

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1959

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 30th June, 1959.

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

PRESENT

His Honour Mr. K. N. R. HUSBANDS (*Speaker*); Mr. J. E. T. BRANCKER, (*Leader of the Opposition*); Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, C.B.E., M.D., C.M., (*Premier*); Hon. R. G. MAPP, (*Minister of Communications, Works and Housing*); Hon. F. E. MILLER, (*Minister of Social Services*); Mrs. E. E. BOURNE; Hon. D. D. GARNER, (*Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries*); Mr. H. A. DOWDING, M.B.E.; Mr. C. B. SEARLES; Hon. L. ST. A. THORNE, (*Minister of Education*) and Mr. G. E. S. STRAUGHN.

Prayers were read.

Messrs. CORBIN and TUDOR entered the House and took their seats.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that the Minutes of the Meetings held on the 16th and 23rd June, 1959, respectively, have been printed and circulated amongst hon. members. Unless there be any objection, those Minutes will be taken as read and confirmed. (AFTER A PAUSE). There being no objection, those Minutes are taken as read and confirmed.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 16) Order, 1959.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to lay a Statement from the Barbados General Agricultural Society regarding the appropriation of the Legislative Grant for the year 1958.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Government Notices were given as follows:—

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: A Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 16) Order, 1959."

Hon. L. St. A. THORNE: Resolution to place the sum of \$4,000 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1959-60

No. 9 which forms the Schedule to this Resolution. Mr. Speaker, I am giving notice of my intention to ask for leave to deal with this Resolution in all its stages today.

QUESTIONS

Mr. G. E. S. STRAUGHN: To enquire of the Minister of Education:—

Is the Minister aware that the post of Headmistress of the Alexandra School has not yet been filled?

2. Does the Minister know for what reason a Headmistress of this school has not yet been appointed?

3. Is the Minister aware that the post of Headmistress of this school has been re-advertised for?

4. Does the Minister know how many applicants replied to the first advertisement?

5. Can the Minister state the qualifications of these applicants who replied to the first advertisement?

6. Is the Minister aware that all but one of these applicants were eliminated as not being capable of being appointed by the authority?

7. Will the Minister state if any local applicant possessed suitable qualifications for this post?

8. Will the Minister state the policy of Government *vis-a-vis* the appointment of local and qualified personnel to positions of responsibility in the public service of the island?

LEAVE TO PROCEED WITH RESOLUTION

Hon. L. St. A. THORNE: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to proceed with the Resolution for \$4,000 of which notice has just been given, in all its stages today.

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

12.25 p.m.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, in view of that, I am asking leave that Committee of Supply be the first Order of the Day.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. member is asking leave that Committee of Supply be the first Order of the Day and unless there be any objection, leave will be granted.

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

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. 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,

while in Committee, to deal with the Resolution for \$4,000 of which notice has just been given.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I beg to second that.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE, 1959-60 No. 9

Hon. L. St. A. THORNE: Mr. Chairman, in moving the passing of this Resolution for \$4,000, the sum of money which will be used for supplying furniture for the purposes of running our external examinations, I should like to observe that hon. members will remember that the Department of Education is responsible for many overseas examinations including the London Chamber of Commerce, the London General Certificate of Education and the London Degree Examination. Quite a number of students, Mr. Chairman, take these examinations yearly; and it has been the custom to hold the examinations at the St. Leonards' Girls' School and, whenever necessary, at other schools.

The position at the moment is that the St. Leonards' Girls' School can no longer be secured. There is very much overcrowding there; and it is also absolutely impossible for the Department of Education to get the necessary items of furniture from other schools. We have approached the Army people, and they have decided to allow us to have the use of one of the Army huts at the Garrison for the purpose of holding the examinations; but we are confronted with the difficulty of not having the necessary furniture which could be taken there.

The Ministry of Education has decided that it would be the best thing for us to have a sort of furniture pool which could be used on these occasions for examination purposes.

We have discovered that we would need to have 200 desks and seats. These desks and seats can be supplied at the cost of \$20 per desk and seat; so the cost of 200 desks and seats will amount to the sum of \$4,000 which the House is being asked to pass.

I therefore have very much pleasure in moving that this Resolution for \$4,000 do now pass.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: I beg to second that.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, it should need very little debate to commend the passing of this Resolution to the House. We scarcely get before us matters so clear in their nature and so urgent that can be dealt with without much ado. Everybody would sympathise I think with the plight of the Education authorities in this island who have to superintend the holding of overseas examinations for secondary schools. I myself have had some first hand experience of the seating arrangements and general comfort of children who have to sit these examinations. I can say that they leave much to be desired. Therefore, the request of Government to provide furniture for greater accommodation is one which would be well taken, not only in this Committee, but by the authorities responsible for these examinations at large.

• However, one point emerges from a consideration of this matter, and it is this: first of all the Minister should be in a position to tell us what will happen to this fairly large number of desks and seats when they are not in use for examination purposes. I understand the Addendum to say that the schools from which furniture had previously been borrowed can ill afford to lend their furniture at these critical times for examination purposes. I take it therefore that these schools themselves would be glad to have some of it for use throughout the year or in the normal seasons. I suppose the Minister can give an assurance on that point: that the furniture will not just be stacked away for use once a year.

The second point is this; and this does not concern the Minister alone but perhaps all the Government Departments. I notice that from time to time in the course of a year we appear to spend considerable sums of money on furniture repairs, equipment repairs and purchase of furniture and equipment for several Government Departments. I have never had it satisfactorily explained to me whether in each case we import this furniture, or what proportion of it is constructed locally. I should like, of course, to make a plea in this instance for local artisans and the local trade generally; to entreat Government wherever possible to have whatever furniture is needed for Government Departments made here, and only the smallest possible amount imported if that is not being done. I suspect that quite a lot of it is being made here, but it is a plea which is not out of tune or out of date, particularly in this instance where the desks and chairs may most likely be made out of local wood, and there is an opportunity for local craftsmen to have a little pick.

Those are the only two points that I should like the Minister to clear up; but, so far as the general tenor of the Resolution is concerned, it has our support.
12.35 p.m.

Mr. STRAUGHN: Mr. Chairman, one of my questions is precisely the same as that of the hon. senior member for St. Lucy. What will happen to the furniture when examinations are not going on? Another question which stems from that is this: I wonder if these desks and chairs are enough for public examinations or whether you will have to be borrowing from schools again.

Another point is that these examinations will be held at the Garrison Quarters which, I presume, is the same place where Combermere School was housed previously. Certainly, it would be a good thing to bear in mind the lighting situation as exists there. I know that it is not too good; therefore, not only should you have desks and chairs, but you might find that you will be needing additional renovations to lighting and so on so as to make those quarters suffice for examination purposes.

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Chairman, I would like strongly to support the hon. senior member for St. Lucy in his plea that these desks be made locally. I feel probably the Hon. Minister can tell us today that there are being made locally. I think it is a very good point, and we must remember that charity begins at home. I do hope that these desks have not, or will not, be ordered from overseas. I believe that today in our Prison, local industry has been started which, I think, is something which should be congratulated and assisted. I would like to hear from the Hon. Minister that it is his intention to have these desks and chairs supplied by local labour.

Secondly, Sir, I am led to understand that only those persons who have been passed by the Headmasters of Government-aided schools are allowed to take these examinations free of charge. If I am wrong, I would like the Hon. Minister to correct me. I do not think that when the taxpayers money is being expended, only one particular group should get the benefit. I admit that there may be the necessity for a fee of some sort to stop what I would call the exploitation of examinations.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. senior member for St. George is straying away from the subject of the Resolution and dealing with the policy of examinations. I have just passed the hint so that you will not go into details on that point.

Mr. DOWDING: This, Sir, is a money Resolution of \$4,000 for the purpose of supplying desks for the holding of public examinations. I cannot see how I am straying from the subject in any way when I am dealing directly with fees, taxes and public money expended on the holding of public examinations. I hope, Sir, that you will allow me to continue to finish my point. I do not intend to go into detail; I am only raising this point in order that the Hon. Minister in charge may make a statement as to whether or not he feels that money should be expended for a pur-

pose such as this, and that certain individuals should be charged a fee while others are not.

I do not feel that this House should grant any money for this purpose if we are going to find, as I am led to understand, that certain persons have got to pay fees and others are not if they are going to use these desks.

I would like to summarise the points I have made. I strongly support the point raised by the hon. senior member for St. Lucy. I would like to feel that this is an occasion on which the Hon. Minister should be able to tell us how they are going to use these desks, and if these desks are going to benefit all students or otherwise as far as the finances of their parents are concerned.

Hon. L. ST.A. THORNE: Mr. Chairman, in replying to the queries which have been made by the various hon. members, I should like to begin with the question as regards the payment of fees by students sitting examinations. I am wondering whether the hon. senior member for St. George is referring to fees paid by students from the public-aided schools, or whether he is including students from private schools. In the case of students from the Government-aided schools, the Government pays all those fees. In the case of students who come from the private schools, the Government does not pay any part of those fees.

