana -there were large areas of working lands, and the freed men migrated to those countries and carved out literally from the Virgin forest a holding for themselves, and worked as small farmers and were able to survive.

This territory in which we live is small in area, circumscribed and limited by the Atlantic Ocean and the Caribbean Sea. It is 166 square miles in area containing 106, 117 acres of land or thereabouts and more or less with a population, even at that time, of perhaps 175,000 to 180,000 people. This land was owned by a few expatriate planters who swaggered around the streets of Bath and Bristol displaying

their opulence with conspicuous exhibition. The people in this Island had no alternative but to stay where they were on the plantations, on lands belonging to those from whom they could stick out no bona fide claim or right under the existing law.

The Land Tenure system remained the same. Those persons who owned land before 1838 and 1848 continued to own the majority of land in this Island and so for the longest time, as far as the island of Barbados is concerned, there is a false reputation that the Barbadian is a hardworking man. It is not false that he is hard-working, but false in the sense as if the Barbadian was endowed with

special attributes, just as mules and donkeys are endowed to work hard. Because the Barbadian is not able to develop his very personality as a land-owner or planter in any aspect, he has to, as it were, work hard to pay rent and to buy food and clothing for his family.

Sir, there has never been any legislation for this purpose except one which has been described as the Located Labourers Act which was repealed some 18 years ago. There has been no legislation of any account for the security of tenure of persons who live on lands belonging to other people: and so in contradistinction to a territory which is less prosperous than this island, you have developed a type of architectural portmanteau or travelling traffic in housing in Barbados in which you have chattel houses which have been built for easy removal so that as a result of eviction or the desire of the tenant to make himself scarce, all that he had to do was to pack up and go. 1.25 p.m.

The absence of a system of land tenure, such as leasehold tenure for a long period of time or outright fee simple ownership of land, has dictated the type of architecture which we have in this country. Therefore, people live in houses - attractive, it is true; they are well designed, but they are designed with a view of impermanence from the necessity of many of these people from time to time having to do, what the Arabs did with their tenants, suddenly steal them away by night. They move your house, take it down sometimes like a pack of cards, but the house is always capable of being removed. You will notice that where a Barbadian has been able to acquire a spot of land for himself, even through the death of a former landowner and the necessity to divide up the estate through his beneficiaries or through the voluntary disposition of land by some people who want to make money, people have been acquiring small bits of land of varying sizes, and they build something more permanent and more substantial for themselves. You will see that the worst living conditions in this island exist not through poverty on the part of the inhabitants of the houses, but through the lack of incentive on the part of the owners of houses to create something more lasting and more substantial than the chattel house which dominated the plots of land.

I am a great believer in entrenching and conserving the national sense of ownership of the chattel houses which we have but at the same time I admit that the practice of the merchants to import woods infested with termites into this island for the building of chattel houses is destructive and far outweighs the financial aspect which people may possess. There are territories where termite wood is not allowed to be imported, and the only reason why this Government has not introduced such legislation is because of the additional cost of the house builder. I am not now dealing with the merchants, but with the landlords. I will deal with the merchants when the time comes, but we cannot allow the people of this island to be exploited by getting the worst possible things from these countries and we are being asked to pay for them. There are new heights to be scaled, new living standards to be achieved; and as long as this period of stagnation existed, the pressure on the tenants in these tenancies was not great because

there was no other use to which the landlords could put their land. They could not develop these tenancies so as to encourage people to live on their land because it had no economic value in many instances.

In a country which has passed the point where the economy has expanded from a declining national income In 1960-61 of \$91 million or \$92 million to \$149.8 million in the short space of four years, as we disclosed at the end of the financial year, we will find that more purchasing power has been generated and the country has been made more attractive by the Tourist Board. We have more purchasing power, and people who come here are very interested to see the attractive pieces of land with the value of which the landowner may compete anywhere because of its economic value. Therefore, we have witnessed a largescale movement to evict persons who, in some instances have been living on lands for a period of forty or fifty years, so that land speculation may take place - quite

completely oblivious of the requirement of the masses of the people of this island to have a place under the sun. Some 25,000 people have emigrated from this island between 1957 and 1965: and despite that fact, there is not only a shortage of house spots - and house spots they are - but a shortage of housing in this country. Although the population has actually declined with everything else in the year 1960-61, despite that population decline, there is a terrific demand for housing and land in this country, due to the reasons which I have already explained. With this rise in the national income there is a demand for land by people both inside and outside the country.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, if I may give you some statistical analysis of the current situation - you will bear with me, Sir - we have in this country a Statutory Authority which we call the Barbados Housing Authority, and the Barbados Housing Authority appears to be a kind of landlord in the last resort. I will explain what I mean by that. In the same way that the buying of land is the last resort of the Clearing House and the Commercial Banks, the Housing Authority is regarded as the landlord of the last resort in that way. Not only is the Housing Authority charged with the duty of constructing new houses at a rate which is dependent upon the finances which are available, but the Housing Authority is also charged with the duty of providing land for dispossessed clients to live on. The Government of Barbados not being a conquered colony was never seised and possessed of vast areas of Crown lands or of any Crown lands at all, because every single square-inch of land has been bought by some one, and not taken away from some foreign power as in the case of St. Lucia, St. Vincent, Dominica and so on. 1.35 p.m.

All the forest land, all the hills and plantations which were not under cultivation were automatically vested in the Crown, and we got this term \"Crown lands\" employed in these different territories; so you may find that in neighbouring Trinidad over 40% or 50% of the total area of land is actually owned by the Government, and the Government has no problem. The Government was able to take over 18 square miles of territory at Chaguaramas Naval Base because it belongs to them. They could go to Waller Field and do the same thing; it could set up a new town in the Waller Field area because all the land already belongs to Government by force of arms, and not by expenditure out of the Public Treasury. In Barbados there have never been any Crown lands as such. After the franchise was given to the Earl of Carlisle and Sir William Courteen and people like that, all that was abolished and the land no longer belonged to the Crown or was in the right of gift to the Crown at all; so this territory has no Crown lands. It means, therefore, that every time the Government wants to construct a new building, they have to go to the land owners. Even the Government is at the mercy of the land owners, and I have heard recent criticism of the passage of the Land Acquisition Act; but if this Government in 1963 did not

amend the provisions of the Land Acquisition Act, we might as well have gone out of business, because the Government is always being held up to ransom by the land owners, who think that they have a God-given right to ex-ploit the whole community because they may have inherited a certain area of this island.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, special circumstances call for special measures to deal with them, and in other places where there is not this pressure, one may say there is no need for legislation of this kind or there is no need to freeze the development of land or the prices which could possibly be charged for land. In a place like Barbados with a marginal economy and a growing population, it is one of the conditions of survival. It is as bad as that; and if the Government does not do something about it, the Government might as well go out of Business.

The Housing Authority, as I was saying, was vested with this responsibility, but the burden of the duty imposed upon the Barbados Housing Authority has become intolerable, and I will give you an illustration of what I mean from the figures I have before me. There are, Sir, in the parish of St. Michael alone eleven tenancies in which the

tenants have been given notice to quit, and in some in-stances an order of ejectment has been made by the Court. These cases involve 373 houses. These are not all the potential ejectments; these ejectments have already been placed before the Court. Tenants have petitioned the Gov-ernment and the Housing Authority, and every single Minis-ter has had from time to time to refer to the Ministry of Health, Housing and Community Development, and also to the Housing Authority. I will name the tenancies because I want them on the record. The places from which the tenants have been given notice to move are Hinds Road, Cave Hill - 24 houses; Connell's Land, Black Rock - 44 houses; Dodson Land, Black Rock - 28 houses; Harmony Hall Land - 131 houses; Parish Land, Barbarees Hill - 60 houses; Thomas Gap - 21 houses; Burke's Land - 18 houses; Weymouth - 9 houses. That notice has been given by us. I would like to be fair. The notice has been given by Government and that notice is twelve years old. The people at Weymouth have been given notice every year for the past twelve years, but we have special provision for that. The Government is erecting a stadium there. The peo-ple who live there do not own the houses; they are exploited matchboxes, and the owners of these houses who do not live in them but rent them out at fairly high rents to the occupiers, have been given notice every year for the past twelve years. Then there are eighteen houses in Constitution Road and another 33 houses in Ellis Land. In addition to this, we moved off last year 121 houses from an area where the people should never have been living, and that is at Delamere Land, next to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, and that cost the Government \$185,832 or an average of \$1,535 per house. That is what it is costing you and me, the taxpayers of this Island, to move each house whenever there is a slum clearance or through ejectment. The Government has to provide land, water and lights, things that they never had before, on Government housing areas in order to relocate those dispossessed tenants.

Now the Housing Authority up to 31 st March, 1965, had 9,898 applications for houses. This gives you an idea of the pressure in the low income brackets. They have been able to assist up to that time 2,962. The number of applications received for house spots was 4,072, and the numbers which they have been able to assist are 1,085. The number of houses which has actually been removed by the Housing Authority is 1,085 at a cost of \$1,200 per house. In other words, not only did the Housing Authority have to provide the land, but because of the shortness of the notice and the lack of means of the persons who were evicted, all this had to be done at the expense of you and me. A man working for \$15.00 a

week cannot afford year after year to have his house moved from place to place. This is the only way to make people understand anything. It was not done by the United Kingdom, by the Queen or an international agency, the I.M.F., the A.I.D. or the I.D.A.; it was done out of the taxpayers of Barbados. 1.45 p.m.

We of course have instituted a new programme for ownership of the houses owned and built by the Housing Authority; so the desire on the part of Barbadians to own houses of their own is being met by this Government.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, if I may just mention in passing, the total amount of Labour Welfare Housing Loans is \$1,500,358.97, and the General Loan is \$8,654,775.27 making a total amount of over ten million dollars in housing loans to people. The reason why I have mentioned this is because the people themselves are unable to provide themselves with the necessities of life and, therefore, the Government has to act not only as the landlord but also as the lender in the last resort. The Government is acting, in other words, as the nation's banker as well. This is the situation which we have today.

In the nineteenth century, Mr. Charles Dickens used to write on these things, and it is a great pity that the high Christians of today do not write as Mr. Charles Dickens did on the conditions of the working class. We all know the old man coming and pinning to the door of the owner of a small cottage a notice and saying to the owner that "Your rent is due; therefore, out of this door you must go in the

snow". There is only rain here - not snow; but what Mr. Dickens wrote about in the nineteenth century, those appalling conditions are the same which obtain in this country in this twentieth century, and people are so inured to the conditions of those who are poor that they regard them as something which is normal to these people. They feel that it is not given to the average man to own anything or to have any security, and that is why this Government has to iron out all these inequalities which exist in the social conditions which we have derived from the so-called Metropolitan powers. This is what they have given to us, and this is what we have inherited.

Now we come to the Colonial Development and Welfare Act. That has to do with the putting up of a public market or to add a new dispensary to a hospital; but all of that is of no avail to the West Indies unless the economic condition of the people can be improved.

One may think that I am sermonizing, but I want all of this to go down in the record. Today we are introducing one of the most important pieces of legislation which we have ever enacted. Sir, we have increased Workman's Compensation. That is a quantitative change which we have made. We are introducing a Social Security Act in this House within a very short time - within a matter of weeks. All of these small qualitative things which we have brought into being are being done to make life less burdensome; but nothing is more fundamental than the security of the individual, and nothing can be more heart-rending to the individual than for him to know that he is going to be evicted by his landlord.

Sir, you will remember that, in 1961 we said that we were going to make arrangements for the freeing of land for the people who live on plantation tenancies. Why did we say that? We said that because there had been this terrific drift of people from the rural areas to the urban areas; that is to say in other

words, from the country to the town, I remember a certain Minister of Housing refused to call it the City and described the Bridgetown City Council as the Urban City Council until one day someone asked him what is the meaning of calling it "Urban" and he said that the word "Urban comes from urbi urbat in Latin which means a house. That is on the lighter side.

However, Sir, there has been this drift and we said that we were trying to analyse the problem. The number of persons employed in agriculture within the past thirty years has declined by about 50 percent. There are probably less than 23,000 people employed in agriculture today, whereas there were between 48,000 and 49,000 people ungainfully employed within the last thirty years in agriculture. Barbados is not such a large place where a man cannot normally take up his trade and come into town. But there are certain advantages of living in the country which are not attendant on living in the City. He is able to keep stock such as chickens, sheep, goats, and cows. But when he takes up residence in the City, there is a break-up of the family union.

Now, soon after he leaves the rural area where he lived and comes to town to work in the City, he is given notice that he would have to move his house off the plantation tenantry, some of which are tucked away in the back in gullies and the most outlandish spots. You will find this portmanteau type of houses being built for the people who work in agriculture, and those houses are nothing for the people to spend their money on because they know not the day when they would have to move.

After much agitation, this House passed the Agricultural Holdings Security of Tenure Act of 1956. This Act says that instead of a plantation owner giving a month's notice to a tenant, that the tenant is entitled to six month's notice, and it goes on to say that the agricultural tenure has to terminate on 31st day of May in each year; therefore the security given by the last Government was a six months' security. 1.55 p.m.

The security which was given by the last Government was a security for six months, but at the end of that time

the Courts had full jurisdiction to throw any tenant off the land by the power of ejectment. Many a time the Housing Authority has had to go and collect the families and not only the families, goods, chattels and belongings, but the very houses in which they live and which were left dismantled and cast by the side of the road for the heat of the sun and the rain to beat down on them.

At this stage, it now bring 2 p.m. of the clock,

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is now 2 p.m. of the clock.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

It is now 2 p.m. of the clock and this Sitting stands suspended for half an hour, until 2.30 p.m. of the clock.

This Sitting now stands suspended. On resumption:-

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

It is now Question Time.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, before you proceed with Question Time, I am asking the leave of the House to give notice of a Resolution which was not processed in time to be put on the Notice Paper for today's sitting,

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

The Hon. Minister of Education is asking for leave to give notice of a Resolution which was not ready to be given notice of at the appropriate time today. If there is no Objection, leave will be granted. (After a pause) There being no objection, leave is granted. The Hon. Minister may proceed.

NOTICE OF RESOLUTION

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Premier and Minister of Finance, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to place the sum of \$1.00 at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates, 1965-66, part 1 - Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1965-66 No. 6 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Also, I am giving notice of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply at its next sitting in order to (deal with the money Resolution of which I have just given notice.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

It is now Question Time and there being no questions to which the Replies have been laid the House will now proceed to the consideration of Private Members' Business.

RESOLUTION RE THE HOSPITAL (FEES) REGULATIONS 1965.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Under the Head "Private Members' Business", the first Order of the Day is to move the passing of a Resolution relating to the surgical fees, accommodation and treatment charges as set out in the Schedule to "The Hospital (Fees) Regulations 1965.

Notice of this Resolution was given on 25th May, 1965, and on the 15th June, the hon. senior member for the City, in whose name the Resolution stands, was speaking when the time for the consideration of Private Members' Business expired. If the hon. member desires to continue his address, he may do so now.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I had hoped that I would have finished my remarks on this Resolution on the last

occasion. Strangely enough, I had hinted a breakdown at this Institution, unless something was done within six months; but it is thought that the breakdown at the Institution is limited to a shorter period unless something is actually done. I do not think I should tire the House by going over what I said before, but there were a number of things which I did not say. I do not know who is responsible for making these Regulations, but I consider that he did not

take into consideration all things relative to the people of this country. This is the only Hospital to serve 240,000 people. I was at the point, when the time for Private Member's Business expired on the last occasion where I was dealing with the question of minor operations and major operations and the fees which are allowed to be charged. Since then I must say that I have seen a bill for \$470.00 for a few days' stay at the Institution by a little man for whom I am sure the family had to rake up a lot of money in order to pay this bill.

The Hon. Minister has said to me that the actual fees in respect of visiting patients in the rooms cannot exceed a certain amount. For a full day, the fee is so much. He has said that if the sum total comes to a certain amount, it cannot exceed that amount. The Hon. Minister also assured me that that also happens in respect of surgical fees. With respect to the surgical fees, you must take into consideration, with the increased fees, that the Hospital is used for the service of the small people. I was referring to the Radiologists Department, and since I have spoken in actual fact cases have been brought to my notice in respect of persons who are going to the Hospital to have pictures taken by the Radiologist. 2.35 p.m.

The fees which are presently in operation when compared with the fees which are paid in other places are really out of proportion to the economy of this Island as a whole. I have always felt, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that at a training hospital we must have the best. I saw recently in the newspapers where the Minister said there would be a further shortage of six junior Physicians at the Hospital, and I was somewhat alarmed because I thought that rumour would have been caused to be a lying jade when I said in here that I had spoken to these people and what was the position at the Hospital.

I am not actually attempting to make any reckless generalisation about the Hospital as such, because I think I said on the last occasion - and there are the words of a very eminent and learned physician - that a doctor is as good as his nurses, because after a physician or surgeon has finished his expert job, the care depends upon the nurse, and I am happy to hear that steps are being taken to train nurses now I feel, however, that something radical will have to be done. It is not only a matter of training. I believe that the Government is trying to train and get as many nurses as they can but there must be something radically wrong. If you train these nurses and you do not treat them professionally, you are going to have the same difficulty. If persons are suffering from doctoritis and feel that nurses are inferior to them in this respect, you are going to have the same exodus of nurses from Barbados.