I will go further and say that I think the hon. senior member for St. George will be willing to admit that, before Government can undertake the responsibility of paying the fees of those students who come from private schools to sit these private examinations the Headmasters of those schools or such people would have to satisfy the Government that those students entered for the examinations have reached the standard of literary attainment which can justify their taking such an examination with any possible chance of success. We know that there are schools which, from the point of view of advertisement, would contrive to send children to take examinations even although they know in their heart of hearts that those children have not reached examination standard.

From my point of view, I would say that the point raised by the hon. member is one which has been occupying my mind for some time. I have merely decided on a course of action which may be taken to set such things right. I will not say what are the regulations which I intend to make, but as soon as those regulations are made possible from my quarter, hon. members will hear of them.

As to the use of this furniture, I would just like to say to the hon. junior member for St. Lucy that I am positively sure that he appreciates the old saying "one good turn is deserving of another". We have been using the furniture which exists at some of these schools for these public examinations; therefore, when we get this pool, we are prepared to put it at the disposal of such schools which stand in need of it, and to have it used by the students of those schools. We certainly do not intend to stack it up and allow it to lie dormant when it can be used for assisting where shortages occur.
12.45 p.m.

Both hon. members enquired as to whether this furniture will be manufactured locally. The answer to that question is "Yes"; it will be manufactured locally.

Mr. GODDARD: I thank the Minister very much for the answers which he has given, but I would like to assure him of what would be the correct procedure; it is that the private school children should pay the initial fee and in those subjects in which they have passed, it should be refunded by Government.

By all means, let them see that the fees are paid initially in the private schools; but if the pupil has satisfied the examiners and has qualified, then those fees should be refunded. I think that that is what the private schools are after. It would still not be as full as what

is given the Government-Aided Secondary Schools because, whether the pupils pass or not, the Government pays the fees. That is the screening test.

MR. CORBIN: With regard to the furniture for the various departments I think it would be necessary to pass this Resolution so as to meet the needs both of private schools and of those children who benefit from the elementary training. Both of them should have the same facilities; and furniture is needed in every department.

I think that those children who have been trained in the private schools and who have passed the examination should have the same facilities as others; therefore, the fees should be refunded, as the hon. member who has just sat down has said. The private schools are really relieving the Government; they have to put themselves to great sacrifice and take upon themselves the expense of opening the schools for the education of these children.

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

Hon. L. ST. A. THORNE: I beg to move, Mr. Chairman, that you do now report the passing of one Resolution in Committee of Supply.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: I beg to second that.

The question was put and agreed to.

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

On motions of Hon. L. ST.A. THORNE, seconded by Hon. F. E. MILLER in each case, the Resolution was read a first and second time and agreed to.

GOVERNMENT SCHOLARSHIPS AND EXHIBITIONS BILL

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day is to resume Committee on the Bill to consolidate and amend the law for making provision for Government Scholarships and Exhibitions and other purposes connected therewith.

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House resumed Committee on the Bill, Mr. BRYAN being in the Chair.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: On the last occasion when the Committee reported progress, the hon. senior member for St. Lucy was speaking on Clause 6 of this Bill.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I am afraid that now we have got back to this matter, we shall not be in a position to see eye to eye so quickly with the Minister of Education as we saw with him when the matter was recently discussed and approved of in this Committee. When the House was adjourned last week, when we were in Committee, we had reached the stage where I was discussing Clause 6 Subclause (2) of this Bill which was, and still is before the Committee. This Sub-Clause reads as follows:-

"It shall be lawful for the Governor-in-Executive Committee in prescribing the value of Barbados Scholarships to prescribe different values according to whether or not the course of study which the holder of the Scholarship wishes to pursue is offered at the University College of the West Indies and whether or not the holder of the Scholarship is able to gain admission to the University College of The West Indies to pursue such course of study where it is so offered."

Stripped of its verbiage, what this Sub-section means is this: Young Mr. "X" or young Miss "Y", both being

Scholarship winners, it rests, if they went by merit alone, with the Governor-in-Executive Committee of this island to direct them, in the first instance, towards the University College of the West Indies; and if Mr. "X's" or Miss "Y's" parents or teachers or the parents and teachers combined do not advise them to study at the University College of the West Indies and they tell the Executive Committee so, the Executive Committee reserves the right to cut down the yearly value of the scholarships. Instead of giving £600 which they might give to somebody of whom they approve, they may give £450 or £500 or £520. They have given themselves the power to be the final arbiters in this matter.

Let me emphasise that this is not a Clause which, as it were, gives a student a fifty-fifty chance of choosing his or her University and getting the value of the Scholarship; the Government says this: "If we feel that you should go to the University College of the West Indies and you do not go there, then we reserve to ourselves the right to reduce or cut down the value of the Scholarships". If that is not dictatorship of the worst sort, I do not know what it is. This is an unwarranted and wicked intrusion upon the choices and preferences of private persons which no Government ought to have the power to make.
12.55 p.m.

The Scholarships are won by boys and girls of our secondary schools in open competition. The examinations are not held behind closed doors; and so careful are we that each pupil should have his fair chance of winning or even of not winning one, we make sure that the examination papers are set by overseas authorities and corrected by overseas authorities. Therefore, when somebody wins a Scholarship the whole community rejoices and takes the result as it has come from overseas without wondering whether such and such a person deserves it or not. We regard the standard set by the overseas examiners, as well as the scrupulous fairness with which they do their work, to be the final arbiter as to who has or who has not won a Scholarship.

Secondly, Mr. Chairman, the parents of the Scholarship winners and the persons who have been teaching them in the schools here are amongst the most competent persons to assist the Scholarship holders in choosing their Universities. It should not rest with the Government or the Executive Committee, except in the technical sense of giving advice, to choose; that choice should rest first with the pupil and then jointly with his teachers and his parents according to the course he wishes to study. The financial arrangements, which in addition to the Scholarship money his parents can make, his preferences of atmosphere and such like, are the things which he, his parents and teachers should settle between themselves or any other interested persons; but, to put in the law of the land that a group of persons who themselves did not set the examination papers, and in most cases not the parents or guardians of the Scholarship winners - this group of uninterested persons - should have the privilege of saying "you shall go to this University because we say so and no other" is something which I think should be resisted.

I should like to say this to the Minister of Education. In addition, this sub-section gives the Government power which no Government ought to have. I would say that it gives the Government a sort of power which no Government ought to want to have. What object can be gained and what is to be achieved by being able to direct the course of people's lives and perhaps blight their careers in ways of which we cannot think? The choice of the place of study may make the difference between a good career and a not so good one in the case of a student; and no Government has the right to exercise its veto on preferences of its citizens so long as these preferences, especially the preferences of study, are exercised within the law of the land.

When a young man or young woman wins a Barbados Scholarship, the community rewards that effort of merit by providing certain funds to be put at the disposal of that

student. So long as the course of study is one which can be approved by the Education Authorities at a recognised University in the British Commonwealth, or even outside of it, so long as the teaching standard and the reputation of the University are widely recognised, so long as those two conditions are met, no Executive Committee, no Government or no group of administrators have any right whatever to tamper with that choice. It is even more wicked and reprehensible, Mr. Chairman, to use the power of veto in a manner which affects and hurts the student's career most.

You say that you are giving yourselves the power to alter the value of scholarships. What does altering the value of a scholarship mean? It means that, whereas the law of the land says you can have up to £600 for a certain number of years, a group of persons who did not have anything to do with winning the scholarship decides for reasons known to themselves, because they have given themselves the power, that they will arbitrarily alter the amounts given to a particular student. As long, Mr. Chairman, as you give yourselves power to do that, you cannot help discriminating against persons you do not like.

As it is, there has been a lot of dissatisfaction over the last ten years among the parents of Barbados Scholars; there has been a lot of discrimination and a lot of spiteful, vindictive handling of the affairs of scholars. Any perusal of the Scholarships given since 1949 will show that in one year alone - this is a glorious exception - that Barbados Scholars of 1950 have had no trouble whatever from this Government. Barbados Scholars of 1948, 1949, 1952, 1953, 1956 and 1957 have all in their various ways had to complain about unfair treatment by this Government; but those in 1949-50 had no trouble whatever.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it is not in the public's interest that the Government of any country should have power to direct the lives of young people in so material an aspect. The community rewards merit by saying that if you win a scholarship and the overseas examiners say you are entitled to University education on performance, they will match what the examiners have done by providing the funds. The only legitimate province of the Government is to see that a report is given to it on progress and work of the students; to see to it that the University chosen by the students is one whose standards are recognised the world over; and to see to it that the money is forthcoming out of the Treasury to be put at the disposal of the students as and when they want it to the limit which the Legislature has set on the whole grant.

If the Executive Committee of this island wants more power than that, it cannot use it legitimately. The moment you are arrogating to yourselves the authority to say to a parent "we say: send your child to the U.C.W.I. though you want to send it to Canada, and if you send it to Canada we are going to cut down the money," that is what altering the value means. The Minister cannot get away from it. Any Minister of Education should be the last person, knowing the subject he has to deal with, to want to inhibit, prevent or restrain the educational opportunities of any persons under his care.

In 1953-54 this question of allowances to Barbados Scholars reached its high-water mark. The parents of about five Scholars had to undergo a period of strain for about four months running down the then Barbados Government - some of whose members then are members of this Government and all of whom then as now belonged to the same Government Party - to get the allowances increased; and certain allowances which had been given to some Barbados Scholars were withheld from others. They had to make a row about it all because too much power was given by the Legislature to the Government of this island in the administration of these Scholarships.

This is a matter which nobody in this island, in his right senses, whether he is a parent of a Barbados Scholar, a brother of one or else, should let slide. You never know when you are going to come up against it. And as a matter of principle, there should be a limit to the powers which

all Governments have, whether it is a Government of a Party one favours or members of a Party which one does not favour; and any Government which justifies the retention of this particular power on the grounds that it is good for them to have it, does not mean well to the educational system of this island.

1.05 p.m.

There is another aspect of the matter, Mr. Chairman. In choosing a University, a student or his teachers or his parents do not always choose a University for reasons of finance or convenience or anything like that. You choose it sometimes for sentimental reasons or for reasons of association of one sort or the other. A man who has not the opportunity in his own life of going to a particular University to which he may have loved to go, may have that same feeling if his child were to win a scholarship to go to a University. He may say that if I had the opportunity I would have gone to McGill University in Canada, or to Oxford University in England, or to Melbourne University; and now my child has won a scholarship I would like him to fulfil the desires which I have. Do you mean to tell me that a Government which is not connected with the child in any way should step in and say: "You must satisfy our legitimate desire"?

"We say that it is our desire that you should go here; and if you cannot go here you cannot go there because we are going to cut down the money". Sir, you can only justify such a stand on grounds of high-power seeking.

The progress of our educational system and the progress of our students cannot depend on the retention of this Clause. If Government only said that they would allow the student to go where he likes so long as it does not cost us more than £600 a year all the requirements of the case are met, we might be more sympathetic; but for the Government to say that 'we hold the purse strings and we can give you up to £600 a year to go where we want you to go else you would only get \$480', that is nothing else but power seeking. That is the acquisition of power for its own sake. This community should not allow a Government, however much it may approve a Government on other grounds, to have power on that ground.

Sir, I feel this is a matter for which parents of Barbados Scholars and prospective Barbados Scholars and all head-teachers and all teachers in all schools of whatever nature they may be, must rise and make united protest against this most atrocious attempt on the liberty of the subject.

Mr. Chairman, I feel very strongly on this matter; and so strongly, that, before I sit down, I am bound to move that this whole sub-section be deleted. I now formally move that sub-section 2 of Section 6 be deleted entirely.

I move it, Mr. Chairman, in the interest not only of the educational system of this island, not only in the interest of Barbados Scholars, present, past or for the future, but because I think the time has come when a strong protest has got to be made publicly on the part of the Government inserting into legislation powers at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee which no Government should want to emphasize and to exercise. This is only the last of a long line of admitted and even successful occasions to supersede the people's liberties.

We are reaching the stage where the Governor-in-Executive Committee is to be the arbiter of everybody's destiny in this island, and no freedom of manoeuvre left for the citizens of the community to order their lives as they think fit. The right of private judgment is being taken away by legislation like this; and anybody who cares for the privilege of people, for directing their lives and their children, so long as they do it in a democratic way, must resist this. That is why I move that subclause 2 of Section 6 be deleted entirely.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, in seconding this motion, I would say that, whereas one can readily understand to some extent Government's earnest desire in attempting to induce as many Barbados Scholars as possible to attend the University College of the West Indies, although a young University, yet Government should not arrogate to itself this power of telling Barbados Scholars that they have to go to the University College of the West Indies, if not they would receive less money.

I will go a little further than my colleague has gone by stating that, just as in the past when the Barbados Scholarship was of a stipulated sum, you should do the same thing now. In other words, in years gone by, the Barbados Scholarship was of the stipulated sum of £1,000; it was £750 at first; and it was not left to the discretion of the Government to say that if you went to a particular University you would get a certain sum; that is to say; if you belong to the Government Party or you find favour in the eyes of the Government Party, you get a particular sum and if you do not, you are offered a sum less than that. As it is now, you can get a sum of £1,500 or £3,600. That is to say, if you find favour in the eyes of the Government Party, you can attend a University for six years and even longer than that although six years is the stipulated time. Because of that, it is possible for a lot of differentiation to be made in respect of Barbados Scholars.

One's course of training may be for three years whereas, in the case of another Scholar who may find favour in the eyes of the Government or may be reading for medicine or engineering, you will find that in such a case that scholar will be granted £600 each year; and he may have to spend six years during that course of training; therefore, that would mean that he would get the maximum of £3,600.

Sir, I am suggesting that it is a bad thing for the Governor-in-Executive Committee to be vested with this power. It is bad in the Government's own respect. It should be free to parents and guardians of the Scholarship winners to decide as to the course of study they want their child to take; and if he wants further advice, he can ask competent people who have been to Universities apart from what the Director of Education and people in the Education Department who know something of education can advise him. The final word should rest with the parent and the scholar, and not with the Government. 1.15 p.m.

The object of this Clause is to give the Governor-in-Executive Committee power to prescribe the value of the Barbados Scholarships. The question is whether the Government has the power to prescribe these values, or if they are now getting that power. The Government has not yet got that power to prescribe these values; they are now only making it lawful for them to do so. The Clause says:-

"It shall be lawful for the Governor-in-Executive Committee in prescribing the value of the Barbados Scholarships to prescribe different values according to whether or not the course of study which the holder of the scholarship wishes to pursue....."

Let us examine this Clause. It says that it shall be lawful for the Governor-in-Executive Committee to prescribe the value of the Barbados Scholarships and, in prescribing the value of the Scholarships, to prescribe the different values. I am saying that the average Barbados Scholar be at liberty, not only to go to the University College of the West Indies, but to go to any University of his choice in the British Commonwealth. The University College of the West Indies is a new and young College; it has not really got all the finishing touches. I do not want to say anything against the University College of the West Indies, but it has not got the cultural background, the tradition and the long years of experience which a University in Canada or the United Kingdom would have. It is wrong in principle to compel a scholar to go to the U.C.W.I.

If this Clause is passed, the Governor-in-Executive Committee will compel the people who win Scholarships to go to the U.C.W.I., which may not be their choice; the scholars will be at the mercy of the Government. It will be better for everybody to be given £3,000 to be spent to the best of his or her ability. Let the Government dole out the money yearly. Let there be equality in the value of the Scholarships. If a Scholarship is worth £3,000, each scholar *pari passu* has won it, and he is entitled to it. The Government will then administer so many hundred pounds a year; and, if the scholar has spent £2,000 and £1,000 is left, that should be his right with which to commence life. There should not be any differentiation between the value of Scholarships.

Let us leave the matter as it was in the past for generations all down the line; the Barbados Scholarship was worth £450 and it increased proportionately according to the living conditions in England. You had a stipulated value for the Scholarship; but, today, with a Labour Government in power, with its lust for power and with its thirst for power, it is possible for the Government to exercise its discretion in whatever way its whims and fancies may direct it to do so.

I am not saying that this Government alone will act in that way; probably other Governments in future will act in that way; but it is a wicked thing for any Government at all or for any politician who has lust for power, to have that sort of power. I regard this as a wicked piece of legislation; merely to vest and arrogate power in the hands of the Governor-in-Executive Committee or the Cabinet as it is now, so that one who can satisfy the whims and fancies of the Executive Committee or the Cabinet will be granted full rights and privileges and full valuation; they will prescribe what value they think fit to the Scholarship. The Cabinet will have the opportunity of prescribing what valuation is for Mr. "X" and what valuation is for Mr. "Y" who is a poor fellow, who may not be known to them and who will be given less than Mr. "X", and so on down the line.

This is certainly not a move in the right direction. Imagine the use of the word "wishes" in this Clause! It says:— "to prescribe different values according to whether or not the course of study which the holder of the Scholarship wishes to pursue is offered at the University College of the West Indies....."

In this way you are not giving the Scholarship winner the opportunity of saying or electing what he wants. I, too, regard this proposal as an unwarranted interference in the domestic matter which affects the scholar and his parents and his tutors directly and not so much the Government.
1.25 p.m.

If the Government were to say that after qualifying - provided Government can place you - you must serve the first three or five years in Barbados to be of use to the taxpayers and the ones who contributed money whereby you could avail yourself of the higher and further studies at Universities in order to secure a profession of whatever nature it might be, that would be reasonable; you would get something in return. But to suggest something along these lines is wrong.