I am criticised in the Press for saying that qualified people such as nurses, technologists, radio technicians and the like should come back to Barbados and give of their knowledge. I know it is very difficult, but I have received complaints from qualified persons in the United States, Canada and the United Kingdom that they have made applications in their particular line and have not got an acknowledgement of their letters. I hope the Minister will note that carefully, because if it spreads around in Canada, the United States or London that Barbados is trying to get back home her sons and daughters

who are qualified in order to assist in developing the country and they are not given the courtesy of receiving a reply to their letters, then there is something wrong some place. If the Minister wants me privately to call names, I will do so, but it is not right to call names of the floor of the House. I would say to the Hon. Minister that it is my personal view that when persons make applications in any field, out of courtesy You should acknowledge the letter and have somebody abroad interview them and see what is happening* I read where it was suggested that Mr. Owen Rowe should interview people in Canada, but I understand that people who have made application have not received answer to their application in connection with posts at the General Hospital.

There is one question which I would like to bring to the attention of the Hon. Minister, and I am bringing it

because I want to be consistent in what I have been doing all my life in this respect. You will recall, Sir, though you were not here, that not only during the last election but the election before that, when the now junior member for St. George was Minister of Health, the question of charging a fee at the Hospital came up, and I was among those in the vanguard who staged a protest against it. I feel that you still have provision made in Barbados for poor and destitute people by the District Medical officer; then you have what is a sort of misnomer in the Casualty - which is now more clearly defined as the Out-Patients' Department -to which people who feel ill have been accustomed for years going and being attended to and getting medicine, and that is why I ask the Hon. Minister to let me know in no uncertain terms the number of persons who attend this Department who cannot pay and the number who can pay and are attended to by the Physician Specialist, the Surgeon Specialist, the Dermatologist and other specialists at the Hospital, I have some figures myself, but I would prefer to have them from him so as not to be accused of not having up-to-date figures. In passing I did mention that I hoped the hon. member would be able to clarify for us the situation with Dr. St. John at the Hospital.

The Casualty in the truest sense of the word is a place which, as the Hon. Acting Leader of the House has said, is free to all. If anybody is involved in an accident, the first place he thinks of is the Hospital, because there you can find doctors all the time. I do not, however, like the idea of saying that the entire Hospital is free to all. As I wended my way through the Hospital and I saw what was happening, I questioned and discovered that you have Out-Patients' Department and patients in the Casualty from accidents and so on. There are people in the Department who decide whether the persons are able to pay after they have already seen a general practitioner who recommends that they see a specialist at the Hospital. I think you have it divided into two phases. You have the patients paying the general practitioner who recommends him to see the physician specialist, Surgeon Specialist, Radiologist or paediatrician. 2.45 p.m.

Now, Sir, they recommended that they should direct a letter to these doctors. They have a right to give direction to these doctors that you should have them attending to those people who are poor. They in turn must go to the Hospital and wait their turn to see a doctor. What I am worried about is that these poor people are not given sufficient attention. In other words, sufficient attention is not paid to these people. Whatever be the case, they should be able to see a Physician Specialist easily and should not have to wait for another three, four or in some cases six months.

I am absolutely certain of what I am saying in this case. There is not anyone who goes to the Hospital who sees the Physician Specialist; but it is not the fault of the general practitioner, or the doctor in the

Casualty or the Out Patients' Clinic. If I am being entangled in any way, I am perfectly willing to be subjected by the Minister concerned. It is frightfully hard on these people to be waiting months and months to see the Physician Specialist. What happens is that you will find your Physician Specialist seeing more of the people who can pay and not seeing those who do not pay. I do not think that is fair in a \$9 million hospital which you have built. I do not think that sort of thing should go on.

There are no two ways about it. This is a question of paying fees. Sometime you find people recklessly maligning certain people who pass a certain age because the people say after seeing doctors that the doctor's medicine is not good enough and they do not believe in taking the medicine. It is because one or two of these people discard the medicine which the doctor gives them that they have to pay now 25c for the medicine. I have had the experience of having a doctor suggesting to a patient that that patient was right not to take any more of the medicine. You cannot say because just a few, let me say about 100, say "I don't think this medicine is of any good to me; so I am not taking it and I am going to another doctor" that that is enough reason that they must pay 25c for the medicine. You do find

these people going to see another doctor. As a matter of fact, some of them leave Bridgetown and go and see a doctor in St. Lucy or in St. Peter. It is not because the particular doctor may be a better doctor, but it is because these people have heard of him. Their ailment may be just hypertension, and this same doctor may give them the same drug. It may be called by a different name, but it may have the same ingredients and it may be of a different potency. The doctor at the Hospital may have given them the same drug. As you know, Sir, there is no doctor who can do anything for a patient suffering from hypertension. The most he can do is what has been discovered in the laboratories. There is no doctor who can do anything once your arteries begin to harden. There is no justification in saying that all the reasons why they have to pay 25c for the medicine is because they throw the medicine away.

On the other hand, I may say this. This regulation was there ever since. I know that in 1956 the last Government tried to bring in this regulation, and not only the Press but the general public and those of us in the Opposition made a tremendous howl about it and it was dropped.

The Hon. Minister of Health knows this. Has he ever taken into consideration that the Hospital is not a parochial institution, and therefore he is responsible for every old age pensioner in Barbados? Even if you are going to bring in a regulation for the payment of medicine to these people who attend the Casualty, then surely enough certain people should be exempted.

I want to know - I do not know if it is so - if you are continuing to carry and bring such people as those who suffer from diabetes in the ambulance free or if they will have to pay a charge. You had a practice of bringing in these type of people free and having them treated, and then sending them back home by your motor ambulance. As I see it, you have made no differentiation. Are you going to charge the old age pensioners? Let us say that one of these people has lost a foot because she has diabetes and she has to come to the Hospital for treatment. She gets only \$9.60 per month from old age pension, and I am liberal enough to say that she has an old house for which she pays \$2.00 per quarter for land rent, and the balance of that pension must feed here. Let us say that she must pay for an insulin injection every day - at least you must use it every day if you have diabetes- according to this schedule, such people must pay 25 cents every day for attending the Hospital to have these injections. As I have said, I do not

know if this is so, but you fell like charging the out-patients. There fore, if you feel like charging the out-patients now for the medicine which they receive, do you not think that at least the old age pensionrs should be exempted? 2.55 p.m.

Therefore they must feel it. I consider myself that that particular item would need a tremendous lot of think-ing, although we have no power to amend these Regulations. These Regulations come under the 1947 Act; they do not come under the Act where we can say that we declare the whole thing to be null and void. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I feel that the Hon. Minister should be able to give us some light on a matter of this sort. I am very strong about this 25 cents charge. I cannot say \"yes\" to this and then, on another occasion, say that you should not charge the out-patients. The people who accept the services of District Medical Officers are really, with few exceptions, persons who cannot afford to pay their own private medical practitioner in certain areas. I have heard from one practitioner who has told me that what he finds most pathetic is that he would be sitting in the Casualty and he would get telephone calls, or he might be off duty and he would get a call to this effect: \"Please try and come to me for God's sake.\" That call might be from St. Thomas. It might be a case of a hus-band having taken ill and he cannot get any doctor. He has put his foot in the hot water or something like that. The doctor says that if he can get to the Hospital he will be attended to, and the reply is that that person cannot get anything to take him to the Hospital.

It is not a question of payment, because that makes very little difference to some medical practitioners; it is a

question of being friendly enough with a practitioner in order to get him to come to your house. I know a man who was taken ill with an attack of appendicitis and he was intelligent enough as not to use a hot water bag. However his doctor friend came, he was rushed to the Hospital and the operation was performed. That is why I would like the Minister to tell me something about the removal of Dr. St. John who is about 38 years of age. I know I will be told by the Minister that he is not being replaced by Dr. Romitti who is at the age of 75 years. As to the general public, here was a Visiting Surgeon who would come out at 1 o'clock or 2 o'clock in the morning in order to give his services, not to paying patients but to non-paying patients; not to patients who could afford to pay \$75.00, \$80.00, or \$120.00, but to those who could not afford to pay one red cent. That is why I would like this House and the general public to have some proper information with regard to this matter.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, there is no point in going over all of these fees. If you look at what they call major operations - acute appendicitis is a major operation and for that you can charge \$212.00 if you go into the Ward which is \$15.00 a day. I am not prepared to say that the fees which were charged for the Hospital Wards should remain as they were; if I were to say that, that would be dishonesty and hypocrisy. I mince no matters about that. But what I cannot understand is this; you used to charge \$4.80 per day and \$1.20 a day; now you have trebled the \$4.80 per day and carried the five shillings a day to \$7.50 per day. How can you decide that for those wards for which people were paying \$4.80 per day the fees should be increased to three times as much, and those who were paying \$1.20 per day should now be paying \$7.50 per day, which is six times as much? The Hon. Minister will say that they are providing a \$3.00 a day Ward, but it is not a \$3.00 a day Ward. You have four beds in the general Ward which you screen around for persons who pay \$3.00 per day. That seems to be all right. You cannot get breakfast at Austin's at \$5.00 per day. (Mr. SMITH: Do you go down at Austin?) I eat at two places - at home and abroad.

I feel that the fees which are charged at \$7.50 per day should be reduced to \$5.00 per day. In those public Wards where you just have a screen for four persons each for \$3.00 a day, that is a departure and something which people do not like. There are those persons who cannot afford to pay \$5.00 per day, but there are those who would pay \$3.00 per day for privacy in that part of the Ward. I notice that in the Regulations you have anticipated that we will soon have a Federation, and there was an invitation to say that where Barbadians abroad were given reciprocal treatment in the Hospitals of the Leeward or Windward Islands, Trinidad or Jamaica, other people would be entitled to similar treatment in Barbados. There would be treatment for members of the Police Force and her Majesty's Forces in the same way. I have no quarrel about that at all; that was a matter of holding out the olive branch to people. You are saying that if you treat our Barbadians in this way outside we will be prepared to treat your nationals in the same way in Barbados. 3.05 p.m.

I must confess, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that I do not agree with jumping from five shillings to \$7.50 a day. I believe that \$5 a day would be a very reasonable charge. The charge of \$3 a day in the poor wards is all well and good. I am not here, Sir, to criticise and make bad enough worse, but I am here to see if I can do anything to help as far as the Hospital is concerned. If hon. members were in my position as Leader of the Opposition or were in politics as long as I have been, they would realise that they are bound to have friends and enemies, and they could not help hearing certain things. There are people who go to the Casualty who, I know, cannot pay. The hon. member will be reminded that when I walked through the Hospital there were people getting out of vans and calling at me because they know me. There are times, Sir, when you must talk straight to people. Some people feel that they can hold a big stick over your head and you cannot do better.

There is one hospital here; and while it may be true that a lot of the professionals might be able to come out and work for a living, I would say here and now that not one of

them would be prepared to give up the services of the hospital and the salaries they receive together with the three-quarters of the fees they get from people. I cannot stand the idea of the Specialists taking the majority of people sent from the general practitioners and leaving those who are sent from the Casualty, and they have to wait for five or six months. I have on several occasions had to speak to the Minister who, I must confess, has remedied the situation in this respect for me when schoolmasters telephoned me about children who had been suffering and had been put off for a year or two. This ranges from the Ophthalmic Surgeon right down to the Paediatrician.

I must say finally before the Minister replies that I should like to see the Hospital working in harmony. What I said when that Hospital was opened is that the four walls, the lovely tiled floors, the lovely rooms, the beautiful lights and the setting might as well be a hotel or a casino if you do not have co-operation between doctors and nurses, nurses and domestics, and domestics and doctors. I said that four walls never made a hospital, but that a hospital must be made by co-operation and human sympathy which is expected.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, that is my contribution and my criticism of the Hospital Fees Regulations. While none of us in here can do anything about them, I believe that I was very strong in my criticism last week, and if the Minister has got his data and is prepared to go into this matter, I am perfectly willing to give him any information which I may have to help him. I think from the bottom of my heart that you must

have a very strong administration, and I hope that in the not very distant future I will see the Minister come down with a very strong Board to run the Hospital, and we will be able to see that at least the poor and underprivileged and those who cannot pay are attended to. But for the grace of God I could have been numbered among those who have to wait six and eight months to be attended. I hope too that more non-paying patients will be attended, because you will admit that in Barbados you have more poor people than well-to-do ones. I hope the Minister will be able to give this House a clarification of the situation at the Hospital, and I will reply when the Minister has spoken,

Mr. MILLER:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I suppose it is expected that I would have something to say on this Resolution re the Hospital services. What is unfortunate about all this is that it has come at a time when the institution has just been completed and put into service. These changes are not in the interest of the people who subscribed their taxes for the main structure of the Hospital, and to its maintenance and upkeep. It must be pointed out that these general Regulations are not consistent with present-day thought even in institutions owned outright by doctors and their families bent on profit.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

If the hon. member would give way, the hon. senior member for Bridgetown moved the Resolution, but it has not been seconded.

Mr. MILLER:

If you want me to say that, I will do so, but I am seconding the Resolution. We cannot change the Regulations anyhow. If you want me to say formally that I second the motion, I will do that, but it is just a formality.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

The procedure must be adopted.

Mr. MILLER:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to second the Resolution. If you would not mind, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I will move all over this unfortunate document and I believe that we can ask the Minister or those responsible for the Regulations to re-examine this again. When you have a hospital, you begin to think in terms of a mercy institution. In the United Kingdom Mr. Aneurin Bevan introduced this free Socialist service, and when the Conservative Government came into power, they introduced a fee which was stabilised and the number of persons going to the Out-Patients* Department or Casualty, most psychiatric cases, paid something like 50 cents. 3.15 p.m.

You put something at 50 cents and you might want to justify this by making them pay 25 cents. What is the bone of contention in all this? The fees are geared to pay Specialists and for heavy operations. The fees which Socialists receive are probably 75% of the charge. This obtained during the period when you had two Specialists at the Hospital; but today with the institution which you have, where a person may have to pay £400 you are putting people to death by these fees. You have in the average run of persons today some people who are still filled to some extent with personal pride, and they would want to have a little separation. These are things which you want to examine. You have 15,000 souls going out through the Out-patients' Department. Have you found out whether these people can pay? I remember during the period when my Party was in power, they made an assessment of the people who

pass through that Department. We found out that the postman's daughter or wife who actually visited the Outpatients' Department was actually less than half of one per cent of the number of persons going through this Department who could well have paid a fee. What you want to do is to examine this thing.

This is a mercy Hospital. This Hospital was started by a few dedicated persons who wanted to help. You are changing all the ideals set by the early Pilgrims. The only thing which is free now at this institution is for the person who goes there to deliver a child.

We are making a grave mistake here. Of course, we can do nothing about it. It is law. The only thing which we can do is to persuade. You just only have to shrug your shoulders and bear it. However, you are bound to pay for this. Go to the Out-patients' Department and you will see the number of people there. There are some of them who are unable to pay bus fare. Some of them go and spend the whole day there and cannot even drink a mauby. Many of them will not be able to pay this fee.

This is sad, Mr. Deputy Speaker; there is no point in criticising the Minister. What is more, the patient in the Hospital will pay in the end. I remember the first debate we had in here about this question when we thought that we were holding up the flag purely in the interest of the patients in this institution. I am not criticising the Hon. Minister on this because this is a negligible thing. I instituted a shuttle service there and said that the fee should be 25 cents.

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Since the hon. member's memory and his conscience has now afflicted him, he has just remembered that it is he who introduced this 25 cents charge. What is he fulminating against now?

Mr. MILLER:

What is the Hon. Premier talking about?

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

The hon. member said that he would like to know what I am talking about. I said that since the hon. member's memory has now returned and presuming that his conscience has afflicted him, he has just remembered something. He said that it was he who instituted the charge of 24 cents.

Mr. MILLER:

We had a recommendation by a number of doctors and a Committee who advised that there should be a figure of 24 cents. We had that recommendation from a group of doctors and the head of the Hospital. A tremendous row they had with the Ministry, and it resulted in that not only they were asked to withdraw, but I removed the Medical Superintendent from the Hospital. I remember, that same day, I got out of my chair and left.

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Is the hon. member seriously saying when something was done about the Hospital rates which we questioned him on, that an individual was withdrawn and that he ordered the member from the Hospital?

Mr. MILLER:

Under the Hospital Act, you have a number of Regulations which nobody can change at all. There

were Regulations which I found during my term and they will remain while I would die. Under the Hospital Act you have a number of Regulations which nobody can change. You know that well enough.

Hon. E. W. BARROW rose to speak.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

On that particular point is the question of memories. I close debate on that particular issue. The record will speak for itself. The hon. junior member for St. George can continue his general contribution on the Resolution. 3.25 p.m.

Mr. MILLER:

I hope it will not be necessary for us to have the childish interruptions which we so often have. The whole country is in a state of turmoil as a result of these Hospital charges in these Regulations. Some of these charges do not apply in some American Hospitals. You are dealing with a mercy Institution, and I will say that most of these fees must be paid in advance. The hon. member got up in here on a point of order. (ASIDES) You have a number of charges in these Regulations, and before I was a Minister.. (ASIDES) Get up and talk to somebody else. You are dealing with the Hospital (Fees) Regulations; you are not dealing with the Elections. Now you have come down with matters relating to land owners. You have made promises to the people before, and now you are sitting down waiting for a slice off the bone. (Laughter). What we have here is not commonsense. When we had a shuttle service at the Hospital we did not have enough beds. The Hospital is for the purpose of rendering a free service. There is no room for people in the Hospital and they have to go and come back. The fee is now \$5.00; If it is a distance of five miles, the fee is \$5.00 and if it is more than ten miles the fee is \$10.00. In this way, if you pay for a service to bring people to the Hospital twice a week, that is \$20.00 per week. You are asking such persons to go home and die. The Hospital service is a free service and we have free ambulances for that purpose.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

I should like to remind the hon. member that I must see his face.