I think, Sir, that I have made most of the points which I set out to make. I will again stress that this Clause will bamboozle, fool and, in some cases, take advantage of poor backward parents who do not understand what their rights are or do not know anything at all about Universities. This Clause will be interpreted in a manner whereby they will be told they must either send their child to the U.C.W.I. and get £400 or £500 for them, and the scholarship would be for three years; and if they don't agree you cannot help them. That is the object of this Clause, Mr. Chairman, and whoever does not see it that way is just as wicked as the ones who were responsible for the drafting and the bringing into being of a Bill with such wicked intent.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman,.....

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: If the hon. member would sit down

Mr. MOTTLEY: You mean "give way"; I am always willing to give way.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, I thought at this stage that I would shed a little light on this question of the value of the scholarships. That is all I intend to speak about. The Minister is quite capable of taking care of the rest of it.

A lot of accusations have been made against Government of trying to rob people and twisting the value of the Scholarships. I think I happen to know a little about it. I do not remember the year in the 1950s when efforts were made to increase the value of the Scholarships. The Government of that day tried to get information, naturally, before they could accede to these requests. We got advice from several sources, but mainly from organisations in England. There was some liaison organisation between West Indian students and the Colonial Office, and we more or less took their advice. The cost of living, cost of boarding and cost of books varied from University to University. At London University, which I think was the highest, it was recommended by this organisation that the scholarship fees should be £600 a year. But there were some Universities where it was cheaper: £400, £450 or £500. At London University, and one or two others like Oxford and Cambridge, the fees were something like £600; that is how the scholarships came to be varied.

We are not picking out Tom, Dick and Harry and saying, "I like you, I will give you £600; but I do not like John so I will only give him £400." As I said, it was based on the cost of living and on the cost of education at each University at which Barbados Scholars were placed. Because the amount varied from University to University, and in order to make a worthwhile contribution by way of an increase, the Government decided on the different scales that were put up to them.

It is quite unfair to be making these charges and accusations of dishonesty by the Government. If hon. members had only asked why it was done, they would have got the information without making those unnecessary speeches. I am sure that the Minister is capable of taking care of the rest of it.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I have not accused the Government of any dishonesty; and I do not intend to do so. As a matter of fact, unlike Government members, I always accept people as honest until I find them contrary. That is very much more than I can say for the Government members.

I have listened carefully to what the Hon. Premier had to say. I only wish I could believe that many of the persons who had to do with the Barbados Scholarships - I do not mean the awarding of the Barbados Scholarships, but the giving of allowances - would create the impression to the Scholarship holders which the Hon. and Learned Premier has created for us, and which will be conveyed to the general public.

I should like to challenge the Premier and his Ministers to say if it is not a fact that there has been great dissatisfaction among the general run of Barbados Scholars within the last nine years in this country. I would like them to answer that question.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Dissatisfaction on what point?

Mr. MOTTLEY: Dissatisfaction about the following: (1) trying to shift or direct Barbados Scholars to certain Universities when they could be accepted at others. Mind

you, I am not accusing the Premier of anything; I understand there is a Committee which has to do with it. (2) of refusing to grant certain Scholars more than a certain amount of money when other Scholars are granted that money, even though cases are made out that the cost of living is just the same.

There is absolutely no word when it comes to the question of fees. I have imported, for my own benefit, a book on scholarships which I could never get from the Director of Education. I had to get the advice from the West Indian University, so I know whereof I speak. On the question of fees at Universities, with the exception of Canadian Universities, the fees are similar throughout the Universities in the United Kingdom; but there are certain Colleges which are more expensive to live at. I have that information in my possession, and would offer to lend the hon. member. Mr. H. W. Springer advised me if I wanted information, to get it, because his copy was on his desk at the University.

1.35 p.m.

I have received letters from England from a number of Barbados Scholars who did not possibly know me, no more than knowing my name. I have taken up the matter in the right quarter. Let me tell you that right in your service you have people who are dissatisfied. They are saying that they are dissatisfied because their allowance for their boys is only £400 per annum, while another boy's allowance is £600 per annum. Let me state again that I am not accusing the Hon. Premier because, as a matter of fact, he has never had a son who has had a Government Scholarship.

Who decides that a boy wins a scholarship? The Government does not know who is going to win a scholarship; the boys who win scholarships are decided on by examiners in England. It is the boys' abilities which have caused them to win scholarships. The Legislature decides that, for winning the prize, or the Blue Riband of education in this island, so much is what we are going to spend on you. I agree with the Government; I do not believe in giving any boy too much money so that he can go wild all over the Continent. Even if it was my son who won a Barbados Scholarship, I do not believe that, because he is my son, and because I have some influence, I should channel him to get a certain course of training at a particular University overseas and, because my servant's son wins a Scholarship, that I should channel him to go to the U. C.W.I. That is dishonest.

I must let this Hon. House know that I have experience in this matter; I have experience of several boys who have won Barbados Scholarships. I am now addressing my remarks to the Hon. Minister of Education who has not been in that position for very long. Barbados Scholarships are awarded to three or four boys annually; and, naturally, there is the difficulty of differentiation as to the question of the boy who is going to do medicine which is the most expensive, as against the boy or boys who are going to do law or to read for a teaching degree.

It is a fact that, when a boy chooses a teaching profession, attempts are made by persons responsible in the Government to tell him that he should not read for that. There should be no interference. There can be no guidance to tell the boy what line he should pursue. I therefore say that a boy should not be bullied into taking a course in a direction which you may choose.

On the other hand, Mr. Chairman, I am a very strong supporter of the U.C.W.I.; I think the Hon. Premier knows that. However, there are still those boys who would prefer to go to a Canadian or English University as against going to the U.C.W.I.; and, if that is so, why should you not allow them to do so? So long as a boy gains entrance and so long as you are not prepared to give him more than the amount you have provided, he should be able to go to McGill, Toronto, the U.C.W.I. or any University to which he has gained admittance. It is no business of yours, after a boy has won a scholarship, to tell him to which University he should go. You should not tell him

that if he cannot go to the U.C.W.I. he cannot go to McGill. Your business is this: you should tell him that he will be allowed to go to any University and to take the profession of his choice so long as he does not expect anything more than the £600 which you are providing for him. That is all that I am contending.

On the other hand, there is the grave dissatisfaction of boys from here who win the Barbados Scholarship. Let me say now that I doubt, if the Hon. Premier had this measure in his hand, that he would have agreed to it. I also know that this has nothing to do with the present Minister of Education because he was not Minister when this thing happened. Sometime ago, the son of an ex-Air Force man wrote me a letter. He was a brilliant young man by the name of Mr. Waldron whose father sacrificed his life in the Royal Air Force during World War II. He as a Barbados Scholar, was doing medicine in England and so brilliant was he, he won prize after prize. Let me say that he was only getting £400 a year while I know of another who was getting £600. These things are dishonest; it is what I call perpetual Negro snobbery.

The Professor says to him: "I think you have done so well that I suggest you take a degree in Anatomy." That is a rare thing. The youngster wrote down here to the Government, or to those responsible for education, and told them about it. In the meantime, before he got an answer six months had passed and the Professor told him to go ahead and take out the degree in Anatomy. With three months to go, he got a letter from this Government telling him that the Government could not give any consideration to that at all. Bear in mind, he was not one of those who was getting the full £600 per annum; another boy was getting that. When he got that letter, he did not know what to do. This is what he said: "I do not know what I can do with only eighteen months to go. I am at a loss. My Professor said that surely my Government or Education Authorities would pay for what I was doing." He wrote to me. I took that letter to Mr. Hammond who told me that surely those responsible do not realise what this means to the West Indies. The Professor had told him that he would be of great use to the West Indies University. I took some steps in the matter and I got some Old Boys to subscribe the amount of money.

As I have said, I believe the Hon. Premier knew nothing about this; may be, this is the first time he has heard anything about it. Some steps were taken to get Old Harrisonians to subscribe the amount of money which was needed. That goes to show you there is grave dissatisfaction among Barbados Scholars at present.

1.45 p.m.

I do not agree with Sub-section 2 of this Section. You must let it appear that you are doing justice. When somebody is awarded a Scholarship, we provide the money. We agree that a Scholarship is awarded purely on merit. Now this Sub-clause 2 says this:

"It shall be lawful for the Governor-in-Executive Committee in prescribing the value of Barbados Scholarships to prescribe different values"

I would say that if my greatest enemy or the son of my greatest enemy won a Scholarship, the taxpayers would say: "You have won this Scholarship and therefore the value of it is so much". That is what I would want for my child. I do not understand this question of "prescribing different values according to whether or not the course of studies which the holder of the Scholarship wishes to pursue is offered at the U.C.W.I. and whether or not the holder of the Scholarship is able to gain admission to the University College of The West Indies to pursue such course of study where it is so offered."

If I am wrong, please correct me. A boy may say to you, "I want to get into McGill; I prefer to broaden my experience not only from books but in a broader field". We cannot confine ourselves to the West Indies; nobody is discrediting the standard of the U.C.W.I., in fact, I am told that it is far higher than some of the standards in the U.K. or Canada; and I have accepted it.

The very fact of being in a big country is an experience; mixing with various people is an experience. I do not think that anybody should interfere with a boy who makes a choice of going to a big University. I would really like the Hon. Minister to tell me what they mean by prescribing these different values. All along we said that the value of a Barbados Scholarship should not exceed £600 a year and, let me repeat; I held letters in my possession.

You have people in the Civil Service whose parents went about borrowing money and the Committee was told: "This boy is pursuing a similar course to my boy and this is my allowance"; but the Government says: "You are at a particular University and therefore we are paying for that." I believe that the three Ministers over there will see what I am saying in that way. Sometimes the Ministers do not read the Bills which come before us. Funnily enough, this was brought home to me by no other than the distinguished son of the Premier. I was trying to get information for the benefit of my children and he drew to my attention that the actual tuition fees in Scotland were no higher than they were at the University College of the West Indies.

Before I make any further accusations, I would like the Hon. Minister to explain as best he can, what is meant by "prescribing different values according to whether or not the course of study which the holder of the Scholarship wishes to pursue is offered at the University College of the West Indies." I am sure that both the Minister and the Premier have heard that there has been occasional interference in trying to guide boys.

Boys have left Barbados for the University College of the West Indies with a Scholarship in Modern Studies - let them write this down and publish it in Jamaica - and when those boys got to the University College, they were shunted into the Medical School. What faith have you got in that? While it is a good thing that you can guide some boys, there is no reason in the world for what is happening to happen.

We agree that the value of the Scholarship should not exceed so much. If a boy says: "I want to go to Liverpool or I want to go to some other school, is it the business of the Director of Education or the Governor-in-Executive Committee to say "No, you will only have this Scholarship if you go to the University College of the West Indies"? Do not let us build up a grudge. After a boy gets 19 years or 20 years of age you cannot force anything in his mind.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot say anything further until I hear what the Minister has to say. I have heard what the hon. senior member for Christ Church has said, and I too say that this clause can be interpreted as being very dangerous. Let us hope that the interpretation of the matter is not the one which has been placed on it; the interpretation can be a very wicked one.

1.55 p.m.

When I said just now that there was a certain amount of Negro snobbery I knew what I was talking about. When Mr. Hayden was here, he felt that a chap who graduated at Oxford or Cambridge - though he had just a Pass degree - was better than a chap from Codrington College who had Second Class Honours. There are many people in this country who still feel the same way. If a youngster went to the University College while another went to Oxford or Cambridge, and could flaunt his Oxford and Cambridge blazer, the latter was considered to be better for a job.

If a boy wins a Scholarship, as far as he is concerned a matter like that should be left in the hands of the teacher to instruct him on what course of study he should pursue, and instead of wasting time in waiting to get into a University he should take his chance at the University College itself; but for the Governor-in-Executive Committee to tell him that he is not going to England or Canada but must go to the University College of the West Indies, as I have heard, I hope that that is not the interpretation of this Bill. I want the Minister to tell me what he means by different values. The Premier laughs, but I do not think he should laugh; he knows that I never make accusations like those.

I challenge the Premier to say now on the floor of this House that it is not within his knowledge that Barbadian Scholars were dissatisfied in the differentiation in the grant to persons who were doing similar courses in the United Kingdom. I challenge him to say that parents did not come to him and ask why "X" was getting £600 and they were only getting £450; I challenge him to say further that there were not persons who said that they could not exist on the amount and pointed out that others were getting more. When a boy has won something, he regards it as a start in life, and you should not play around with him like that.

I contend, Sir, that the interpretation which I have heard is correct. I await the Hon. Minister's explanation to describe what they mean by different values. We have come a long way from £500 for a three year course to £750 and £1,000 for a whole course. Anybody in the world would have had to do this because of the value of money and the cost of living. I really would like to know why you have this particular section. I hope the Hon. Minister will be able to tell me as soon as he comes back in the House his interpretation of this.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. SPEAKER: It now being 2.00 p.m. o'clock, this Sitting now stands suspended until 2.30 p.m. o'clock.

On resumption,

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to draw your attention to the fact that there is no quorum and ask that you direct the Clerk to ring the Bell.

The Bell was rung and a quorum was obtained.

QUESTION TIME

Question Time was called.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave that Item No. 10 under Private Members' Business be taken as the first Order of the Day.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, I regret that I may have to object to this Order being moved out of its place. The position with private Bills of this nature is that, when Government knows that they are coming up, it usually discusses its attitude to the Bill as a Cabinet. I did not know that this Bill would have been dealt with today; and that procedure has not been adopted in respect of this Bill.

I would therefore ask the hon. member to be so good as to delay it until next Tuesday when he can have it first on the Order Paper. We would have had time to adopt the same procedure. We have always gone through these Bills as a Government before coming here and discussing them.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, under the circumstances, I accept the suggestion, but this has been on the Order Paper for so long that I thought it was dealt with. If it can be put first on the Order Paper under Private Members' Business I would be very grateful.

2.35 p.m.

DEBATE ON SANDY LANE PROJECT RESUMED

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, I had begun, last Tuesday, the discussion on the Resolution standing in my name in connection with Sandy Lane. What I would say is this: it is obvious that at some time or other in the past the Government was made aware that Sandy Lane was for sale; whether they heard of it generally in the air, or whether they knew of it as a result of certain proposals being put before the Government in connection with the road diversions, they certainly did know about it. As soon as they became aware of the intention of Messrs. Da Costa & Co., Ltd. - who I believe are the owners of this factory and plantation - one would have expected that Government would have tried to purchase for the public of Barbados that factory and that land.

As you know, Sir, some time ago there was a proposal in this House which received considerable support from many members: that Government should own a sugar factory for itself thereby to be of assistance to the peasants who might send their canes to this factory from which they would expect a better price than they would receive from a privately owned factory. The question of profit for private owners would not arise in case the factory was owned by Government; and so long as Government was able to clear its expenses, the Government would consent that the peasants who brought their canes into the factory should be properly compensated.

The Hon. Deputy Speaker of the House, the senior member for St. Joseph, was the hon. member who proposed that the Government should purchase the Joes River Factory which was then on the market for sale so that the Government may be able not only to help peasants, but would also be able to gain valuable insight in the working of a sugar factory. They would have been able to determine the margin of profits which these factories make; and if they were making these high profits which we know they are making, to compel them to pay peasants more for their canes and the workers more for their labour. Other than that, it is essential to have accurate figures; therefore, with a Government-owned sugar factory, even if it was only for experimental purposes, Government would be able to really know how to run a sugar factory in the interest of the persons who are sending their canes there.

Unfortunately, Government arrived at no decision in connection with the purchase of Joes River Factory which, no doubt, was equipped with very modern machinery. That machinery was sold out piecemeal to various people. The result of that was that a first-class opportunity which Government had of owning a sugar factory was allowed to slip away. Therefore, as soon as Government had become apprised of the willingness of Messrs. DaCosta & Co., Ltd., to divest themselves of Sandy Lane, it would have been useful if they had purchased this place for themselves.

It is an open secret that the people who live in the parish of St. James have stated that the Government is seeking a place in that parish for a new school. In fact, unless I am misinformed, a backbencher has been making enquires of certain landowners in the parish as to what properties or lands they might be willing to sell to Government, as I am told, with a view of informing the Minister of Education that such and such a spot of land or property is available.

I do not know if the Ministry of Education has received any information as to whether or not some land at "Appleby" is for sale, and at what price Government will be able to purchase it; but, as I happen to hear it, I would not be surprised that, as Your Honour travels so quietly and slowly along that way, your interest has been aroused in that matter.

If Government appreciates that this property was on the market and was for sale, what more favourable opportunity have they to consider acquiring this land than on this occasion? Of course, it may well be that Government only heard of it through that very eminent United States Citizen who is a gentleman who, I understand, every now and then changes his nationality from being a United States citizen to a British citizen. I do not know if through that source, Government was told that these people would only buy it if they can get the Queen's Highway along there for the people who would be living on that property or who would be staying there as their exclusive preserve - the type of people who, I understand, it is proposed to cater to.

I understand that a number of them are people who used to spend their vacation in Bermuda, but that colony is now showing signs of awakening when it comes to the abolition of discrimination; so, on account of that, those people want this to be their little secluded area whereby they would not even have, in order to get from home to the sea, to cross the Queen's highway where people like yourself, the democratic number one citizen as you must be

as Speaker of the local House of Commons, and humbler citizens like myself, happen to traverse in our normal way. Those people can cross it by trolley or by some other motor vehicle, but they want this place as their exclusive preserve; and they are prepared to pay for it. This *Tennis* multi-millionaire is the type of person, like Governor Faubus, who would pay any price to live in this property provided it is absolutely exclusive.