Mr. MILLER:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am moved by emotion. I heard a cheap remark from that piece of human dross which calls himself a Minister; he had better try and join the Salvation Army which was established under General William Booth, (Laughter).

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

I am warning the hon. member; he must keep to this Resolution.

Mr. MILLER:

I have been taught to be respectful at home. I know my unwavering respect for the Chair. The Hon. Minister was unable to open the Hospital because there is a shortage of Nurses, and imagine that you have only four passes in one hundred cases! That was not our trouble in the Ministry. Our trouble was

that we were having quite a number of passes, and people were going out to the various institutions to study. I am saying that you must make up your mind about this matter or fail. Mr. Deputy Speaker, there is so much in these Regulations that would involve so much discussion that I do not know what is going to happen. I should like to ask this question How many people we have in this island who can pay \$15.00 a day so as to keep them in the Hospital for a few days? If the Minister would sit down now with his pencil and make a calculation as to the payment for the Specialists, he would find that he would not have them going out to Jamaica to get these salaries. I would ask the Minister to make a calculation and he will see that he could slash these fees to less than one half of what they are, and he would be able to provide a service and have his full-time men at the Hospital as well. He will be able to attract the best Specialists in the world because a Specialist would be happy in an Institution such as this.

These Specialists would like to have an association with the top boys, and we have a lot of Popes up there. You have a lot of stalwarts who are wanted all over the world, people

like Dr. Graham and Dr. Cummins; but the Minister is so stupid that he is bound to be a twin, because no one person could agree to these fees.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

I will ask the hon. member to guard his language.

Mr. MILLER:

If the hon. member wants me to withdraw that statement, I will do so.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

It is my duty to remind the hon. member that he should keep his language on a proper level.

Mr. MILLER:

My friend must have been thinking of the Christmas Carols or he was looking for something to turn up.

3.35 p.m.

You know, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that this means nothing

now. This is the dying ember. You will remember the scene at Golgotha; "Is it nothing to you, all ye that pass by?" Remember Demetrius the Greek slave! It does not matter now what we charge, because they will soon be out of office struggling, and you know how it is. After four years you have a Tenantry Act being brought in.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

I will ask the hon. member not to touch on that.

Mr. MILLER:

I am saying, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the people who get hurt and want to go to the Hospital must pay fees, and with my unchanging and undying respect to the Chair, if you think of Charles Dickens,

you can treat this with scant courtesy. I am not sure which of the Labour Party members will have the responsibility of changing this, but it is bound to be changed probably in less than a year. This will be torn up and we have to come back to Parliament with the Socialist view and idea of mercy treatment. It is written in Holy Writ as spoken by John the Baptist that 'greater than I will come. He was talking about the Messiah, the Galilean, the Man born to be King, King of the Jews, the Carpenter's Son.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order, is what the hon. member saying in the Resolution which is before this House?

Mr. MILLER:

My pal and friend the King, the Prince and the Pauper. We are dealing with Charles Dickens and thinking of Scrooge and David Copperfield. The attitude of the Minister means that there is nothing he can do, and he can sing "On a hill far, far away". It is only a matter of time before this is thrown in the waste paper basket. He can provide the Hospital with a number of dedicated souls, and if he would do a little elementary arithmetic, he will see how happy he can make the Hospital. I presume that the Minister is in trouble with 1,500 or 1,600 in the Out-patients' Department; yet the Minister of Education talks about the Casualty being free.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Let the hon. member address the Chair.

Mr. MILLER:

I was only quoting from what the member said.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

You cannot reply to a member and at the same time address the Chair.

Mr. MILLER:

I am not replying; I am only saying that my friend, the Leader of the Opposition, said that the Casualty is free.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

On a point of order, what I said when I started to discuss this Resolution is that I saw some paragraph in the newspaper which said that the entire Hospital was free, but I said that the Casualty as such was free. What we call the Casualty formerly was a misnomer, but the Casualty as such is free. If my colleague, the hon. junior member for Christ Church got into an accident on the road,

the first place he would think of would be the Casualty of the Hospital; but to say that the Out-patients' Department is free is certainly not true.

Mr. MILLER:

If you get in an accident and go to the Hospital, it is not free. In the Out-patients' Department you have to pay a cover charge. The hon. member knows that if a doctor has to attend to you, you are

covered by Third Party or otherwise; so you have to pay for the health service.

After the Regulations have been laid for forty days, they become law; but whether or not they work or how many graves he is bound to dig is another matter. You have a lot of people on the waiting list at the Hospital, the most of them being old ladies with tumours, but a number of these cases will die at home and probably some will go overseas because they are not attended to in the institution. If this is a free and charitable institution, what is going to be the position with the old girl looking for three days' fees? There is no authority to whom you can appeal on the ground of poverty. You see some dejected souls going through the Out-Patients' Department, and when you look at them, you can see a complete sacrifice of pride in going to get something free to save their lives. What are you going to tell them? When you talk about that Ministry, I believe that six months before I left, there was a Jamaican nurse in charge of the out-Patients' Department of the Casualty; a patient was turned away and she could see a glare of white in that man's eye, and she went outside and discovered that the man had a high temperature, and the doctor had no alternative but to give him an injection. The girl was transferred immediately. He would either have to have 25 cents or go without the service, when a small social service organisation working as in all the hospitals in the world would examine this person to see if he could pay.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the hon. member is misleading this House. A man is not charged 25 cents to be seen in the Casualty. He is charged 25 cents for the medicine.

Mr. MILLER:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, he is not charged to be seen, but you know that no doctor can prescribe medicine for a person unless he is seen. If you say it is for the medicine, that is the sort of folly we have. A man is sick and they hound him down and charge him. Look at the kind of Minister of Health we have. I am guarded in not saying anything more. I have no personal grouse with him; so he can say that I am his friend. 3.45 p.m.

I have never really criticised the hon. member, but to tell us that the man is not charged a fee..Who charges the fee? The doctor?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

Sir, I rise on a point of order. I said that the patient is not charged a fee. What he is charged for is just a contribution to the cost of the medicine so that he will appreciate the medicine. That was started during the time of the hon. member when he was Minister of Health. All that we have done is to change it to the round figure of our currency today.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

The point has been made.

Mr. MILLER:

The Hon. Minister will say what large part of the population passes through the Out-Patients' Department of the Hospital. You must socialise medicine in any society. We have sugar cane and there is a form of Slavery in sugar cane. Sugar is never a good employer. The Hon. Minister went to Trinidad and he must have seen at all the big plantations in Trinidad that you have Out-Patients' Clinics all about the

place with doctors and nurses serving the community. Wherever you go, wherever there is sugar cane you find that sort of thing. In Jamaica, you will find that sort of thing. As I have said, it is so wherever sugar is the island's economy. It is so because you do not want to charge the Out-Patients. You can go and get treatment at all of these Out-Patient clinics. Even little starving St. Lucia has these clinics and you can go and get it. You will

find these little outposts all over the place with a man going around on a little motor-cycle and helping the people free of cost. We give service to 14,000 souls.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I again rise on a point of order. The hon. junior member for St. George is misleading the House. The point is that nearly all the beds at the Hospital are free but if you want to be in a room by yourself, you have to pay for it.

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, there is something which is worrying me in connection with the rules of the House. It is fairly evident to us on this side that the hon. junior member of St. George is transgressing the rules of the House.

Mr. MILLER:

We are talking about the Hospital and the Casualty Department at the hospital. I have a slender knowledge of what is operating in the mind of the Hon. Premier. I instituted a Casualty service at the Mental Hos-pital. Outpatients go there.

I was saying that all those who want to have a little privacy could have gone to the Pay Ward of the old Hospital and pay \$1.20 per day. But you must have your charity Wards. I believe, Sir, you remember the time when patients wore long white gowns, and you had in those Wards other patients wearing their own clothing, and paying for that pri-vilege.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I can understand the feelings of the Hon. Minister now that this thing is being spoken of. There is nothing in this which can continue to be called a mercy service in this island. What about your ambulance service? You must have such a service in a society such as ours. There are some who have to go to that institution all the time. They are too ill to get there. How are you getting some of them to and from their homes? Some of them come to the institution with an empty stomach. They come there starving and then they have to wait eight or nine hours and they do not possess a penny even to buy a glass of mauby.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, these fees are out of the reach of all poor people. These would only survive until the next election. You may delay it. The time has come when the taxpayer is willing to pay for you to provide a socialist service for this country and that Is something which they will enjoy. Have you anything to tell me how many of the country's population will be able to pay these fees? Somebody should be in the Administration Department to investigate this and say who can pay.

Hon. A. DaG. EDWARDS:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, again I rise on a point of order. The hon. member attempts to mislead this Hon. Chamber. If he used to attend the meetings of this Chamber, he would have known that we have

appointed an Almoner whose duty it is to investigate the means of the people attending the Hospital and determining who can pay or who cannot pay.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Your point has been duly

made.

3.55 p.m.

Mr. MILLER:

In the Out-Patients' Department or the Records Department, we had such a person or persons. We had something which is as ancient as the Minister's birth-day. That is the service to which he is referring. We are now stepping out of space.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order. There has never been such a post on the Establishment of the Hospital, that is to say, the post of a person who has to go into the needs of these people. What the hon. member is speaking about is not a Social worker's post. When we placed on the establishment of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital the post of Almoner, that is a person who will be trained to go into the means of the persons attending this Hospital and determine whether those persons can pay or not.

Mr. MILLER:

That is the ruling of the hon. member. We have a number of persons who are still there.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Is the hon. member still

addressing the Chair?

Mr. MILLER:

I am sorry, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have an undying respect for the Chair. What I am saying, Sir, is that this is a service which has been going on anno Domini. We can think of people whom we have sent overseas. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I may as well come to an end of my remarks because you can see the arrogance of the hon. member. He is the Armageddon of the 18th century. I will continue in existence, however, until the Election and I am reassured that I will be in the team. We are now watering down the School Meals Service.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

There is no question of any School Meals Service.

Mr. MILLER:

Is there not the tendency to stop them? I thank you, Sir; we must have a sense of humour and this is a thing which we need to talk about and have some jollification. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am seconding the

motion which has been made by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition and I assure you that in the next Election I will be there.

Mr. HUSBANDS:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to make a few remarks relative to this Resolution. (ASIDES)

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

I am afraid that I cannot hear the hon. member who is addressing the Chair.

Mr. HUSBANDS:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have been waiting for a long time to say something on this Resolution and now I have been very well informed during the course of the speeches which have been made by the two previous speakers. I cannot promise this House that I will be as general as they have been on this question of Hospital Administration; my strictures will be limited to the question of the recent Schedule of fees which have been circulated to hon. members. To begin with, I share the view which has been expressed by the hon. senior member for the City, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, that we cannot expect that if the new Queen Elizabeth Hospital, which is a very imposing Institution, is to get started, there must not be some increase in the fees. I will not tell this House that I did not expect that there would have been an increase in the fees, but I will say that I did not expect the increases to be as high as they are set out in this Schedule. This has come almost on the eve of a scheme of social security. To those of us who say we are Socialists, those of us who have told the island's population that we are Socialists, those of us who have campaigned as Socialists, it is not very understandable how, at this particular time, we can see such an increase in the fees charged for rooms and for the services rendered to the community by this Hospital. When it comes to the question of Socialism, we are providing a public service which is for everybody. Admittedly, the majority of patients in the Hospital are in free wards, but everybody who is living in Barbados is not a direct pauper.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, there are many people in Barbados who work for remunerative incomes and they have families who happen to be in what we would call the big income group. We have not had any increase in salaries; and if ill-ness were to strike such families, it seems to me as if we will be penalised for being ill. As we know, the enjoyment of health is necessary in this country and that is also so where education is concerned. However, I think I would have preferred to see this scheme for social security being set in motion before I see this increase of prices in the Schedule of the Hospital (Fees) Regulations which we have before us. 4.05 p.m.

How are you going to equate one thing with the other? How are you going to prevent people from having that constant fear of sickness? When a man is sick, the usual expenses continue, plus what he has to pay for hoping to get better; so it does appear as if when he is sick now, he is being penalised for being sick. I cannot appreciate that. Many income groups have profited from the five shilling and \$4.80 a day wards, but now they are completely out. The hon. senior member for Bridgetown said that he would appreciate a \$3 a day ward, but he did not think that the \$4.80 ward should go to \$15.00. I myself share that view entirely. We Socialists have got to be very careful. Every man and woman in this community contributes to taxes. The majority of people may be destitute, but they are helped by the people by the people who work and contribute to the wealth of the country. Do not therefore put an extra burden on those people who would more or less be going to the Pay Wards. Do not penalise them by making them pay double. They are taxpayers contributing to the free Wards and to the general

administration of the Hospital. The idea of working out a social security scheme and bringing it here was to allay the fears of people as they approach old age to make them feel that they are not going to be penalised when they are sick. Health is a very significant part of a social security scheme, and before it comes down to us, we have fears of the community mounting. A man's child may become ill, his wife may have to go for an operation, and many families are afraid now because of these increased rates.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, although we can do nothing about these Regulations now, I am grateful to the Leader of the Opposition who has given me an opportunity to speak and to voice my criticisms on the increased prices. There may be something in what the hon. junior member for St. George said relative to increasing the salaries of the Specialists rather than increasing the fees to the patients. You may have technical conflicts, in that you may have to pay them more than the Governor, but the suggestion is very practical. I did not share all he had to say, when he was in an electioneering mood, but in so far as the suggestion is concerned, I do agree with him. One thing strikes me which is pertinent to this issue, and it is the question of what aid we would be led to expect from the West Indies Hospital Sweep. We were led to believe that these West Indies Hospital Sweep people would have given financial help to our Hospital. It seems, Mr. Deputy Speaker, as if sooner or later instead of this West Indies Hospital Sweep being able to help financially this new Hospital of ours, it may be that we may have to safeguard the potential local ticket buyers from that.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

I will ask the hon. member just to make reference to that en passant,

Mr. HUSBANDS:

I was not completely off, because the West Indies Hospital Sweep was intended to aid this Hospital financially. It may be that because that aid cannot be seen to be forthcoming, these rates have had to be stepped up; so you see how pertinent the matter is now. As I said, I appreciate very much listening to the criticisms of the overall administration of the Hospital, but I do not think it was very pertinent to the Resolution before us. My alarm is that actually on the eve of a scheme for social security for all, we find that the fears of the community are mounting in respect of the Schedule of rates. That should not be. I hoped that the Hon. Premier can in a matter of weeks give us some assurance that he will be bringing down the social security scheme to which we are looking forward. That scheme, I hope, will allay the fears of people and prevent them from getting hypertension from fear of becoming old and fear of having to suffer through being poor.

I do hope, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that in the very near future the Government whose responsibility this is will see fit to make many an amendment as far as this Schedule is concerned, because I cannot balance the idea of a Social security scheme just in the offing and the increases as set out here. They seem to oppose one another and that should not be. None of us here should be debating as we are. Admittedly the expenditure of this Hospital will be very high; it is a new institution, but there will always have to be subsidisation. It is just like education. Today we provide health free for all, because the great majority of patients at the Hospital are poor patients, but those in the community who contribute co taxes must benefit in some proportion; they must not be penalised twice. They must not be

wage earners, taxpayers and have penalties for being better off. Some are not so well off, but just appear to be. When sickness hits a family, you see how strong it is. They may be going well, but after a few months' sickness, you can check and see what is the position if they have to pay \$200 for an operation and spend 30 days in a hospital at \$15 a day. You may talk about insurance, but the insurance is negligible. 4.15 p.m.

I think that this is penalising a certain section of the community, and it is not in keeping with the sort of security scheme that we would be looking for. That is my comment on this matter.

Mr. SMITH:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the hon. member wants to speak now, but I want to speak before he speaks. I just want to say that I will not have to go too far in the country on these Regulations because the last two or three members who spoke have found themselves all the way up by Four Cross Roads on it. That being so, I do not think I will have to go too far I will only have to stop off by St. John's Church.

These Regulations have had me wondering from the time I read them. Clause 10 (1) reads as follows:-
"All fees payable under these Regulations shall, unless the Hospital Director otherwise permits, be paid in advance."

Now Sir, I am wondering if human beings had anything to do with these Regulations, especially this section. We are dealing with a poor community. There are some poor people in Barbados who think that they are rich, but I do not want to fool my self or any other person. I would not say that the fees should remain as they were, although it would not be anything wrong if they remain as they were. However I believe that the facilities and everything of that sort are much better at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital than they were at the old Hospital. It is more costly to run; you have a few more beds and things of that sort at the new Hospital; therefore you should pay a little more.

But it is a Government institution run by the taxpayers; in other words, every living human being in this country has to contribute to the upkeep of that Hospital. Even the little child, so long as it can drink a coke or a half bottle of coke, contributes because that coke is being taxed. Before you could have said that the children were not included; but now, this present Government has things so tightly - and is screwing up the vice even tighter - that nobody is getting away from taxation.

Sir, you have got to consider - whoever is responsible for it - that we have what other people call middle-class people working for a very small salary and, among other things, a family man has to pay house rent and school fees for his children. Every parent does not enjoy the benefits of free secondary education for his children. Along with all that, when one is sick, expenses go up; they do not come down. You may be one who is in a job, but if you do not have a regular job, you only can receive pay when you work. If you are sick and you are one who is drawing a salary, you have to spend more during the time that you are ill. There are some people who ration themselves with a half-pint of milk daily, and that has to serve all the children; but when you are ill, you have to buy two pints of milk for yourself. In other words, you are not bound to drink milk when you are well, but you must drink it when you are ill because the doctor is going to order it for you.

Do you mean to say that, only because you have built a new Hospital, the cost for treatment must go up? In some cases it has gone up about 30%. Now, Sir, we should think, and we should think always

before we do these things. It is no use telling the people of this country that you are going to bring down heaven to earth for them in one way while, on the other hand, when they are sick you are putting them further in the coffin. You should do more for the people when they are ill than when they are well.

Now, Sir, after you have raised the fees, you are calling on them to pay these fees beforehand.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The fees are not raised for the average person in this community because, as I have pointed out already, 90% of the people in this country already get free hospitalization. It was the Barbados Labour Party which asked that fees should be payable in advance, because this is part of the Regulations which were made by them.

Mr. SMITH:

I expected, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the Hon. Minister would have got up on a point of order not before too long. However, he is too small to stop me this afternoon. He cannot stop me I am too heavy. The Hon. Minister said that it is the Barbados Labour Party who fixed the fees beforehand. I am sorry that I cannot call him by his right name now. Members of the present Government went to the country telling the people that the Barbados Labour Party was the worst thing out. The Barbados Labour Party did everything wrong, and if you put the Democratic Labour Party in power they would make everything right. Now, the Barbados Labour Party which was doing everything wrong has been thrown out and the Democratic Labour party has come and has followed the pattern of the Barbados Labour Party. They have come and are carrying on the same way as the Barbados Labour Party.

I was not going to be so hard on them, but since they have taken a leaf out of the book of the last Government with respect to these Regulations, do you think that the people of this country should not call on them to leave because all that they are doing are the things which the last Government was doing and they are not changing the things which the people wanted them to change? 4.25 p.m.

The hon. member is only trying to find a scape-goat. Now, Sir, if you had to pay for six days at the Hospital at five shillings per day, that would be \$7.20; but look at what this Government is doing now. For one day you have to pay \$7.50, whereas in the regime of the Labour Party you paid \$7.20 for six days.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

On a point of order. Mr. Deputy Speaker, the hon. junior member for St. Joseph is trying to point out that these charges have gone from \$1.20 per day to \$7.50 per day; but what he has not said is that what was the five shillings a day Ward is now \$3.00. That fee of \$1.20 was fixed some 30 years ago, but today it is costing the Hospital \$35 per day to run the Wards, and that is a lot of money.

Mr. SMITH:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the hon. member has said that all the Wards at the Hospital are free.

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

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

It is now 4.30 p.m. of the clock and the time for the consideration of Private Members' Business has

come to an end.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that this Sitting be now suspended for five minutes.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

The question that this sitting be now suspended for five minutes was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER suspended the sitting accordingly.

On re-assembling,

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, there is no quorum present and I ask that the bell be rung.

On the bell being rung, a quorum was obtained,

RESUMPTION OF GOVERNMENT BUSINESS TENANTRIES (CONTROL AND DEVELOPMENT) BILL

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

On the suspension of the sitting for five minutes, the time for the consideration of Private Members' Business had expired. It is now time for the resumption of Government Business. On the last occasion of Government Business, the Hon. Premier was speaking on the second reading of a Bill to provide for the control and development of tenancies. The Hon. Premier may continue his speech.

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I notice that the members of the Opposition are conspicuous by their absence. I suppose that they would not call this a walk-out, but a sitting out in the dining-room. Two of the main reasons for the epidemic of the rental notices which erupted towards the end of last year were, firstly, that under the Local Government Act, the owners of tenancies could be called upon by the Local Government Councils or Local Government Authorities to put the roads of their districts in a proper state of repair, and most of the owners of these tenancies were reluctant to do so. You will remember that, as far back as 1962, the owners of the Bannister Land Tenancy were the subject of a debate in the Bridgetown City Council, and I believe that some statements were made on the floor of this House. The second reason is not unconnected with the first one. This is a deduction from certain questions which were asked on the floor of this House by members of the Opposition. Reason number two was that the owners of the land thought that the positive alternative to their spending money on the construction of the roads or being under any obligation to make them put these roads in a proper state of repair - I do not know of one single case in which the Bridgetown City Council, up to now, has actually taken action

against a landowner to make him put his roads in order. It all headed up to this, that the real estate agents and the solicitors thought that they would start a large-scale eviction on tenants on every possible tenantry. I have mentioned sixteen tenancies where 357 tenants have been given notices to quit. These landlords felt that if they issued these large-scale evictions, the Government might give double the price which they were asking for the land, and then the Government would have the headache of seeing about repairing the roads. We find that sometime last year the hon. senior member for St. Michael tabled a Question in this House which was a very remarkable Question. It not only disclosed an Interest about the state of affairs, but it actually tried to dictate to the Government a certain line of policy. The Question which was tabled by the hon. senior member for St. Michael was to this effect. 4.40 p.m.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am looking for the text of the question which was to the effect of asking the Government whether it was aware that tenants had been given notice to leave land, I think, at Brittons Hill, and would the Government purchase the land. He did not ask whether the Government would take steps to introduce legislation. He asked whether the Government would purchase the land and resell it to the existing tenants, but there would be no need for the Government to intervene if the land-owners were themselves willing and ready to sell the land to the tenants. There has been some subterfuge which has been going on in the Courts to which I will refer in a moment whereby the Judge was misled into believing that all these charitable land owners were anxious to sell the land to the tenants and the Government was preventing them from doing so. This is not so at all, because if they wanted to sell, they would not have to give notice. They could do what the Government did with the housing estates. We have released all the houses and made them available to the people who occupy them. We did not give notice to one single case of the 2,000 houses in the Pine, Gazettes, Bay Land or any of the others. All we did was to send a polite letter saying that those who wanted to go on paying rent could do so, but for those who wanted to purchase, 40 per cent of the rents paid would be credited against the house and they could go on paying the same amount of rent, and when the value of the house was paid, the freehold in the house would be theirs. If this was not subterfuge and a plot - I am using strong language - to enrage unjustly and unduly and without

any justification whatsoever the people who owned tenancies in this island, if it was not a device to encourage tenancies in this island, if it was not a device to encourage them to escape their responsibility under the provisions of the Local Government Act, 1958, of putting the roads in the tenantry in a state of repair, then they would not have to serve notice on the tenants to move. All they would have to do is to release the land to the tenants on terms and conditions which I am sure the hon. senior member for Bridgetown would advise on. He is always boasting about what he did in the New Orleans and Carrington Village, how he gave the people a long time to pay. We would not expect him to be as generous as the Government was to its tenants in the Housing Schemes, but certainly with his ingenuity in real estate, he would have devised a beneficent scheme to pay for the land over a period of time, as he is Dean of the Faculty of Real Estate in this island, and everybody knows that. He is Leader of the Conservative Party, and he is also Mayor of the City of Bridgetown; So coinciding, we have three fortunate circumstances whereby he was eminently qualified to advise these people how to go about the matter. But his colleague, the hon. senior member for St. Michael, comes into the House and asked whether the Government was aware that these people were being evicted off the land, and the Government after investigation would normally say \"yes, the Government is aware\". Then if the hon. member asking the question really had the interest of the people of St. Michael at heart - his own constituents - he then would have suggested that the Government introduce legislation to stop the evictions. This is what the Government is doing on its own initiative.

Now, Sir, if I may go back to this idea of the Government to take over these tenancies at a phenomenal price. We introduced a Development Plan here about two or three months ago which was praised in the Other Place only last week, but nobody suggested during the course of the debate that the Government should put aside \$13 million for the purchase of tenancies in St. Michael, the whole plan is only \$41 million -because hon. members would have entertained the same suspicion about such a proposal as they entertain about the hon. junior member for St. George.

Mr. MILLER:

On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not know what suspicion the hon. member is talking about. I am not a land shark or real estate agent. I am in possession of what was given to me by my father and mother. If the Premier is conscious of some suspicion about land, I really do not know anything about it.

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

I think the arrow missed its mark. I did not choose to make myself clear. It is good to fire an arrow in the air sometimes; it falleth to the ground you know not where. I am acting like the hon. member now going off into flights of fantasy.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, on 8th December, 1964, the hon. senior member for Bridgetown in Question No. 2 enquired:-

"Is Government aware that the respective tenants of the lands known as Burke's Tenantry"

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have not the slightest intention of interrupting the Hon. Premier, but he should read correctly. He said "the hon. senior member for Bridgetown". That is absolutely untrue.

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

I thank the hon. member for correcting the mistake. I thought I had said "the hon. senior member for St. Michael." I must have made a slip. To make it abundantly clear, the hon. senior member for St. Michael who is not in his place asked this question which he had a right to ask-

"Is Government aware that the respective tenants of the lands known as Burke's Tenantry situated at Burke's Road, Brittons Hill, St. Michael, who are unable to purchase the lot occupied by each such tenant, have been given notice to quit and deliver up possession of the lots occupied by each tenant?"

Is Government also aware that the majority of the said tenants are unable to find suitable sites to which to remove their respective houses?"

Up to there I take no exception to the question at all, because it is perfectly legitimate for any member of this Chamber to come in here and draw to the attention of Government something that is going wrong in this community; but this is where our philosophies part. The third part of the Question says this:-

"Will Government consider purchasing the said area of land with a view to selling same in lots to the said respective tenants thereof on reasonable terms and or letting the same in lots to the said respective tenants?"

That is the difference between the Socialist approach to public affairs and the Conservative approach, because the Conservative could never consider that a Government should introduce legislation to prevent landlords from doing something which is to the detriment of the majority of people in this community, so that they get the best of both worlds. The Government comes in and pays the landlords and then the Government turns around and becomes the landlord, and waits until the end of time to get back money it does not have. 4.50 p.m.

If the hon. member had asked the Minister responsible for lands, who happens to be myself: "Will the Minister state what proposals he has in mind to bring this state of affairs to an end?" he may have got an answer; but on the 2nd March, 1965, the answer which the hon. member received was that "the Government has under consideration the land tenure system as a whole in the island and proposals in relation to the problems of tenancies will shortly be presented to the Legislature."

The hon. member did ask a supplementary question, and, I believe, the hon. senior member for St. Joseph had also drawn to our attention that there was some similar difficulty in his parish. This is the way which we approach problems - not by putting money in some people's pockets.

I will draw a review of the development of the land system in Barbados. I can give you a review of the one in existence in England also, but it is out of context with the general situation in Barbados; so I would not go to the United Kingdom legislation in order to find a remedy for the state of affairs which we have in this island. Therefore, we had to sit down and devise a system which would be suitable for the state of affairs which we have.

It is unfair to ask the taxpayers of this island to find \$13 million to put in the pockets of fifteen or twenty landlords whose property their grandfathers may have only paid a half million dollars for. We can make calculations of the correct figure, because all we have to do is to get all the conveyances out of the Registry and see what the cost is. I guarantee that it will not amount to more than half million dollars. You are asking the Government to pay a price 25% higher and you are using the House of Assembly as a means of purchasing and saying that the only solution was to pay out the landlord. Unfortunately for them, they have people in this Government who can think.

There was not any legislation in the United Kingdom Government similar to this; therefore, we sat down and worked out the implications of the measure and what was the best to introduce. This is the most important piece of social legislation brought to this House in 100 years. The amount of legislation which we are coming down with in the near future is going to smoke some people out of politics, and you are going to see the difference of philosophies of one Party from the other. Absolutely nothing was done in the past to reform the land tenure system in this island.

I ask permission to read an extract from Mr. Charles Abram's Report which I have here in front of me. I cannot remember the date of the Report, but this is from paragraphs seven and eight: -

"In recent months, however, the number of displacements have accelerated and rents have been

raised. The decision by the Bridgetown City Council to compel land-owners to build roads in spot settlements has been one reason. The cost of these roads is about \$4.00 per square yard, imposing a charge upon the owners of \$100.00 or more for a house spot. Since these owners receive a few dollars monthly for their site-rents, a growing number have been taking stock of their position and concluded that it is cheaper to keep the land rent free or to sell the freehold. A few parcels owned internally or abroad have been sold and re-sold, awakening the consciousness among land owners of urban land as a saleable commodity.

In some instances, site-owners have offered their spots for sale to individual sub-tenants who have purchased. In other cases, an operator might purchase a row of these shacks, sub-divide the plots and re-sell them at a profit to the individual sub-tenants with small down-payments. But often tenants are too poor to make the required down-payments and have been compelled to move their shacks to other spots, frequently too far from their work or their friends, and often with damage to the structures to boot. The speeded-up movements of chattel houses brought about by these events have recently brought demands for eviction controls and rent restrictions or for some other remedies that can restore a more stabilised tenure. The growth of population in recent years coupled with such pressures on land made the Housing issue one of the main concerns of the political parties, and the provision of housing one of Government's most popular social reforms.

If I may go on to quote from Mr. Abram's Report which is very lengthy:-

"Under paragraph 3 of the Security of Tenure and Small Holdings Act provision is made for Small Holdings Committees which are given the power to reduce the period of notice terminating the tenure. I have been informed that the Committees have not functioned. If they were functioning, such committees may well be given the power to administer the modified forms of control, including the giving of extensions to threatened tenants where indicated. The alternative administrative devices that can function should be considered. A representative of Government might be designated in selected areas (Bridgetown, for example) who would hold negotiations with owners, and for quasi Judicial authority to granting the extension in hardship cases as I have suggested. The administrator should have sufficient staff to undertake negotiations with owners on behalf of the tenants.

It should be remembered that ceilings on land do not bring help, and that neither controls nor extension of notice periods for evictions will add to the supply of land and housing. As the population increases, or as more workers seek houses nearer to their work, the programme must simultaneously be on the way to increase the supply of land and housing. The most effective remedy for housing shortage is a programme to enlarge the number of available housing sites and increase the quantity of housing available for the working classes. It is through positive rather than regulatory programmes that the problem is solved in the long run."

The next paragraph of Mr. Abram's report is rather significant and I want to make a disclosure which stems from members of the Cabinet, but which has the authority of the Minister of Communications, Housing and Works. It is not normal that we make these disclosures in advance, but it might set the minds of hon. members of the Opposition at rest who might be concerned about the daily concern of the tenants.

I go on:

-

" Since road installation required by site are one of the main causes of current evictions, the Government should consider taking over responsibility for road installation. The cost of such installation might be shared equally by the Government and the site owner. The owner's share can

be payable in instalments over a period of five or ten years. The owner's share should be a lien against the land payable when site taxes are collected by the Local Government. The instalments as collected would be remitted to the Government,

The alternative proposal by the Authority made on January 28, 1962, suggests that the Government assumes the responsibility for tenantry roads in turn for which the tenantry owners would freeze rentals for a period of three to five years depending on the amount which Government has spent on the roads in question."

Mr. Abrams went on to say:-

"I have no objection to this being tried except that it leaves too much to uncertain negotiations. Better administration will call for fixing defined sums and collecting them through already established agencies as I have suggested. In any event if the Authority's proposal is adopted, a very close co-operation must be worked out with the Bridgetown City Council."

I am taking into account all the economic considerations and otherwise in view of Mr. Abram's remarks. The Minister of Communications has agreed to that in view of the fact we are not freezing the rate for two or three years, but freezing the right, 5.00 p.m.

In view of the fact that there are about 27,000 people in St. Michael - at least who live in these tenancies as citizens of Barbados, we are going to abolish the system whereby tenantry roads which were owned by the tenantry owners and not by landlords only - what this Government intends to do with the consent of the owners, because the land is still theirs, is to repair all of the tenantry roads in all of the tenancies throughout the island, regardless of whether the roads are private or public. (Hear! Hear!) You cannot accuse the Government of being unfair because when we are introducing the legislation which we are introducing, it would be uneconomic to carry out the Regulations of the City Council, which very few of the tenantry owners have done (Mr. MOTTLEY: I must answer that.)

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

There will be no asides.

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Well some of them have done it, but not as many as we would have liked to see. The ones who have done so, the ones who have repaired their roads, have increased their rents. If we say that the rents will not be increased, we will have to put the Barber Greene machine on these roads because the people are entitled to get to their houses at night without breaking off their toes on the roads, as I see them in some of these tenancies. I consider that the standard of the highways in Barbados is sufficiently good since we

have done the roads with the machine, and the machine must go off the highways and into the tenancies and then come back on the public highways. (Cheers!) The owners claim that they are carrying out all of these requirements of the City Council. (Asides)

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

I am hearing one voice only.

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Your Honour is not challenging me because I am on my feet.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

But you were replying to something which I heard. Let the Hon. Premier proceed.

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, as I was saying, Sir, that cause of complaint has been removed. If the landowners were genuine in that because of their having to repair these roads they had to increase the rents, we are saying that we will repair the roads for the people who live in these tenancies.

When we come to the Plantation tenancies, we have introduced certain amendments to back up the provisions of the Bill as introduced. The original Bill follows the lines of the Town and Country Planning legislation which describes specific areas of land to which the provisions of the Act would apply from time to time. The Minister of

Health and Housing has drawn the matter to my attention and we have drafted an amendment dealing with the provision for prescribed areas and making the whole island come under that provision with effect from 1965. I can assure you that the tenancies in St. James will not be left out. The second amendment is due to the fact that we did not have in mind that it was possible for the Court to make orders for people to leave lands by a certain time. The people of Harmony Hall were given until the end of June by the Chief Justice to get off the land which is in St. Michael, and we have inserted a new Clause which is in the Bill and which reads as follows:-

"Any order of ejectment made by a court of competent jurisdiction against a tenant which has not been executed before the 8th day of June, 1965 shall be stayed and no further proceedings shall be taken thereon." (Cheers!)