Sir, no one is more interested in the development of the tourist industry than hon. members on this side. We have seen the benefits which would accrue to the people of this island; but even for tourism, too high a price can be paid.
2.45 p.m.

If the purpose of this scheme is that we begin with a little sort of "Bermudisation" of Barbados, who knows when that will stop? There is no doubt about it. If these exclusive rights are granted, and if it is proposed to cut a right of way twenty feet off the public road to the beach, you can well realise how little value that will be to the inhabitants of this island. I know I will be told that at the present time there is a barbed wire fence on the sea coast whereby persons cannot go from the main road traversing Sandy Lane on to the beach. I also know that the Government will not prevent the owners of Sandy Lane from cutting down all the trees and thereby reducing it from the present status as the most picturesque and delightful bit of road way in the island to one of the hottest stretches in the island. To think of Cherry Tree Hill being on all fours with Sandy Lane is to compare Sandy Lane with some remote place to which people only go on Bank Holidays.

Mr. Speaker, I have seen you playing cricket there on one occasion. I trust that I will not be misunderstood to be comparing Cherry Tree Hill, which is only frequented by people who live in the immediate vicinity, with Sandy Lane. To do that is to compare the density of population of Barbados with that of Greenland or some such place.

On Highway No. 1 is Sandy Lane. It is beyond dispute that that particular stretch of road is the most exquisitely beautiful stretch of road in the whole island. (A MEMBER: Dark.) Only those who are on the other side and who have never seen the light or from whom the light is now temporarily obscured, would say that it is dark. A lot depends upon the hour at which some of us traverse Sandy Lane Woods. Some of us have experience of it only after dusk and before dawn; and that is because they live so far away, it is not part of their driving to come from Speightstown to Hometown.

When Mr. Hilton Vaughn spoke of Sandy Lane in those few memorable words - you will perhaps forgive me if I quote them - even those who have never been to Sandy Lane would have realised that there is no more beautiful stretch of road not only in Barbados but in the whole Caribbean area, than this stretch relative to which these people have decided that if they could get the Government to agree with this diversion they will have their exclusive preserve on which no common man may traverse or even enter in future.

Mr. Speaker, you will remember this poem "Sandy Lane". I am sure you must have read and enjoyed that particular bit of poetry as all of us, I have no doubt, have done. I am certain that even the youngest member of the House, and even the least read member of the House would not have failed to get hold of that product of the brain of the local poet. You will remember that Mr. Hilton Vaughn wrote of his experience of that particular part of the island in this way:-

"This Miracle I felt at Sandy Lane:
Not the long glistening beach, the sea, the good
Black earth laughing and fruitful, the great crude
Machines crushing to crystals clear the cane;
Not these, but the hushed centre, where the main
And sacred way goes winding through the wood
Bearing its sense of joy with peace imbued,
Of rest and rapture, past all worldly gain.

And this too: that the princes of the Mart,
And light o'loves go swaggering, crashing through
The goddess Beauty's vaulted calm abode,
Knowing no-where to ease their secret load,
Of weariness, no ritual to renew
Lost faith, the mystery to change the heart."

Mr. Speaker, even if through the activities of travel agents, the designers abroad thought it worthwhile to consider an investment in this island having read this poem and being enraptured as obviously the poet was when he went into the ecstasies which caused him to produce this work of such high-class literary merit, or whether it was because the financiers, the banking house which is probably instructing its local representatives to invest in this property on their recommendation - whatever the reason is, it is clear that this section of the island is as dear and as picturesque to them as it is to us. So much is that so, they are prepared to pay any price for this diversion so as to ensure that this property is forever kept out of the ken of the Barbadian man in the street.

2.55 p.m.

The point that I am endeavouring to emphasise, Mr. Speaker, is that if the proprietors of Sandy Lane had decided to cut down the trees, in the absence of legislation, we could not have done anything about it; they could do what they like with their property; but, as soon as they intimate that they are prepared to sell the property which is still intact, and trees not cut down, then it was up to Government to see whether this was not an ideal opportunity to acquire it before anyone else; to acquire it because a sugar factory is there. They have missed Joes River; are they going to miss Sandy Lane? They have missed the first bus; have they missed the other?

The hon. senior member for the City some time ago spoke of another aspect of this property. Just as the hon. senior member for St. Joseph has recommended that Joes River be purchased for Government to have its own sugar factory, the hon. senior member for the City suggested that Sandy Lane would be the ideal place for a park for the Leeward coast. He said it is so pretty an area - and if Government were ever to learn, as he said in this House, I think, a year ago that the property was for sale - that Government should be first to intimate their interest in its acquisition.

I am saying, Sir, that nothing could be done except legislation was passed to ensure that the trees remain intact; nothing could have been done so long as it was private property by Government; but since Government (a) knows that the property is on the market for sale and (b) realises that the people who intimate their interest have said that they do not want the property or would not buy it - although, Mr. Speaker, I have reasons to believe that they are talking with their tongues in their cheeks - unless they can get that diversion, then Government should prick up its ears and realise that this is a situation which requires very deep consideration before they even appear to be giving this acquiescence to the proposal by these people.

I am told, Sir, that they are putting up to Government that, in Jamaica, they had been granted road diversions; and if it is good enough for Jamaica, therefore presumably it is good enough for us. That is novel to me, Sir, to be told that whatever Jamaica does we should follow; but in respect of these road diversions in Jamaica how many of them were granted during the tenure of office of Sir Alexander Bustamante? How many have been granted since Mr. Norman Manley has been in power? In any event, Mr. Speaker, irrespective of whether we are following Busta's Jamaica or Manley's Jamaica or who knows whose next Jamaica, I feel that it is strange that we should be saying that, if Jamaica is doing it, therefore you should do it. May I pose this question: has it ever happened in Jamaica, whether during Busta's or Manley's tenure of office, that the most beautiful stretch of popular highway has been given up?? Miles of highway have been given up in Jamaica, but has it ever happened in that country which is so many times bigger than ours, and which has so many more miles of highways than ours, that their finest stretch of road has been commandeered for the benefit of tourism?

If we consider Mr. Manley's Jamaica, his principle and policy has always been that there can be too high a price to pay even for tourism. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the price which we are asked to pay for the "privilege" - I use that word, Sir, and I trust the Reporter will realise that it should be in inverted commas - of having these multi-millionaires settle down here can well be a price which we cannot as a people with national pride and racial self-respect agree to pay. The type of people, Sir, whom we want to attract to this island in ever increasing numbers are of course tourists; but the type of tourists we want are those who have been coming here in the past, and who have never suggested that they will not come any more or will not come again unless they have a secluded area, a place where even the Queen's Highway must cease to be the Queen's Highway; that must be their private right of way, because they do not want to cross from the hotel to the beach on the same road on which ordinary people have been crossing since Barbados was Barbados.

Can it be said, Mr. Speaker, that these folk are worried about traffic hazards? Is it merely that, perhaps having not gone to New York, London, Rome or Paris, these fabulously wealthy people are scared of crossing the highway in Sandy Lane to go from the hotel to the beach? Can it be that? They would have any number of taxis waiting for them; and, for the type of persons whom I understand this scheme is going to accommodate, taxis would be kept running all the time because they would not want to wait; they would come from the hotel and step into a taxi where the driver in uniform would dart them across to the beach when they decide they want a sea-bath. That type would not do Barbados any good; it would be the beginning of the end for Barbados as a tourist resort; we would be a tourist resort *à la* Bermuda. The type of person who is interested in that type of resort might well go somewhere in the deep South, somewhere by the banks of the lazy Mississippi or in dreamy Alabama where the old folk are said to be ever waiting, and find exclusive places, with the Governor Faubuses keeping a watchful eye to ensure that they do not become intermixed or intermingled with the common hoard, as they think of people even like you, Mr. Speaker, and more so, people like me.

The type of tourist whom we should go all out to encourage to continue to come and come in larger numbers to Barbados is the type who go to the Marine Hotel and the Windsor Hotel, and who have never complained about crossing the public road to get to the sea, or of the contamination from which they might suffer as a result of having possibly to rub head and shoulder with some native pedestrian or some motor-car people. We want these people; they might have their individual idiosyncrasies, but they have never made themselves objectionable to people who spend their money, and I have no doubt that they spend good money. The proprietor of the Marine or the Windsor would not be reduced to be an old age pensioner or draw poor relief; not one of them would you find without a cheque book, a cheque book which issues cheques which anyone of us would appreciate if legitimately handed to us, and which any Bank cashier would unhesitatingly cash.

3.05 p.m.