What we intend to do is this: we have no fewer than three lawyers in the Cabinet. We fully recognize that it is not in the interest of the administration of justice that legislation should reverse a decision made by a Court of competent jurisdiction and which is properly the function of a Court of Appeal or the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. At the same time there is nothing to prevent us from saying that the Chief Justice exercised his discretion, but the matter cannot be carried out under the Order. We say that all of these Orders which were made by the Chief Justice against people in Richmond are not capable of being enforced. We can challenge the right of any ejectment order. We say that the people who have cases in Court should be protected by the Act. Even since the hon. senior member for St. Michael asked his question, these people could not be put off the land. We cannot put back on the lands those people who have been ejected, but what they should have done should have been to use some delaying action such as appealing.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Daily News in its issue of Tuesday, 9th March, 1965, published an article and that article related to the same Harmony Hall tenants of which I have made mention. That article reads as follows:-

\\"HARMONY HALL RESIDENTS TO QUIT HOUSE SPOTS\\"

\\"A number of tenants from Harmony Hall, St. Michael, who have been served with quit notices but failed to leave the spots they were occupying for many years, appeared in the Supreme Court yesterday morning. The Chief Justice, Sir Kenneth Stoby, gave judgement against them and allowed them until June 30 this year to search for new spots.\\"

Hon. members were wondering why we should be so concerned about getting this Bill passed and I would say that if there was not any good reason, that paragraph in itself would have been a good reason.
5.10 p.m.

\\"The Landlord is Mr. J. Robert Peterkin. Mr. Elliott \\"Mottley, instructed by the Solicitor Firm of Messrs. \\"Hutchinson and Banfield appeared on his behalf.

\\"Mr. Mottley told the court that the tenants all had \\"their chattel houses at Harmony Hall and some time ago \\"the landlord called for his property. The tenants expressed \\"the desire to buy the land which they had previously been \\"renting and this was agreed to. The landlord, in the meantime, applied to the Town and Country Planning Officer \\"for permission to sub-divide the land and the Town Planner had agreed in principle, the lawyer said.\\"

Now this is what I want to draw to your attention. It is headed \\"A Snag\\".

\\"The position now was that the landlord could not ac-\\"cede to the tenants\' requests because the Town Planner\'s \\"decision had not come officially into effect. He said that \\"there was another snag involved because a Government \\"Minister had intimated some time ago that the develop-\\"ment of tenancies would be \\"frozen\\". It is not only a

\\"question of law, but politics was also involved, said Mr. \\"Mottley. He added that whilst his client was quite willing \\"to assist the people, the Government\'s decision was pre-\\"venting him from doing anything.\\"

Now the Judge then took it upon himself, acting on that wrong information to say that he would make an Order that possession of the land be given up by a certain date, but he would make such an Order so that- whoever was on the Bench - the Order would not be signed, and the tenants could apply for further time, if they needed it, to look for spots. I did not know a Judge could do that.

\\"As the tenants kept on explaining that they were an-\\"xious to remain where they were, the Chief Justice sug-\\"gested to them that since it appeared as if there was a \\"deity in Government circles, affecting the final decision \\"to be made by the Town Planner, a small deputation of \\"the Harmony Hall tenants could approach Government to \\"enquire what was the position with the tenancy.\\"

Here then, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is a Chief Justice asking the tenants to march to Government Headquarters. Now, Sir, I would like to deal with this, because you cannot allow people to get away with statements like that. When the Town planner was questioned about this, he said \"it appears to me that this report gives the impression that \"Government's withholding of planning permission in this case has caused more hardship to the tenants than it has to the landlord because it has prevented the landlord from selling his plots to the tenants in response to their request. If this is so, why the need to dispossess? Surely the best thing to do would be to show sufficient evidence to Government that the plots would be sold by the landlord to willing buyers and any obstacle to sub-division would be removed.

\"The facts of the case as I understand them and which have not been brought out clearly in the Court case are that a large number of the tenants have petitioned Government that they are threatened with ejection and cannot afford to buy plots at the high prices asked and that in consequence the Hon. Minister of Housing, Health and Local Government has directed that permission should be withheld in order to ensure that the housing problem is not aggravated. It is clear that the Chief Justice has been misled on these facts if the article referred to correctly reports his statement in court to the effect that if there was a delay in Government circles affecting the final decision to be made by the Town Planner, a small deputation of Harmony Hall tenants could approach Government to enquire what was the position with the tenantry,\"

I do not think it is the part of any Judge to advise people to go on a march to Government House or Government Headquarters. He should leave that to the politicians and to the people on the floor of this House, because when you get people in responsible positions jumping into the political arena, their eyes become clouded by the dust and smoke of the battle. In the case \"Yuill vs. Yuill\" the Lord Chief Justice of England in the All-England Reports said that a Judge should not descend into the area, because his eyes become clouded by the dust and smoke of the battle. So a word to the wise is sufficient. A Judge must therefore make judicial and not political pronouncements, and I hope that the Judges we get in future will remember that little adage. It is true, Sir, that the judge was misled in his facts, but when a Judge does not have a Jury to assist him, he should be well seised of the facts.

Now, Sir, further on that score, we have several letters here from the tenants at Harmony Hall and I would like to quote one of them. This is to the Minister of Health and reads as follows;-

\"Dear Sir,

\"We the above tenants are living on lands formerly owned by Mr. Fields of the same address above (now deceased). His sons have taken over the land and management since his death and we have continued to pay rent to them for a long period of time. This tenantry, Sir, in-

cludes over 300 people, and the lands run from as far as Eagle Hall adjoining Barbarees Hill, the New Harbour Road down to the Westbury Cemetery. Some time in 1963 when tenants went to pay rent as usual, we were told by Mr. Fields Jr. that he was not collecting rent. The tenants were left uninformed for a long while as to the whereabouts of a collecting office or as to the name of a person to whom they could forward the rent.

"Much later in the year 1963, a Mr. Peterkin, who lives at Rockley, Christ Church, came to us and said that the former owners had borrowed money from him and had given him permission to collect rents in payment of the debt. We began paying rents to him, receiving receipts on some occasions.

"Then, without warning, we were suddenly issued with writs to appear before the Supreme Court of Barbados, before His Honour Sir Kenneth Stoby on 8th March this year. These writs are issued through the Solicitors, Hutchinson and Banfield, of James Street.

"Sir, we Richmond Gap tenants are in deep despair and are asking you as Minister, whose portfolio is dealing with Housing, to do anything in your Ministerial capacity to see that our rights are not being infringed upon and that we are not being subjected to purposeful, fraudulent mismanagement of Landlord/Tenant affairs.

"We are demanding a public hearing so that this matter can be settled immediately and so that, if we are being swindled, our fellow Barbadians will learn who is perpetrating the deed and will see to it that the culprits are apprehended and duly dealt with.

"We have no other homes than these, and our despair is lightened only by the confidence we have in you. We know that you will do everything in your power to see that justice is done."

This is signed by a gentleman for and on behalf of the Richmond Gap Tenantry,

Then we have a letter signed by two of them and what is remarkable is that when we asked the Manager of the Housing Authority to make a report on this matter. Far from the tenants being offered land at any prices, the gentleman who owned this particular tenantry said that he had not finally made up his mind about the prices yet, but I should like to quote the kind of prices he had in mind. "For spots facing on the Northern Access Road, \$1.25 per square foot." Now that is higher than any land in Blue Water Terrace, and I can vouch for that. That is higher than land in the Pine, and I do not mean the Housing Area. "For spots just behind, \$1.00 a square foot, and all other back spots 75 cents a square foot." There are no roads and no water or electricity, only in the front, and here you have spots being sold at higher prices than the most desirable residential districts in the island. How can this state of affairs be? It is very simple. The way they argue is this: a man living on a house spot only needs 2,000 square feet; the minimum area is 1,800 square feet, and therefore if you charge him \$1.00 a square foot that is only \$1,800, but the middle class man building a \$20,000 house needs 8,000 or 10,000 square feet and has to pay \$5,000; so in truth and in fact you are selling the man on the small spot cheaper, because the amount of money which he finds is less. That is the way they think, and therefore you will find that the tendency among the real estate agents is always to pressurize Government to cut up the land in as small spots as possible. I am not fulminating against any real estate agent; and I am talking about the profession as a whole. They do not divide land into two and three acre lots, because the market for small lots is wider although the price per square foot is high.

5.20 p.m.

You can get more from an acre of land, cutting it up into twenty 2,000 to 2,100 square feet lots than you can get if you had divided it into four one quarter acre lots. That is why we find today tenancies becoming the biggest business. When they go in court and represent to a judge that

they want to sell the land to the tenants, you would think that they would tell the tenants what the price is going to be. In our case when we said that we want to sell the land and the houses, we said what the price would be. I would give you an experience. All of the land which we are selling to the people is at the average price of 20 cents per square foot, The only land which is being sold at more than 20 cents per square foot is the land on Beckles Road which is at 40 cents per square foot, and I do not think that the Hon. senior member for the City of Bridgetown would say that is an unreasonable price. (Mr. MOTTLEY: I will buy it all at that price.) Compare Beckles Road with Thomas Gap and all the way down there along the Northern Access Road and you would see the comparison. You will see that the tenants are being charged. Could those landowners go in and tell a judge that the Government is preventing them from selling the land to the people when they have not told the people the price? The Order was signed against them in order to prevent themselves being thrown off, no matter what the price is, but they would not be told the price before the Order was signed. This is where the ball bounces. The sad part of it is that we are aware of what is going on.

Is the Government justified in an island where most of the people live on tenancies in relieving the landlords of their social and moral responsibilities? Well, Sir, I will go through the list: but I shall like to draw to hon. members' attention that for the past three hours I have been debating this matter, and I have laid out on the Table of the House a map for the parish of St. Michael which designates all the tenancies in St. Michael, all the tenancies in which the tenants have been given notice, even those tenancies in which the tenants may be given notice and all the tenancies which we consider substantial in their housing facilities.

Eleven tenancies with 375 tenants on them have been set up for sale. We have 36 tenancies-in St. Michael. I will name them. They are:-Kensington, Richmond, Alkins Land, Hanschell Land, Manning's Land, Yearwood's Land, Bank Hall; New Orleans, St. Leonard's Village in Westbury; then the area aback of Barbarees Hill and the area around Lakes Folly, Chapman's Lane, Phillip's Tenantry, King Street, King's Village, cats Castle, Bull's Alley, Suttle Street, Dean's Village and there is a tenantry which has no official name alongside the Courts. Then there are Hinkson's Land, Church Village, Ellis Village, Nurse Land and the Golden Square. Then there are Bannister's Land and Dukes Land which are tenancies outside of the Government Housing Area which we consider to be substantial housing areas.

The Government has its eye on the problems of development of these tenancies, not only for the purpose of securing the tenants in their present holdings, but also for the purpose of redevelopment of the areas in joint co-operation with the landlords. The Government at the present moment cannot afford to buy out all the tenancies throughout the length and breadth of the island.

In addition to these tenancies, we have other tenancies, and other than that, we have plantation tenancies. These tenancies have created a special problem. There are 4,900 acres in all of plantation housing tenancies. This is nearly 5,000 acres. I cannot now remember exactly the number of tenancies. For the past few years, we have been making a door-to-door assessment of the plantation tenancies in this island, but there is such a wide disparity of public utilities, accessibility, the nature of the land and such things that it would take a time to work out all this before we can introduce the necessary legislation for plantation tenancies. However, this present legislation also provides security for those

people; so at least they are no worse off. They say that while the grass is growing the horse is starving. But the horse will still get some treatment, because no plantation tenant can be evicted except for some great reasons such as enumerated in the Bill before us. Therefore, as far as these tenants are concerned, although they have not made representation we have made legislation to cover them as well.

If I may summarise the position, it is this. We have put more muscle in the Bill which we introduced two weeks ago by the amendments which have been brought down; and

if hon. members will follow me while I go through the Bill, I will not read it with the amendments.

In the Objects and Reasons paragraph (a) a full stop shall be placed after the word \"housing\" and the words thereafter shall be deleted.

The explanation of clause 3 is deleted.

In the explanation to clause 4 the words \"in a prescribed area\" are deleted and the figure 3 is substituted for the figure 4. 5.30 p.m.

Clause 5 becomes Clause 4 and Clause 6 provides for the staying of executions where an Order of ejectment has been made by a Court before the coming into operation of the Act. In Clause 2, the definition of a prescribed area is deleted. Clause 3 is deleted, Clauses 4,5 and 6 are renumbered Clauses 3, 4 and 5 respectively and the words \"within a prescribed area\" are deleted from the new Clauses 3 and 4. The reason for that is that the Bill now extends immediately to the whole island. A new Clause 6 is inserted after the new Clause 5 and worded as follows:-

\"Any order of ejectment made by a court of competent jurisdiction against a tenant which has not been executed before the 8th day of June, 1965, shall be stayed and no further proceedings shall be taken thereon.\"

After Clause 12 we add a new Clause 13 as follows:-

\"This Act shall be deemed to have come into force and always to have been in force as from the 8th day of June, 1965.\"

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

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I will promise you that I will always observe all the Standing Orders of this House and I shall not attempt to refer to anything which has been written in the newspaper or to anything said about me as a member of this House relative to this Bill. I should just like to say at the outset that, if for no other reason, the Hon. Premier should at least appreciate the fact that what happened last Tuesday has enabled him to bring in further amendments to the Bill only today. The Hon. Premier should appreciate the stand which I took and I am not apologising for that stand; but, at the

same time there was some publication in which it has been alleged that I was given a copy of the Bill and I threw it on the floor of this House. There could be nothing more distorting of the facts than that. I challenge the Clerk of the House to say that he gave me a copy of this Bill and I threw it on the floor. (Hon. E. W. BARROW You cannot challenge the Clerk.) If anybody has caused the Premier to make so much distortion...

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order. I said this at a public meeting. My understanding was that before I actually entered the House, the Clerk started on that side of the House to deliver copies of the Bill and the hon. member refused to take his copy of the Bill. I also understood that, in the course of the exchanges, the Bill fell on the floor as a result of the gesture which the hon. member made. That is my understanding, and, of course, I may be incorrect.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

The Hon. Premier said that inside of this House. You will remember, Sir, that that was said when Your Honour adjourned the House. (Hon. E. W. BARROW Why did you not correct me?) Even when I heard things being misrepresented by the Hon. Premier, I never rose because I had no intention of interrupting him.

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

On a point of order. If I said that, the hon. member should have interrupted me on a point of explanation. However, Sir, I take it that the hon. member will support this Bill today.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Deputy Weaker, when you ruled me out of order and stated that you would not be hearing

any more of it, that was the time I stood on my feet for the purpose of correcting the Hon. Premier. I bowed to Your Honour's ruling. I intended to make that explanation on the floor of this House. If you will recall, Sir, when we were dealing with the Order paper and the Hon. Acting Leader of the House asked that we deal with Order No. 5, I said that we have not got any copy of this Bill. I said that to my colleagues. I said this to the Acting Leader of the House; "If you are dealing with this Bill, we have not got any copies of it. You have not actually postponed it for next Tuesday; you have postponed it temporarily and I should not like you to deal with it because we have no copy of it."

Mr. Deputy Speaker, you have heard the Hon. Premier speak on this Bill for more than two hours. The Acting Leader of the House did not give us any assurance, but Your Honour said that you would see that things are done in a constitutional manner, and I sat down. It was at that stage, when we were dealing with Order No.4 relative to the Town and Country Planning (Amendment) Bill, that the Clerk offered us a copy of this tenantry Bill. asked him: "How can you expect me to deal with this Bill when we have not got any copy of it?" Every member on this side of the House has a post mark from the Post Office that this Bill was posted to us on Tuesday last at 10 o'clock a.m. It matters not whether this Government or the last Government was in power. I offer co-operation. I am the Chairman of a Party whether you like my views or not. The Hon. Premier says that they have three lawyers in the Cabinet and, fortunately for us, we have lawyers in our Party also. Not one back-bencher of the Government got this Bill before Tuesday afternoon because it was not mailed; therefore the whole idea of trying to say that I attempted to sabotage a Bill in this House in order to prevent it from being passed is absolutely untrue, unfounded

and unwarranted, and I am ashamed of the Hon. premier even attempting to say what he said because this Bill was not circulated. We never saw it, neither did I ever take any Bill and throw it on the floor of this House.. 5.46 p.m.

All I asked when he came with the Bill was how did he expect us to deal with it, since we would have to read and discuss it and see what it was.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

I think that the explanation as to why the Bill was not debated last week has been given now.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

By your ruling, I was debarred from giving an answer, and therefore it is untrue to say that I tore up anything and threw it on the floor. Now that I have cleared the air, I can proceed to deal with the Bill. I will say for the benefit of the Hon. Premier that I am accustomed to these things. On the last occasion, just before the present Government won the election, the now Mr. M. E. Cox brought a Bill in here fixing the rates and times for domestic servants, because he was certain that by doing that he was removing every possible thing from the eyes of the electorate not only in the municipality of Bridgetown, but of the entire island; but these things boomerang.

Let us take this Bill, for instance. The Hon. Premier said he knew I would support this Bill. Do you know why? I have never had such intimate conversations with any other Premier of Barbados as I have with the present one, and I remember that the land in Jones Tenantry next to the area in which he lives was being fixed at \$1.50 a square foot, he asked me about it and we discussed it and I said it was impossible and absurd", and I told him as a real estate broker what it should be. I did not think that the price asked for was fight.

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

The hon. member should explain that I did not have any property in the district, but I dis-agreed with the valuation at the time. I was not asking him to corroborate that it was worth that.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

I did not say so. Sit down and do not interrupt me; I did not interrupt you, man. The Hon. Pre-mier agreed with me that the price was too high. I am ask-

ing these points in reply to this harangue about real estate agents and that I am the Dean of real estate agents. Why should I be afraid to say that I have made money as a real estate agent? I have made it and used it to help others, and I can tell you that I am today in semi-retirement.

As I was saying, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we as a Party, though not of the numerical strength of the Government Party, still have people who are not Parliamentary members with whom we must discuss these Bills. Look at this Bill! Could I stand here on the floor of this House with this pushed into my hand and decide there and then that I could deal with this Bill? I would not fit to hold a seat in this Assembly. I have to answer questions from my constituents and others in respect of anything passed in this House. It seems to me, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that because hon. mem-bers on the other side see us sit here and allow things to pass quietly, they think we have not done our homework; but I can tell them that it is done not only with the Parlia-mentary members but with other members of our Party, and

therefore when we see no necessity to criticise, we will not do so.

Some people believe, Sir, that because you carry the stamp of Conservatism, it is the same as the 1939 philosophy. That is not so. There are certain things which you must have in a community if you must progress and move forward, I have certain criticisms to make and the hon. member might not like them. Some people look at me and say I am the Chairman of the Conservative Party, and yet I make some very strong Socialist speeches. My position is that I have got to do what I think is right, and I have to sift out what is wrong and what is done by the Leaders of the people. For some reason the Government Party has become jittery because of meetings held quite recently. I have not become jittery, because I know when to come out, and I will come out at the right time. What I object to most strongly is persons making statements against me. If somebody told me that I learnt real estate on the Marine floor, I would simply tell them "Look where I am now" For that reason I know numerous doctors with whom I have worked side by side who learnt medicine by cleaning public conveniences aboard boats, but I reserve that for when it is more appropriate for me to use it.

With respect to this Bill, I will deal with the first part where the Premier said that under the Local Government Act the Bridgetown City Council is charged with calling on private tenantry owners to repair their roads. The Hon. Premier only chose to mention the Bridgetown City Council but all three councils are charged with this responsibility. However, everybody in this country can clearly see that for this particular reason I am claimed to be the villain of the piece. Before the hon. member read the report, he said that we did not call upon any one of them. As a matter of fact, he must have forgotten, did not read the report before or was out of the Island. His colleague can tell him that the man who put the suggestion to us when we called the first meeting of tenantry owners in this island was Mr. James Tudor, who suggested that it would be impractical for tenantry owners to do the roads at one time with the prices charged for rent, and that it should be stretched over a period of three years. I would like to say to the hon. member that the Housing Authority has not given him more than two or three tenancies in the Municipality. I do not pretend to know all, but there are several more. We called three different meetings, and when they said they could not do the roads, we threatened that we would do the roads and they would be charged for doing them and putting them in order, and if you go through it you will find that an officer was attached to this. I am not saying that they can do the roads like the Barber-Green, but we called upon them to do them.

The hon. member called a number of tenancies, but one of the worst and most shocking is that at Brandons where there are hundreds of houses, and we have called upon the owners to do the roads. 5.50 p.m.

Therefore, to say that we have sat down and done nothing is not so. As a matter of fact, we, the Central

Council, were the only Council which called upon the tenantry owners. I felt under the circumstances, the hon. member should not have made that statement unless he had all the facts at his finger tips. Of course, the hon. member was, I think, out of the island at the time.

Now let us deal with the Bill. Whether I am Conservative, or whatever I am, do you think that I have forgotten that but for the grace of God I would be renting a spot? The Hon. Premier should know that a Bill of this nature I would support. I would tell him where I have objected to certain things at a later stage. There are further amendments which must be made to it, but I will give them at the proper stage. I

repeat that by the grace of God I am in the position which I am in. If I were not, I would not have been able to send out my son to be a lawyer. However, this Bill has nothing to do with him or with his working for a firm of solicitors if they decided to appear in the courts of law in matters of this sort. That has nothing to do with this Bill. I think it is most unethical that you should have brought him into this.

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

I rise on a point of order. I did not hear the hon. member's comment. What I did see was the report which was in a newspaper published in this island. I read the report and the hon. member must have been very sensitive to say that someone connected with him appeared in court with respect to a matter of this sort. Whatever was the opinion of the Chief Justice on the facts which were represented to him, that is the feelings of the Chief Justice, I do not see why the hon. member should have got so sensitive about the matter. Everybody has read it already.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

The Hon. Premier may be a learned economist, but I am an experienced politician. The Hon. Premier knows as well as I do that a lot of statements which a lawyer put forward in a court of law are made out by the solicitors and I make no apology for saying that.

I am going to stick to what I said at the beginning: I am not going to make any reference to anything said out of this Chamber. I will only say that the Hon. Premier knows well enough that counsel can only take instructions from solicitors in matters of this sort.

I come to the most important point of this Bill. This thing cuts both ways. It gives a certain amount of security. The security which it gives is this. You can now rent a house without fear of removal. It is true what the Hon. Premier said about people buying up land and speculating with it. Let me say at once that I have never owned a tenantry; but if you choose to buy one and want to sell it, I will sell it for you. I am a politician and I know well enough that I should not own a tenantry.

Now, let us deal with a person who owns a tenantry in this country. Under the Landlord and Tenant Act, tenants are charged usually by the month or by the quarter for land rent. Very rarely are they charged by the week, except those tenants who occupy plantation tenancies. Another thing is that owners usually wait on tenants for two or three years for receipt of land rent, the reason for that being that their security for that is in the chattel house which the tenant owns. That has been my experience. Where there is no trouble, such people go on to pay, owing you all the time about three quarters' rent. They usually keep their receipts, and so on; therefore to give a person notice to quit, and the tenant owed for land rent - the practice has been not to distrain for your rent until the tenant moves the house. You follow, the house and you collect the rent then. You will say to the tenant, "You owe me so much for rent; pay me now or let me distrain on the house now."

This Bill says that you cannot move anybody at all except under the circumstances which are contained in it. I do not want people to go away with the idea that under no circumstances can this be done. There are circumstances under which you can move a person. If you carry a person to court, the Judge can make him move if he owes three months' rent, that is to say, if he is paying rent by the month or the judge can make him move if he owes thirteen weeks' rent, that is to say, if he is renting by the week,

We all have had the experience of a person renting a spot of land, let us say a spot of 2,300 square feet or 2,800 square feet, and putting an 18 x 10 house on it. Well, as soon as his daughter grows up and gets married, she puts a house in the yard. I know that from experience, not only as a real estate broker. Therefore, a tenant can be removed if he rents out part of that land. That comes under paragraph (a) of section V. Another premise on which landlord can eject a tenant is if the tenant creates a nuisance and a nuisance can be not only a noise to the detriment of other tenants but to the detriment of the owner. That can go as far as if the tenantry is in St. Michael and the owner lives in St. Philip.

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I wonder if the hon. senior member for the City of Bridgetown knows that the Attorney General received a letter from a firm of solicitors stating that the Government is going to be actioned because the Bridgetown City Council dumped refuse on somebody's land. 6.00 p.m.

This is what we call a nuisance to the detriment of the owner. We have not paid any damages to the people.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

We had your consent to dump the stuff there; therefore do not let the hon. member raise this question.. Do not let the hon. member tell me \"No\". It is not you personally as an Individual; we have your consent. We are not mad.

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

I do not want to let this debate digress on the rubbish question. I am satisfied with the operation. The hon. member has had our consent and we have not stopped him. I made a quotation to show how a nuisance can be started on somebody's land. A man may start a garage or something like that on the land, and the owner is the person who will be asked to pay the taxes.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Since the Ministry was reshuffled, I understood that the Minister of Social Services was in charge of Local Government, and in relation to any matter which we had relating to health, we instructed our officers to get in touch with the Minister. I can assure you that everything which should be done has been done. As to the price of land, I myself became worried for this reason Under the 1928 Amendment to the Act, a Bill was brought in here which was for the purpose of having valuers appointed for the purpose of the sale of land in tenancies. I could speak of a number of persons for whom appraisers had fixed the price of the land at too high a figure and the Government refused to approve of the licence granting the sale of the land. There is still an incentive to the Barbadian to own land because when he owns land he begins to improve on his property and so on.

The hon. member has referred to the terms which we gave people in Carrington's Village. We sold the land at six cents a foot and at eight cents a foot on easy terms and we gave the people possession of the land. When the agreement was made, these people could remain on the land as long as they paid the actual owners for it. I do not know why anybody should think that, at this late stage of my political career, I would come to the conclusion that I would do anything so as to hamper tenants. I wonder if the hon. member has given any consideration to the matter at this stage. When the 1928 Act came into being, you had appraisers and when the appraisers appraised land which was occupied by people and

they were not satisfied with the appraisal, they could send the matter back. I know that there is a firm of solicitors who threatened to mandamus the Government, and the Government still did not send down the licence. I want to say here and now that it is extravagant for anybody to ask the price of \$1.25 a foot for Field's Land. The trouble is this: here you have land for which a betterment charge could be collected by the Government, because at no time could this land at Fields Tenantry realise more than a certain amount. I believe in a betterment charge which does not

prevent the owners of land from making money. It is all right to say that the people do not have to remove from the land. I am sure that the hon. member knows what has happened with this restriction in France, and that is why the Government thought it fit to bring down a Rent Restriction Bill. Where you have land to be developed and you buy it, that is your business.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not know if the Government has given any thought or consideration to this matter. I have been told that more people try to own their own houses in Barbados than is the case in any other West Indian Island. You will see that Barbadians will go to England, and one of the first things they will want to do is to buy their own houses. So much is that the case, that some streets are called Barbadian Streets because, as I say, Barbadians like to own their own property. You have Holder's land, Alleyne's Land, - do you want me to start calling names, Sir? 6.10 p.m.

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

On a point of order, when I was dealing with the tenancies, I mentioned those which had been valued by the Housing Authority. I know Holders Tenantry and I know Alleyne's Tenantry, but a tenantry where poor people live is not necessarily a sub-standard tenantry, as this depends on the density of the houses, the condition of the houses and the lay-out. Holder's Tenantry is better than some of the roads in Belleville; so I do not consider that a sub-standard tenantry.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

If the hon. member takes tenancies like Alleyne's Tenantry in Bush Hall, he will find that they are laid out in 7,800 square feet lots as under the 1928 Act, but it is only a few years ago when the Housing Authority came in that tenancies were reduced to 1,800 square feet. I will take up the Premier when he stated that we like to have them small, because when the amendment was made we said it should be 2,000 square feet and not 1,800 square feet. The Minister then in charge did not accept the suggestion, but we felt that 1,800 square feet was not enough if you expected people to develop and improve their houses. I suggest therefore that under the circumstances, when you pass this Bill you are going into a vacuum, so to speak, because you are saying there can be no increased rents, and you cannot move people except for the reasons set out; but I am going to show that a lot of these reasons are going to be found such as thirteen weeks' rent owing, three months' rent owing, renting out another spot of land to a cousin, brother or uncle, and becoming a nuisance and so on.

I am not a member of the Government Party; but if I wanted to know something about fishing or fisheries, I would go without any prejudice or forcing my views and ask the Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries. Although you are attempting to assist their standard of living, I know that there are tenants who would like to improve by having a water-borne sewage system, especially when their children grow up and go to the United Kingdom, Canada or America. I know that some of the prices charged are extravagant, and when I heard of the prices charged in a place like Jones Land in Black Rock, I could not see how anybody could concede that these prices should be paid and remain there.

I do not, Mr. Deputy Speaker, under the circumstances propose to refer to anything which was said outside this House at all, and I think I said that when I started. Those tenancies which have been compulsorily acquired under the Land Acquisition Act will be protected. I can quite see that where the Government wants to buy land they should have a certain amount of protection. Let us just analyse this for a minute without the amendments which have now come in. I want (to show that the fracas which took place last week was just a veneer for the simple reason that I thought I was perfectly right in not discussing a Bill which I had not seen. Clause 7 stated that from and after the eighth day of June, 1965, the rent exigible by an owner or lessee in respect of any lot in a tenancy within a prescribed area shall be the rent at which it was let at that date. In other words, from the day the hon. member, the Hon. Acting Leader of the House introduced the Bill, it became law.

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

If the hon. member reads the Bill he will see that there was an omission; it became law as far as rent was concerned. With the amendments it becomes the law; so the Bill has been "beefed" up since the hon. member gave us an opportunity last week, and I must thank him.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

The hon. member has just given me credit for giving him an opportunity to read the Bill and bring in a Bill to help people. Had there not been this fracas last week and I had kept my tail between my legs and allowed the Bill to be passed, he would not have come with these amendments today, and the Bill would not have been worth the paper it was written on.

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

It would have been amended in the Senate, but it has given me an opportunity to "beef" it up on the floor of the House.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

It is not fair to this Honourable House for things to go to the Senate to be "beefed" up. We are the representatives of the people and you should give us an opportunity to "beef" them up here. As soon as there is any Bill which in character makes any change in structure, my Party meets on Monday nights to discuss it; the other Party meets on Monday nights also, and I see that you have become jittery since they have been holding meetings.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Is the hon. member addressing the Chair?

Mr. MOTTLEY:

I beg your pardon. They have headquarters in Roebuck Street.

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

The Bill does not apply to them.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

After reading the Bill, I saw words were omitted, and I telephoned the Clerk who told me that he had seen the omissions; so it has given you an opportunity to come with these amendments today. The one

thing I feel strongly about in this Bill is that it is going to prevent a certain amount of development. The hon. member may not want to take my suggestion, but the Government should go further because there will be a lot of people who will buy land at \$1.00 or \$1.50 per square foot within the rural and urban area which is absolutely extravagant, and Government should appoint their own panel of people, not outsiders, to consult and see what is the real and regular price of land. I am not speaking of what Da Costa's pay for land, or what a gasoline station or a supermarket pays; that is not the real value of land. I am thinking about the fellow who would buy a cottage and improve the standard of living by putting in a water-borne system of sewage. There is something in here that I think the Premier ought to give thought to, and it is that the people renting must get permission from the owners before the Waterworks can enter the land. While the members of my Party support the Bill, we would not want to stultify or prevent development, and you should make a note of my suggestion. 6.20 p.m.

Believe it or not, you have this Bill here. Nobody knows what is happening. If, however, you bring a further amendment which will give the right for this person to buy but the price must be approved by the Government, they are going to fix the price but you can say that you do not approve of it. I cannot agree that that is right.

A lot of people anticipated that I would have made a tremendous row about this. I shall have the courage and the tenacity as I had before and there is still something left in me to reply to anybody. People thought that I would have come in here and say; \"Oh! this worthless Government] Oh! this low down Government.\" However, I am a man above board.

There was a day when I had a lot of people come to see me at my office about this matter. I rang up the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works. At that time I did not know my son was appearing in the case. But what is that to

do with the matter? When I got on to the Minister, I said to him, \"Here it is; I have a lot of people standing here, giving me a story; what are you going to do about it?\" I never suggested the price of land. I do not know what Mr. Lashley from the Housing Board had said, but I gathered that a number of those people said to me that they were offered an opportunity to buy the land, but the price was too dear. Whenever counsel goes into Court instructed by his solicitors, they brief him and tell him, \"These are the facts.\" Do you think my son could be so ill-advised to go to the Chief Justice to say something to him? Despite the fact that he is the youngest person at the Bar, I do not think he would be so stupid as to follow anybody at the Bar in slandering or saying things about people in the precincts of the court.

Sir, while I support this Bill, I think that the Hon. Premier should take it into consideration seriously. The Hon. Premier is an economist and I am a real estate broker. I know that there are people living on lands who would like to buy them. I think the Hon. Premier said spots.

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of explanation. I will just like to explain whether it is land or spots. I said \"spots\" because there were little pieces of land,

Mr. MOTTLEY:

You have a number of people living on spots who would like to acquire those spots. When you own a spot of land it gives you an amount of security and prevents you from paying more for land rent. I was

saying that we found there were people who had land rented out and who refused to raise the rent. There are still a number of people like that.

The Hon. Premier referred to the fact that it is Government's intention to go through these tenancies and provide tenantry roads. I Would like to say this because the Hon. Premier know snot the day, but the day may come, when some other Government may get into power. I think it is fair that the owners of the land should make some contribution to the Government.

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

I did say so.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

I do not think it is fair that the Government should do that without the owners making some contribution. When the Government repaired those tenantry roads, it will send up the value of the land by over 25 percent. I feel when you do that - repair the roads, install water, and so on - that land should come under the Development Charges Act and, therefore, the owners should make a contribution.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have much pleasure in supporting the Bill. I am fully conscious that there are a number of people who would like to be able to buy a house spot. The) want the security. If the Hon. Premier thought that I was going to make a speech criticising the Bill, he missed the boat; he does not seem to understand me as a politician. I walk and talk with the rich, but I Have never lost the common touch. The Hon. Premier thought that I had lost the common touch, but I will never lose it. My duty is to persuade whom I am among that these things have to be done for the better-ment of Barbados. If they want to be comfortable, these things must come into being. Not only must these people have a share, but a real share. I have much pleasure in supporting the Bill.