That Texan multi-millionaire is the sort of segregationist who would not go to the Marine or the Windsor Hotel, or even those establishments on the platinum coast such as the Colony Club and the Coral Reef Club. They want this particular place in which they would lay their foundations and make their footing in a part of Barbados which would be denied to the Barbadians, except one or two who, on certain occasions for publicity purposes, would be invited there, but for general reasons they would not be concerned in having natives invading their privacy at this super exclusive domain which they envisage.

Now as to increasing and enhancing tourism in this island, there is an avenue which is crying out for an intelligent approach; that is, the provision of what can now be regarded by tourists of moderately priced accommodation for the middle-class and upper middle-class United Kingdom man. The more of these people who can be encouraged to come to Barbados, Mr. Speaker, the better it would be for improved Anglo-West Indian relations.

I am satisfied, as a result of discussions I have had during this winter season, that there are several people from the United Kingdom who would visit Barbados, and that there is the desire of large numbers of Scottish and English people of moderate means who have visited the West Indies who would like to pay a visit to our shores; and when they think of the West Indies, they think first of "Little England". Barbados is better known as a tourist resort than any of the other West Indian Islands except Jamaica. I have had several conversations with several of them. I had conversations with a Lecturer of Edinburgh, and a very successful Lancashire business man who did not hesitate to tell me that he had many friends, many of whom could not afford to stay at large hotels, and his coming here was to discover if, during the winter season, one could get reasonable accommodation at about \$12 a day or even £3 or three guineas which was what those people could afford to pay. He openly said that more than that they could not afford to pay, because they would have to pay a lot for travel to this country.

It is the middle-class man and the middle-class woman, if we can get them in large numbers, in thousands from England, Scotland, Ireland and Wales during the winter season - as a matter of fact, in any season - who would be the type of person to whom we would like to cater. The present hotels would not cater to them. Even hotels on the southern coast are hotels which cater for someone who is rather better off than they. If such people do come to those hotels, they stay for a shorter period of time because \$25 or \$30 a day is a price which they certainly cannot manage to pay for many days. If they were available and accommodation at the most of three guineas a day, they would come out to Barbados in large numbers. They say that they do not come out to the West Indies simply because of the cost.

The worst advertisement for this island is for any hotel or any establishment to advertise as its main attraction a swimming pool; that seems to imply that the sea bathing here is not as good as it is made out to be. It is the expensive establishments whose charges are something like \$30, \$40, or \$50 a day which provides such a convenience as a swimming pool. People, from countries which I have mentioned, declare that they are accustomed to swimming pools in their country, as well as in Florida; but, when they come to Barbados, they come for God's sea bathing and hotel accommodation at reasonable prices.

I do think that guest houses on the sea coast would attract thousands of tourists to this island if enterprising businessmen or an enterprising concern would decide to invest in such sort of accommodation. There is no reason why the Barbados Development Board - as a matter of fact, it would be their duty - would not assist if private enterprise would attempt to cater for such people. There is only one businessman who has ever realised the value of catering to the small man, and I am sure that gentleman, if he is not a millionaire now, is not far off because, at a certain stage of his life, he became so philanthropic that he dispensed with certain properties which he possessed. As everybody knows, I am speaking of Mr. A. E. Taylor, the poor man's friend. Of the large number of businessmen in this island, only one of them has ever been a poor man's friend and he is still alive, despite the fact that he has lived such an arduous life and has never stopped working for less than 18 hours a day. He is like "Johnny Walker": still going strong!

As I was saying, Sir, that type of accommodation is what Government should put up to the Barbados Development Board or make it known otherwise. That is the type of accommodation which should be encouraged in this place. That type of person, just because he is not paying a tremendous price, is the type of person who is not going to want to divert the Queen's highway because of his fidgetiness or of his idiosyncrasies or of his love for this peculiar type of exclusiveness.
3.15 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, there are, as I understand, two schemes or plans for the diversion which have been put before the

Government. There is the now notorious one sponsored by the Sandy Lane Scheme sponsor, and there is the one which has been put before many members of the public by that most highly-respected son of Barbados, the Honourable Mr. C.W.W. Greenidge. I do not personally accept the diversion which he has proposed, being merely a resident as I am; but if I were a political representative of St. James, I would certainly support the Greenidge diversion. As a representative of the parish of St. Lucy, I say that it would cause an even greater detour for traffic coming from St. Peter and St. Lucy to Bridgetown and a much longer stretch of road, although the gradient will of necessity be less; with the Sandy Lane Scheme there is a shorter road with a higher gradient.

His diversion, if I follow it correctly, would result in certain small owners' land being on either side of the highway with the consequent accretion in value of those persons' property; and these people could well do with the accretion of the value of their small holdings. I support neither diversion because, as my colleague who, I have no doubt, will be contributing to this debate, can assure you and this House, Mr. Speaker, the vehicular owners of our constituency have been inundating us with their requests to go slowly before accepting the proposals of this banking scheme which is being put forward via a certain gentleman of chameleon-like nationality.

The position in which the people of the Northern parishes find themselves is that they will have, of necessity, in the case of their animal-drawn vehicles, in order to get their vehicles to Bridgetown, to travel a much greater distance each way because of the diversion. Whether it is the Sandy Lane Scheme diversion or the long and lower C.W.W. Greenidge diversion, these people will have a greater distance to travel. There will be more work and labour for their animals and more wear and tear on their vehicles. It is no wonder that we hear that representatives of the Esso and Shell Oil Companies are giving their free, full and unlimited moral backing to this scheme! You must realise the thousands of gallons of petrol, the additional sales of petrol which will take place monthly consequent upon this diversion! If one thousand vehicles are using this highway and they use even a quarter of a gallon more petrol than formerly, you will know how much that means at the end of nine months; there is no doubt that there will be a vast increase in the sale of petrol. That is no concern of mine if my constituents and yours would not suffer as a result; I would say that they are my personal constituents on the sea coast. The additional mileage might be slight per day but, having to do this mileage every day in the month, is something which the owners of vehicles would find appreciable in the amount of their petrol bill. For that reason, if the Government finds itself irrevocably committed to this scheme - I hope to Heaven it is not - As a matter of fact, the Minister in his Statement said this:-

"I would inform the House that after careful consideration the Government has agreed on principle to the diversion of the public highway in the Sandy Lane area to render possible a major hotel development project to be carried out there."

The Statement went on like this:

"This agreement is subject (a) to the provision of an alternative highway built to an alignment, gradient and specification to be approved by the Government; (b) to the provision of public access to the beach; and (c) to the approval by the Government of a Development Plan for the whole area. This Development Plan will clearly show: (a) the line, road reserve, pavement, and carriage way width of the proposed diversion of Highway 1 together with details of any proposed access to Highway 1 where it runs through the development site. These proposals will be worked out in collaboration with the Town and Country Planning Officer and the Department of Highways and Transport; (b) the approximate location of the Hotel and ancillary buildings, any other proposed buildings, and land which it is proposed to use for other purposes, e.g. golf course, sale or lease for building development, residential and otherwise; (c) the broad lines of any landscaping pro-

posals, eg. changes in ground level, diversion of water and drainage courses, clearance of wooded areas, or planting of new trees, and generally any major landscaping proposals affecting the existing amenity of the area generally and visibility from the new line of Highway 1 in particular; (d) the location and extent of any public right of way granted by the developers through the development site from Highway 1 to the beach."

May I just pause to say that the type of person who, as I gather, is most likely to seek accommodation at this particular site, is distinct from the type of person who goes to the Marine Hotel or the Windsor Hotel or the St. Lawrence Hotel where they hear the steel band every Wednesday night, and which does not disturb the neighbours. There is the Caribbee Hotel or the Royal Hotel where everybody goes and enjoys himself and mixes with everybody. By human nature some of us do not mix; some of us in this Chamber are more reserved than other hon. members.

3.25 p.m.

It only happens, by chance, that I am looking across at the hon. member for St. James, but it does happen that some of us are less cosmopolitan and less good mixers than others; and the type of person who wants to abide whilst he is in Barbados at this Sandy Lane place is the type who has either been to Barbados before, and is fed up with the fraternisation which is inevitable at times in the several hotels which are not so exclusive as he would like, which are not so fully Bermudised as he had expected, and who wants to secure the present road and the beach and be assured that there will be no risk of contamination even at a reasonable distance with the local inhabitants or even visitors to this island; even with the middle-class person from the United Kingdom or the poor people from the States. He just does not want to find himself sort of involved with them on social occasions at hotel lunches and all the rest of it; and that is why he wants to insist on a place where even the road which the public now uses is to be a part of hotel scheme, a golf course and bungalows; an area absolutely remote, more exclusive, more difficult of access even than the U. S. base at Harrisons; and that base is only difficult because of strategical reasons, and not because of any prejudices there. It is obvious, if you are carrying out research, that you do not allow everybody to be present to watch your research operations.