Mr. COWARD:

I think it is my right to make a con-tribution. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think I would be lacking in my duty as a representative of the people if I sat here and allowed this debate to finish without making my contribution on behalf of the people of St. Joseph and on behalf of the community as a whole and also to compliment the Government for bringing down a Bill of this sort to the House. 6.30 p.m.

The question is whether or not there should be the control of tenancies in this island in this 20th century, and the answer to such a question could only be \"Yes\". As far as I can remember, Mr. Deputy Speaker, consideration was given to the position of tenants by the Government some years ago for the first time when the Carrington's Village land was for sale. Consideration was given by the Government in relation to the fixing of the price of the land and the size of the spots. It is known that the majority of people who live in these tenancies are those of the helpless and defenceless class. Some of these landlords are very harsh and, on the other hand, some of them are fairly good. But, Sir, as far as can be ascertained in this island more so than ever before, there are people who have a craze for land: and these landlords who have tenancies, although they have absolutely no desire to sell the tenancies, they are continually being persecuted and worried by those people who have that land craze; and eventually the land owners could not resist the temptation when they see the amount of money which is offered to them for the land. The poor people are then faced with a very deplorable situation after the land has been sold from under their houses.

These people who have bought the land collect rent for it for a short time, and, after that, they will offer the land for sale at an exorbitant price. That is the state of affairs which cause us to ask the Government to come to the assistance of some of these people who are living in these tenancies. I know of people who have lived in these tenancies for 50 odd years. During that time, the tenancies were owned by various people and each succeeding landlord increased the amount of the rent. Not only was the rent increased, but the landlord introduced new prices and as soon as the tenants said anything, they were threatened to remove their houses from off the land. That being the case, I support the Government one hundred percent on this issue today. Not only would I like to see the price which the tenants are charged for rent controlled, but also the price of land of the size of 1,600 square feet and under that size, so that if some of these tenants want to purchase spots they will be able to do so.

I agree strongly with the Hon. Minister when he states that the Government will be looking after the repair of the roads. That is another burning question. In the places in which some of these poor people live, you can only get to them by using certain tracks. If any of these people were to fall ill during the night, I am sure, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that it would be very difficult for a doctor to get to them; they will have to die. I feel, Sir, that it is the duty of any Socialist Government to come to the rescue of the poor people of this island. These people are in the majority, and it is the majority of people who always support a Socialist Government for the purpose of enacting Socialist measures.

As you know, Sir, I am very short in making my contribution because I do not believe in going all around a matter but in coming straight to the point. Therefore, on behalf of the people of St. Joseph and the Island as a whole, I Strongly support this Bill.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

I saw the hon. senior member for St. Andrew long before I saw the hon. junior member for St. George, and I also heard his voice.

Mr. CORBIN:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this Bill which we have before us today is one of a great nature. It is one of the greatest measures which has come before us for the good of this island for a long time because its object is for the protection of the people. This Bill seeks to control and stabilise all transactions by way of subdivision, rent or sale of any land consisting of more than five lots and regarded as a tenancy and it also seeks to control and stabilise the ejection of any tenant from such a tenancy. If it had not been for this Bill, quite a section of poor people living in this island today, especially in the parish of

St. Michael, would be living in fear. I remember that some years ago as fast as I could go into certain areas, people would ask me to speak to the Minister for them. When I asked them what was the matter, they would tell me that they have to leave the tenancies. They would tell me: "We hear that the tenancy is for sale; nobody has told us anything, but we have been given notices that we have to leave." Mr. Deputy Speaker, when I got my copy of this Bill, I received it with Joy because I know it will relieve the plight of many of these people who are living in this island.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, during this very week a man told me this: "I have been to Mr. Mahon and asked him to sell me some land, and he told me 'if you want to buy the land you have to go and see a man in Bridgetown'". 6.40 p.m.

When the man asked how he was selling the land, he was told that if the person to whom he was sent said it was \$100, \$2,000 or one cent, it would be that. That shows you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that these land hogs and estate agents are only oppressing the poor. They take the land from the owners at a certain price and go around and get double on it. Today the cries of these poor people have reached Almighty God, and I am glad to see that God has put it into the Premier's mind to bring a Bill of this nature to this House to control and stabilise the tenancies. Imagine, Mr. Deputy Speaker, 300 people on one person's land receiving notices to quit! Some of these poor people cannot eat their food properly, nor can they have a staid mind when they receive the notices. The rents in these tenancies are absolutely in need of control. Tonight when the people in St. Michael, Christ Church and around the whole island hear about the passing of this Bill, I believe that the praise which will go up to the Most High God for this Government will bring them a crown forever. I see, Sir, that any Order which was before the court on 8th June or after will be stayed. The real estate agents can talk as much as they like, but I know that this is going to bring them on their heels. Those who have already made their money are fortunate, as I am sure they cannot make it now.

I have to leave now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, but I am in agreement with this Bill and will support it 100 per cent because it protects the poor. Let the people lift their eyes to the fields and see the mighty work that this Government has done and is doing. Who can be against us if God is for us? When Jesus was on the earth, he was criticised for his good work; so what do you think of the poor man? They want things, but you must give them without taxation. I am certain, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that estates have been sold out in various parts of St. Andrew and St. Joseph, and not even a three-foot road has been left for these poor people, and today they have to come back and ask Government to send a bulldozer to cut roads, and it is costing the Government thousands of dollars to make roads for these poor people who were anxious to get these house spots. I continually have to appeal to Government to help these poor people to get out their canes. According to the Act, any person who is sub-dividing a quantity of land has to cut roads and put in water; but those real estate agents have not left an inch of space between the lots and are now providing the lawyers and solicitors with plenty of work, because there was no proper layout. This Bill will control and stabilise tenancies for the benefit of the poor inhabitants of this island. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I cannot stay any longer, but I support this Bill 100 per cent.

Mr. MILLER:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it was nice listening to my friend, the hon. senior member for St. Andrew. I should like to say that I agree with this Bill. My Party is in agreement with it; It is the law of the country, and is really nothing new. I would like to spend some time in dealing with it, and I hope that you would bear with me. The Bill starts with 17 clauses, and the first four mention the Town and Country Planning Department. Subsection (2) of Section 4 refers to the Town and Country Planning Interim Control Act, 1959 which was before the last election and when the last Government was in power. I do not think that any member on the Opposition benches will object to this statement, but all the new-fangled ideas of this

Tenancies Control Act boil down to the fact that if you rent a spot of land and you are in arrears for three months, with all this bamboozling talk, the landlord can put you off, and no one would move a house on a spot of land with a tenancy for less than three months, and most will not do it unless they had a tenancy for six months or a year. If you are renting on a weekly tenancy, you can be removed if you owe thirteen weeks, but there is no plantation manager, owner or bookkeeper that would give notice to a tenant on a plantation for thirteen weeks. You can take my neck off tonight if that is true. There is no

man in possession of a chattel house that would move it on to anybody's tented land unless he paid for it by the quarter, and after three months the landlord can eject the house, and what is more he can go to the court and state of the magistrate's satisfaction that he is unable to find a spot of land to put the house on and the magistrate can give him another three months, and he can go a second time and get a further two weeks, and yet this Bill says that if you owe three months' rent, the landlord can eject you. 6.50 p.m.

A landlord can create any nuisance. If he has found a pig in your backyard, that can be a nuisance. It is not the case today. As I have said, if the tenant has a pig in a sty and it is discovered by the landlord, he can call it a nuisance. Sir, all of this is Just bamboozling; this is what you look for on a platform.

Sir, I want you to listen to me. I want the reporters to chronicle what I say because this is a phase in the country's history which needs to be repaired. Circumstances have led up to this mistake. This is going to be a brake on the fellow. Sir, you know that we have a land hungry community. The Hon. Premier came to Barbados and started to practise at the Bar, and because he could clear his election expenses, he bought a house. That is what everybody in Barbados is constantly thinking about. It is this pride of possession. This Bill is a cruel thing; this is bound to have its ugly reactions. Here is a man saving for his children and struggling for the betterment of himself and family and he seizes the opportunity to provide a home with the possession of land.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member but he is trying to mislead the House through false interpretations of the law. Amendments to this Bill have been circulated. Clause V of the Bill which becomes now Clause IV states-

"No order of ejectment shall be made on the application of the owner or lessee or of any agent of the owner or lessee of a tenantry or of any part thereof within a prescribed area against any tenant in such a tenantry unless it is proved to the satisfaction of a court of summary jurisdiction under the provisions of any law affecting the relationship of landlord and tenant that -

(a) any part of the rent payable in respect of the tenancy is in arrear, in the case of a monthly tenancy for a period of three months or more, or where the tenancy is a weekly tenancy for a period of thirteen weeks or more."

This Clause is dealing with arrears of rent. In other words, before rent becomes in arrears, it must first be due.

Mr. MILLER:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, is that a point of order?

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I am trying to explain. It says if any part of the rent is in arrears. I am suggesting that before rent can be in arrears, it must first be due. Before rent becomes in arrears it must first of all have accrued and become payable.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Your point of order has been made.

Mr. MILLER:

I think it is quite clear. What has the hon. member explained? He has said nothing new except that you can call this the same old bamboozle. I said if you owed for three months. Nobody would rent land today unless it is the understanding that you pay by the quarter or even half-yearly. The Hon. Minister is a half-baked solicitor; so you must forgive him.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

I would not at all entertain any member bringing personalities into this debate. I rule that remark by the hon. junior member for St. George to be out of order.

Mr. MILLER:

Well, Sir, I withdraw it. The Hon. Minister said \"if he is in arrears.\"

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. A tenant must be in arrears for three months. There must be first of all, arrears of rent, and the second thing is that it must be pending for three months.

Mr. MILLER:

These things are exhausting. You should not deal with them twice. The whole island knows that this is only tomfoolery. This is only election politics; this is just like single-member constituencies. The hon. senior member for St. Lucy does not want it.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

How has the hon. member got single-member constituencies in this debate?

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

According to the rule, it is now 7.00 p.m. and this sitting stands suspended until 7.45 p.m.

The sitting was accordingly suspended.

On Re-assembling

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

On the suspension of the sitting, the hon. junior member for St. George was speaking on the second reading of a Bill to provide for the control of tenancies.

Mr. MILLER:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I was pointing out that much as we wanted to agree with anything which was brought down here for the good of the country, there is absolutely nothing in this Bill. I have attempted on a number of occasions to prove that it is not a question of the uncouth or ruthless landlord; it is a question as to whether or not we are bringing about a brake on the growth and the development of the community. This Bill seems to make land easily available to the people who want to buy it, but it must

bring about a brake on the community because we are land lovers. I have no ambition to be a landlord. I think I am correct in saying that this Bill applies to every living soul in this island. There is the idea of this Bill and the importance which the Government members are trying to attach to it. We all remember what took place on the last occasion when they called two meetings hoping to explain why they had to walk out of the House. This Bill has been ill-conceived so much so that in less than seven days it was thought fit to amend it. They have increased the number of Clauses from 12 to 13 and that is how you react when you do not think. This is not outside the scope of the Bill and these are the things which we have to consider.

It is now almost four years that the Government has been in office, and one of the prominent Ministers was saying on the platform that he was not in agreement with single member constituencies. The hon. member will not want to hear me say this. By pressure one Tuesday the hon. member came in here hastily and the Resolution was through the eddoes. The Hon. Premier is not present now; he does not want to be here tonight. As I was saying, Sir, this Bill means exactly nothing. The exact reason of all of this is simple because it is manifest what is taking place. The first five Clauses of the Bill deal with the Town and Country Planning Department, which is in relation to the Control Act of 1959. That is before the last Election. You can look at Clause 4 and then the other Sections of the Bill seek to set out how a landlord can put off a tenant.

In Section 5 of the Bill reference is made to the effect that no order of ejectment shall be made on the application of the owner of a tenantry within a prescribed area against any tenant unless it is proved to the satisfaction of a Court of summary jurisdiction under the provisions of the law affecting the relationship of landlord and tenant, that any part of the rent payable in respect of the tenantry is in arrears and, in the case of a monthly tenantry, for a period of three months or more. The period could not be less than one of three months. What I am saying is set out in Clause 5 (a). These are the things which we learn in a democracy. If you are a weekly tenant, then it is a question of thirteen weeks, which is a period of three months. These are things which we have to expect and take in a good spirit. There is no escape; in the still night there is the dismay of some trapped animal which is seeking for a way of escape. You have the hot meals, you have free secondary education, but there is nothing in this Bill at all. This is the type of thing which must react but not like a boomerang where you would have a chance to catch it again; it will not react in that way. I know what is taking place; there are those of us who will be able to hold on to our constituents, and we will spread this thing all over the island.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I know that you feel these things and I know that you take these things seriously. I know that you feel deeply about this. We want people to be able to keep their souls and bodies together: but here is this ill-considered, bamboozling election plank where a tenantry Bill has been introduced in this House and before it could be debated you have to bring in a whole foolscap page of amendments. Tell me, Sir, if this is something which has not been ill conceived. With all of this ragged trousers argument which we have been hearing in here, the Hon. Premier will not be able to withstand what we have here. It is like the school meals service/and next week you will come with mauby. With all of this talk about the East Coast Road you have finished it off at Cattlewash. 7.55 p.m.

I want to say to you now that I have in my possession, before my Grand Old Scout died, about six and a quarter acres of land. I have four sons and two daughters, and I requested the surveyor to divide it into six equal shares for my six children, and he was told by the Town Planning Lord Pope to go slowly. This has been in my possession, paid for by my father's earnings and savings, and now in the year 1965 the

land surveyor was told to go slowly. What are we coming to? Is this a strong feeling that only a small section of the community can own land? Are we to explain and exploit this from the platform that people who ordinarily buy house spots and enjoy a measure of peace and security are now going to be denied this, because land should be denied all people other than the working class people of this country? Those are things you have to explain. I understand the fear with a small country like ours where fragmentation can take place in agricultural areas, but this does not apply to marginal lands that people use for planting and homes.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, history reveals something that would be most difficult. Say what you like about the philosophy and attitude of the Conservatives who were responsible for this country, they made available to all of us some form of education, elementary and otherwise. We may hate to admit this, but it is true. They may have rented the rocky and poorest land to those of us who could produce the middle class and send them for education to the Universities and bring them back here, but sitting in this Parliament tonight are able-bodied workers who have struggled with the fork and hoe with the satisfaction that they would be able to deny themselves and send their children overseas. Are we being told tonight in subtle language that those who form the bulwark of our middle-class, those who came from the peasantry who had no shoes - and this is not so long ago - will in a few years discover that land that was once intended for us will no longer be made available, because we have people who really do not understand and come in here to bamboozle a lot of innocent souls that you are going to kill the landlord when he can jerk you off?

When we left the Ministry there were 17 housing schemes. Where did these people come from? We did not import any families. Look at the Bay Land and the Pine

Where do you think the folk came from? We had to embark on slum clearance in the Suttle Street and Wellington Street areas, but so great was the influx of people for better homes, and even those who had chattel houses wanted to improve and wanted to go to Government lands, that we set about the tenancies, and not one house was ejected from the land and sold for fire wood or destroyed. All the people were absorbed, given new houses or rented ones, and they form the population of the housing schemes all over the Island. Not one tenancy was sold during our period for which the people were not given houses to be paid for in twenty or more years. You will remember the calamity that took place at Delamere Land. All those people were willing to be removed. Not only the houses, but the furniture, mattresses, lamps like while fire went into the Pine and the Bay Land but some of those people moved back. Could you say that they were denied an opportunity in the housing schemes with decent roads? He comes in here tonight to fool us that they will send the Barber-Green machine through the tenancies. The width of the Barber-Green will cause congestion; so we know you are lying.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order, to say that the Barber-Green cannot go into the tenancies is not true. The Barber-Green has already done many roads in many tenancies, but not private tenancies as such.

Mr. MILLER:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am not replying to the point of order. He, like me, heard the Premier say that in doing the main roads the Barber-Green will go into the tenancies and come back out. He knows that the Barber-Green is 7 feet 6 inches; how many of the housing schemes can it go through with the little goat

tracks? If you are going to take the Barber-Green in an area where there is no drainage, no gutters, no electricity or telephone, you would do better to move the houses to a better area like the Pine where there is communication, shops and proper roads. The people were told that six months after you came into power they would be given tenancies on plantation lands, but four years after, that has not been done. They are no nearer the road, they are without communications, and cannot get a doctor to come in the areas in this year of our Lord. The Hon. Minister of Agriculture with whom I have worked knows that what I am saying is true. But you must think the people are fools. You fooled them at the last election. The six or eight Labour Party meetings in St. Michael have run you into panic and fear, and in one hour you passed the Single Member Constituencies Resolution with some of the Ministers saying \"not me\" I 8.05 p.m.

This is where we want to save innocent people. We have this big bamboozle. The hon. member does not want to give us a chance because he knows that we are going to answer. There is nothing in this. You are only turning this into a pantomime.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, look at this Bill! Before a debate takes place on it you have increased the clauses from 12 to 13 in seven days. You are bamboozling the people and putting a brake on development. I am telling you that. How can any person now buy something for their family? You know what our people have suffered and you also know that all through the last century what they have been struggling against. It is true to say that before time you used to put him in some trash and bury him on land which was not a cemetery.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The Hon. member is not really speaking on the Bill with which we are dealing. He is giving the impression that in future people would not be able to buy land. The object of Clause 5 is to make the Bill applicable to the whole island and not to vest the power in the hands of the Cabinet.

Mr. MILLER:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, if the hon. member can read it, all of us in here can read it. As I have said, this Bill is helpless. Within eight days, already you have had to make 12 amendments. That is the point which I was

making. I was saying that it was ill-considered. It was fomented in a moment of panic and you can hear the shrill voice of the magpie who is now a trapped animal. All that you are doing now is putting a brake on social development.

This is shocking and the people of the country should be told these things; the innocent people of this country should be told that these things are not in their interest. Read Clause 5. This is ignoring the Courts of Justice. This is where Parliament is robbing the courts of their elementary rights. This is what we are coming to. That shows you when you are in trouble what you will do, and that you are not aware of what is taking place. You say in Clause 6:-

\"Notwithstanding anything to the contrary contained in any other Act a Court asked to make an order of ejectment

may -

(a) adjourn the application from time to time;

(b)

(c) stay or suspend execution of the order, or postpone the date of possession for such times as it thinks fit;

(d)

(c) from time to time grant further stays and suspensions of execution and further postponements of the date of possession and on such conditions, if any, as the court thinks fit;

(d) if such conditions are complied with and the order has been made, discharge or rescind the order."

My daughter is getting married and you can stay or suspend execution of the order or postpone the date of possession until such time as the Magistrate thinks fit. Then from time to time a Magistrate can grant further stays and suspension of execution. What is the good of justice? Imagine that he must stay proceedings! Imagine a Magistrate must rescind an order! This can cause trouble in the country. We have no animosity, but we must tell you the truth. Where have you ever seen Parliament in this modern age ever attempting to direct a judge? This is something that the people of this country should be told. Because you have run mad and become stricken with fear over something which you expected four years ago, you are doing all this. Now that you have lost all modicum of respect and fear has stricken you, you feel you can do anything. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I can see that this has touched you. You now see the harm which this can bring. 8.15 p.m.

We were not here because we blundered. It was not that we could not prove to the people that we were capable of doing more for the country than other people who would abstract something and take possession. That is the only reason why we are here tonight. Now we are being asked to pass this Bill. May God help us; the time will come when I will remind you gentlemen that "I told you so. There is the lack of spine which would be found in the Labour Party where one would tell the skipper: "I do not agree with you". But here you will twiddle your thumb and hold on to something because you know that you will get some of the berries off the tree. You cannot stand the glare of time. Goodnight, Sir.

Mr. SEALEY:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this Bill seeks to take care of the poor and underprivileged people in this island who have been suffering for many years under the hands of unscrupulous landlords. I feel that a Bill of this magnitude needs no more objection to it. What I object to is that certain amendments should be placed in this Bill so that a man who is living on a spot of land and who is able to buy it should be allowed to buy it at a reasonable price.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

On a point of order. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I hate to interrupt the hon. member, but I should just like to say that there is nothing to prevent anybody from purchasing a plot of land if he has the money with which to purchase it.

Mr. SEALEY:

I am not criticising this Bill,(ASIDES).

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

I am hearing more than one voice across the House and I cannot stand it.

Mr. SEALEY:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I share the sufferings of these people who have to be thrown off lands and those who are being asked to pay unreasonable prices for land. As many as 36 houses have to be removed from Thomas Gap and where are you going to place these people? There are those people who have been living there some forty or fifty years ago and where are you going to carry these people? Let us take Villa Road. That is one of the rundown districts and a certain gentleman is asking for \$1.20 per square foot for the land. I am saying, Sir, that this Bill should be supported. I say, furthermore, that a Bill of this magnitude should have been here many years ago so as to take care of these poor people. You have a case where the owner of land died some time ago and now somebody is going to sell it. The place used to be a quarry at one time, it has been refilled and the owner is asking a price of \$1.20 per square foot for it. The place which is no bigger than this horseshoe, is costing \$1,600 and where is this poor person going to get the money from? There are people who have been living in St. Michael for many years; they have been asked to remove and where are you going to send them? In Richmond, over 187 houses are to be removed; where are you going to put these people? People have been brought before the Chief Justice and they have been fined \$26.00 and they have to remove their houses. Where are you going to place them? At morning, noon and night my yard is filled with people who come to me with tears in connection with this matter. I agree that the land should be 'freezed'. I know what it has cost the Government to remove those houses from Halls Road.

There are houses which will remain on their spots for years and years, but if you were to touch them, God help you. This question of the price of land in Barbados for tenants is becoming a racket. They are allowing people to come from outside and buy all the land, and if you are not careful, the people who have been born in Barbados will have nowhere to go. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I support this Bill with the amendment that where anybody is living on a spot of land and he is able to purchase it, he should be given the opportunity to do so. Otherwise, I say that there is no moral objection to this Bill. It should have been passed many years ago and so prevent people from suffering. (Cheers). 8.25 p.m.

Mr. SMITH:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this is a Bill that only a wholesale idiot would oppose in principle. Now, Sir, before I get down to the Bill itself, you will allow me to clear this point as it was said last Tuesday in this House that all the members of this House had received their, Bills. For the benefit of this House I am saying that is not true, because I received my Bill -in fact, I found it on re-turn to my office on Tuesday evening, and the post Office date stamp was 15th June, 10a.m.; so when the Hon. Pre-mier was accusing members of this House of receiving the Bill, it was still in the post, and I do not feel it is fair to me as a member of this House for a responsible person such as the Premier to make the people of this Country believe that we are dishonest by saying we had not received the Bill. I am saying that it is dishonest to say so, because it was not true. Even if the Opposition did not want this House.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

I have no doubt that the Reporter is finding difficulty in hearing, because I am hearing voices on both sides. Let the hon. member proceed.

Mr. SMITH:

Sir, we are all responsible members in this community.

MOMENT OF INTERRUPTION

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

It is now 8.30 p.m., the mo-moment of interruption. Is this matter controversial?

There being no answer, let the hon. member proceed.

Mr. SMITH:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, as I was saying, we have a Leader of this House and a Premier who is not in his seat; I do not like to say anything behind a man's back, but he always does these things - talks whatever comes to his mouth and then clears out, and I will always say that that is the act of a coward. Look out now! A lackey is up!

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the hon. mem-ber should be asked to withdraw the last remark "Look out now! A lackey is up"! I do not think it is parliamentary and I leave it entirely to you.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Did the hon. member refer to the Minister of Education?

Mr. SMITH:

Saying what, Sir? What did I say? Let the Minister tell me what is a lackey and if it is offensive, I will withdraw, or if the cap fits him and he draws the string, I will withdraw it.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Let me remind the hon. mem-ber that as we know in Barbados, "lackey" connotes something derogatory. You have to take it from the Chair.

Mr. SMITH:

Sir, if the Chair takes it that way, I will withdraw.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Let the hon. member pro-ceed. That matter is closed.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Now, Mr. Deputy, I rise on a point of order, having cleared that point. Now the hon. member said a few moments ago in complaining about the alleged action of the Hon. premier that he introduces these

things, talks all over his face and then leaves the House, and I am quoting him now \"that, I take it, is the attitude of a coward.\" Here again we have a Standing Order which says that no member in speaking particularly in reference to other hon. members should impute improper motives. I draw that now to your attention, because I am convinced that to say of an hon. member that he does or does not do something and that is the action of a coward is imputing improper motives.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

It is a matter of opinion. While it might not be a very fortunate remark, I cannot see that it actually imputes improper motives. It is purely a matter of interpreting it different ways.

Mr. BOXILL:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order...

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

No point of order can arise from that. There is no point of order, because that matter is closed and the hon. member has not yet started to speak again. The member would have to rise on some thing else.

Mr. BOXILL:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of privilege. What I want to draw to this House's attention is that members have a policy in here of using derogatory remarks to other hon. members, and when they are called upon to withdraw these remarks, instead of withdrawing the remarks in a proper way, they have a habit of saying that if the person objects they will withdraw. That is not the rightway. It might happen to other people and they might get away with it, but if anybody says anything about me and I object to it, it will have to be withdrawn in a proper way.

Mr. SMITH:

We will not mind him. Simple Simon met a pie-man. I was making a point when I was reminded about imputing improper motives and things of that sort. When an hon. member gets up on the floor of this House.....

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order, you have ruled me out of order in making my pro-test, and I do not see how you can allow the hon. member to continue the debate.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Just let me say this. The hon. member made certain remarks in which he referred to what the Hon. Premier said or did. The Hon. Minister of Education got up and expressed the feeling that it was out of order and I have ruled that I could not interpret it as

imputing improper motives; therefore that particular issue is closed. Let the hon. member proceed with the Bill before the House.

Mr. SMITH:

Sir, when an hon. member gets up on the floor of this House and accuses other hon. members of not

telling the truth, what can I attach to that? 8.35 p.m.

As I have said, Sir, this Bill is one which is seeking the protection of tenants. The tenants need protection. That is true. It is very hard that you call on tenants to move after they have been living on house spots for the last thirty, forty or fifty years. There are some of them who have put in electricity and water and who have built their home, putting in lathe and plaster wall on some of these spots, thinking that they would be there all the time. You would have thought that they owned the spot by the way they had put up their homes, and then suddenly you saw that they had to leave it. Who would say that is a right thing? Nobody. I know it would be said by some that I am more than an idiot, that I am a member of the Barbados Labour Party and why I did not see fit to say this or to say that, when my party was in power.

Now, Sir, the last Government did not forget to bring in something to protect the tenants in a small way. They had begun to insert the thin edge of the wedge because there was a time - I daresay before you were born or even before I was born -that they had people living on tenancies or house spots and if they passed and forgot to speak to the superintendent or the watchman, the watchman would only have to go to the manager and make a complaint. He would tell the manager that John is getting great and he would not speak to me this morning. Soon after that, John will receive a notice that he has to quit in seven days. Imagine in those days notice to quit would only be served for seven days!

Well, Sir, the last Government thought it fit that that legislation should be amended and we now have legislation that owners would have to serve their tenants with no less than a six months notice to quit before that tenant can be evicted, and for agricultural purposes that notice would have to be for one year. That is because if you were a worker at a plantation and you did not care to go out to work for the six days but you went out for only two days but another good worker made it suit him to go out for the six days and you had a piece of land which you had rented from the plantation with a good crop on it, the manager, in order to spite you, could give you four weeks to give up that land and then send and have your crop appraised and you will have to leave it. That was the purpose for making that law to that effect. We said that you must be served with a 12 months notice so that however they served you notice, you would have a chance to reap your canes. No one could then say that those persons were forgotten.

It is our duty to see to it that these people are protected. Particularly when you are developing your country and going forward every morning, you can see something to attract you and cause you to amend the laws and to legislate for the protection of the people. That is the duty of the Government for not trying to do something in this matter, although it may not have done all. This Government through its promises to the people telling them that they were going to do in three years has put forward this Bill for the protection of tenants and I am sure it is in the D.L.P.'S manifesto. If these tenants were penalised so fast and so rapid that practically all the land owners are chasing them out of the island rather than let them have the spots, why then has this Government taken so long to bring about this Bill?

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I just want to get the record straight. The Hon. member said that the last Government did something as regards tenancies. The Security of Tenure Act was passed in 1965. I had the privilege to deal with that Bill. The last Government did nothing as regards the protection of tenancies. According to that Act the period for notice to

quit is six months and not one year. Then if you were renting agricultural land, the tenancy would not expire before the 31st May in order to enable the tenant to reap his crop.

Mr. SMITH:

Believe me, Sir, the hon. member is only wasting valuable time to say that. He is playing that he does not want me to get away with anything. He believes that he is bright, but if he is bright I would be brighter. Both of us know the ropes; we are two torn cats.

Now, as I was saying, Sir, a Bill of this sort was one of the plans in that Party's platform, and if they had carried out their promises, they would have gone out of office in three years; therefore, up to now, they have not got through with all that they had promised; therefore you can see that things are not as bad as they want some people to believe.

Now, first things first. They made the promise that they were going to buy over all the tenancies, and if I am not mistaken, I think Hothersal Tenantry in the parish of St. John was mentioned at a meeting which they held in St. John. As I have said, I am not against the principle of the Bill; I am for it, because I am one of those who would die for the poor people of this country. No man, no Minister, can ever make me or cause me to forget the promise which I made to my electors, as some of them have done.
8.45 p.m.

I believe, as I have already said, that it is either the wash or the paint on the walls of the Ministerial buildings and in the offices of the Ministers which causes them to change their minds as soon as they sit in these offices. They were all in favour of the poor; they would die for the poor; but as soon as they become Ministers they forget all about the poor. When the Labour Party gets back into power, I will ask them to change the paint on the walls up there. How on earth could you have so many applications - and the Housing Authority can only deal with two of them, speaking under correction?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order. The Housing Authority can handle one thousand, not two.

Mr. SMITH:

I said, Sir, that I was speaking under correction and I thank the Hon. Minister. This is the first time that he has been able to correct me. The Housing Authority could not handle all of these applications, and this Bill was brought in only on the 8th of this month in order to complete what was promised three years ago, that they would buy these tenancies. I do not think that they have bought one tenancy, as far as I can remember.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

On a point of order. Mr. Deputy Speaker, the question of the acquisition of plantation tenancies is a lengthy process. The matter has been started and it is almost completed. It is only a question of collecting information. In the interim, we have come forward with this Bill which takes care of the tenants islandwide, including the plantation tenancies. The thing is not done by the touch of a pen; the whole thing is a long process and things cannot be done overnight.

Mr. SMITH:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Hon. Minister now realises that these things cannot be done overnight. The

Minister says that it is a long process especially with re-gard to the plantation tenantries. They tried to railroad this Bill last Tuesday even before we received a copy of it. Now they have brought in amendments only this morning for the purpose of including the tenantries in the country; so that if they had succeeded in passing this Bill last Tuesday, the\ ' tenantries in the country would have been forgotten. If they had remembered the plantation tenantries, those tenantries would have been included in this Bill and they would not have had to bring in any amendments this morning. Therefore I say that they ought to be more than glad that this Bill was not dealt with last Tuesday. As a matter of fact, they walked out; they were not glad for it.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

On a point of order. Clause 3 of this Bill has been deleted so as to have the Bill to apply to the whole island. Clause 3 says this-

\ "The Cabinet may by Order prescribe any area in the Island as an area to which the provisions of this Act shall apply.\ "

If you want the provisions of this Act to apply to Belleplaine tenantry, BankHall tenantry or any other tenan-try, you have an order for that. You delete Clause 3 and make the provisions of the Act apply to the whole island automatically.

Mr. SMITH:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, if they had done their home work, they would not have to do this. What do we find? Before a Bill is passed it has to be amended. That shows that they were not ready for it. Do you know what makes me believe that they are now trying to hurry up with this Bill? The reason, is that this is a vote-catching Bill. They now want to attract the attention of the Electorate in St. Michael. They so much wanted to do that that they forgot the Electorate in the country areas. Do you know why they forgot the Electorate in the country areas? It is that soon with single member constituencies coming about, the parish of St. Michael will be the dumping ground for the D.L.P. members in the country.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

I do not think that the hon. member should use the word \ "dumping ground\ "; let him use a better work.

Mr. SMITH:

Well it will be the cooped off bedroom then. Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER The battle ground.

Mr. SMITH:

Sir, I do not think it will be a battle ground; it will be the matter of a racehorse and a donkey; and when it comes to the hon. senior member for the City, that will be a matter for him and the Premier. However, they cannot stop the senior member for St. Michael in St. Mic-hael. Imagine that this is a Bill which had to become law from the time it was laid on the Table of this House! Even if the Opposition were against this Bill, it would be foolish to talk on it because it is the law already. We cannot do anything about it because it would be the law already. They are only now trying to flog a dead horse and they are telling lies at that. Here it is, it was said that the hon. senior member for the City tore up the Bill

and threw it on the floor of this House. I was in here at the time and I did not see anything like that. 8.55 p.m.

It was said that the only person who did not receive his Bill on Monday afternoon or night is the one who did not sleep at home. It was also said by the Hon. premier that they did not have the money to buy the tenantries, and they are passing this Bill now as a hush-hush thing until they raise the money. The Premier said so, but the Minister of Agriculture has now said that it is a long process before they can get to it. Who am I to believe?

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order, as far as my recollection goes, the Hon. Premier said that for the Government to buy all the tenantries for which notices to quit have been given, would have entailed about \$14 million. He did not refer to the plantation tenantries, because that is a separate and distinct matter which is being dealt with expeditiously. We have to get a lot of information from the Department of Inland Revenue and it is not so easy to get a matter like that dealt with expeditiously. What he did say was that these landlords were going about and issuing ejectments and trying to force the Government's hand.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

It is probably short of 9 o'clock by one or two minutes, and according to Standing Order No. 62, if it is the general assent of the House that the debate should continue on this Bill, the Standing Orders would have to be suspended.

Mr. SMITH:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, you were in here at 12 o'clock today. Do you not think it is time that we should go home in as much as the Premier has said that we should go home? The Bill is law already; so nobody can do anything about it now. Nobody can be turned off now; so it is left to you. I am in favour of adjourning the House.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

There is one dissenting voice; therefore I must term it as not being the general assent of the House.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

It now being 9 o'clock p.m., this House now stands adjourned until Tuesday, 29th June, 1965, at 12 o'clock noon. 9.00 p.m.