Sir, I would be very unhappy to feel that, even in the interest of tourism, Barbados was prepared to pay so high a price. We would inevitably be paying in the loss of our national pride, our racial self respect, our cosmopolitan outlook and our everything, just to oblige these multi-millionaires. As I was saying, Mr. Speaker, before I digressed, if the Government finds itself deciding that at all costs these people must be granted a diversion, either the diversion which they proposed or the alternative which the Hon. Mr. Greenidge has recommended, then Government is entitled to make its stipulations and its rigid proviso. Government should insist that, in the proposals to this scheme, wherever possible the labour employed in the construction of this building and in the management and running of it, carpenters, painters, masons and subsequently the gardeners, butlers and the other domestic services and chauffeurs - I doubt you would disagree with me, Mr. Speaker, and I challenge the hon. members for St. James to jump up and disagree with me - should be recruited from the parishes whose parishioners have been subjected from the beginning of the diversion to the extent of having to travel and in paying so much more from Hometown, Speightstown or St. Lucy to get to Bridgetown and back because of the diversion.

It would only be reasonable, Mr. Speaker, to do this wherever possible; I do not mean where there are no carpenters available from Hometown, because they have all gone abroad or are otherwise engaged, that the work should not be done. If the work is being done it would not be in any spirit of exclusiveness to have people of St. James or of Hometown, of Speightstown, of Heywoods and of St. Lucy who have to travel and who, from the first day this scheme comes into operation, will be taking

more out of their pockets than they have ever taken before because of the greater distance they will have to travel. They are the people, Mr. Speaker, who should wherever possible be given preference for jobs so that money will go back to those parishes whose inhabitants are put out of pocket as a result of the longer distance of travel.

For one moment, Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that you are in the Chair and cannot add your weighty and ponderous note to the appeal which I am making to Government. The Paynes Bay people will not suffer; the Prospect people will not suffer; and the irresistible claim for employment should be from those people from whom so much money is to come out. The Employment Agency should be instructed to give priority to them. When they want so many carpenters and painters, they should be told that they must go to the Employment Agency; and the Employment Agency should be instructed to recruit its labour from those particular parishes. Is there anything in that with which you would disagree? With Your Honour in your present position I can only pose a rhetorical question, and only your face can indicate dissent, Mr. Speaker; it does not indicate dissent.

3.35 p.m.

I mentioned earlier, Mr. Speaker, that sometime ago Mr. Deputy Speaker introduced an Address that Government should buy a sugar factory. It is essential as a trial scheme that Government should own one factory and, after making a success of it, should proceed and nationalise the others. I know at one time that Sandy Lane, even during World War II, was getting canes not only from St. James but from St. Lucy and St. Peter. From the standpoint of the Leeward Coast, Sandy Lane Factory is considered as a fairly central place. If the Government was to own and run it, the huge profits which now go into the pockets of private people would cease and, as a result, the Government instead of putting away all those profits, would be able to purchase a large fleet of lorries for the factory in order that they would be able to go all over the island, wherever a peasant needs his canes transported, and bring those canes to the factory for which the peasant would be charged only the actual cost of transportation. Government would not be trying to make huge profits just like the owners; Government would only ensure, without any attempt to make themselves millionaires out of the running of it, that they are able to cover their expenses and nothing more.

In any community with a population of over 20,000 small holders, there is nothing more necessary than that; they should be able to get a reasonable price for their canes; and there is nothing more incumbent on the Government than to provide a means whereby they can get a reasonable price for their sugar canes. They have to purchase from the merchants foreign manure at a price which to them is excessive; but, if there is a Government owned sugar factory in the land where peasant holders would be able to carry their canes, that is as much a public utility as any other; therefore, it is equally desirable that Government should start off with an experiment in the taking over from the beginning of what I would think is the more remunerative utility.

I supported the suggestion of the hon. junior member for St. Joseph of the taking over of Joes River Sugar Factory. I now suggest that the Government, having failed to do anything with the Joes River Factory, can consider the purchasing of Sandy Lane Factory before it is entirely devoid of its machinery. I do not profess to know what is the position there or how much of the machinery there is sold already. I gather that already factory wreckers amongst private enterprise have been at work and that that factory is devoid of its salient pieces of machinery.

If Government considers seriously the acquisition for itself of this property, the building I gather is still there; I assume it has not yet been demolished; but certainly the land is there, and there are so many useful purposes to which that land can be put. You can divide it up into land settlement schemes, housing schemes and such things. Two hundred peasants can be given the

opportunity of holding two acres each for peasant holdings. You can have room for a school, room for a park, and many other useful purposes.

There is this additional question, Mr. Speaker, which I propose to the Hon. Minister. I posed a few questions to him on the last occasion, and I now pose this one, though I think it applies more to the Hon. Minister of Agriculture who, I observe, is not in his place. Perhaps, the Hon. Minister for Communications may make a note of it to be answered at some subsequent meeting of this House. My question is this: whether the opinion of the Director of Agriculture has been sought in respect of the probable effect on the agricultural economy of this island of the throwing out of cultivation of many acres of land as will be inevitably thrown out if this scheme goes through?

Mr. Speaker, I asked last Tuesday how many acres of land would be thrown out of cultivation as a result of this scheme. I am now asking the opinion of the Ministry of Agriculture - and thereby the opinion of the Director of Agriculture - as to the effect it would have on the agricultural economy of this island if this amount of land is thrown out of sugar cane cultivation. It would be interesting too, Mr. Speaker, to enable us to arrive at certain conclusions in respect of personnel formerly employed at the factory and on the plantation at Sandy Lane, if we can be told the average ages of these people. I mean, how near they are to the time when they no longer will be able to be employed there, and how soon they are for adequate pension to be given them. I now ask the Hon. Minister to submit this question to the Hon. Minister of Agriculture. I hope he will let us know, how many dozens or hundreds they may be who may be thrown out of employment from the factory and the plantation and what are their ages. This is not an idle query; it would enable us to form an opinion of their likelihood of securing employment otherwise, or of the urgent need to make provision for a proper pension scheme for them.

3.45 p.m.

I trust that the Barbados Government will not allow itself to be misled by the undoubtedly very astute proponents of this scheme, in which the promise was made of jobs for a certain number of these people, without any complete satisfaction and guarantee that the jobs are permanent so long as the people are able to work and so long as they provide satisfactory service. There must be a legally-binding guarantee by a reputable insurance company or by some underwriter or underwriters; or there must be the deposit of a sum of money with the Government in order to ensure that there is a pension for everyone who has either arrived at the age for the receipt of pension or who is not of such an age but for whom no employment is available. This latter type of person should be assisted at least by way of a loan until some suitable employment is found for him or for the type of person who has been thrown out of work. These people are naturally factory workers and agricultural workers. I do not know if it would be practicable easily to turn these people into domestic workers, waiters and butlers or even gardeners; the type of work to which the average agricultural worker has been accustomed is not the type of work which trains him for certain other types of employment.

Another thing is this: you would know, Mr. Speaker, from your experience as a Trade Union expert, that there are certain scales of wages in operation. Suppose an agricultural labourer, an able-bodied agricultural labourer at Sandy Lane, could earn so much during the course of the reaping season and so much out of crop season; at the end of twelve months he would earn "X" pounds; what is the position with him if he is told: "Oh yes, there will be work for you as a gardener"? I suggest that there must be an absolutely binding guarantee or an unequivocal assurance that an employee will be getting no less than he or she was getting when employed at Sandy Lane. This consideration would not arise if it happens that the sponsors of the scheme said: "We do not intend to carry out this scheme unless the Government agrees to the diversion". In view of Sub-section 2 of Section 13 of the Department of Highways and Transport Act, 1945 - it is well known that this is what is set out there:-

"Whenever it appears to the Governor-in-Executive Committee desirable for any purpose, and particularly for the giving of a road to church or market to any person who shall be without and shall require one, to alter the course of any highway.....the Governor-in-Executive Committee is hereby empowered to proceed to lay out and allot such highway....."

I cannot say that we, as members of the Legislature, have any legal right to forbid or acquiesce but inasmuch as this matter has to receive our attention, because sanction for this diversion is being asked for, the Governor-in-Executive Committee has its chance to lay down terms and conditions. If the sponsor says: "In view of your terms and conditions we are not prepared to press for our request for diversion, either we proceed with it or we do not proceed with it at all," there is the property available for the Government to consider its purchase and the various excellent uses to which such property can be put for the benefit of this island as a whole.

For once the Government has the whip hand; the cat has been let out of the bag. Since an appeal is made to the Government for its sanction for this diversion under Section 13 of the Department of Highways and Transport Act, the Government can say: "We are disposed to agree but you must assure us and guarantee that employment will be provided for people," failing which, the property being for sale, the Government may decide on the various uses to which this property may be put for the benefit of the inhabitants of Barbados as a whole.

Bearing in mind that we have no information in respect of Jamaica on the question of diversions - I certainly have no information that in respect of that island which has so many miles of road way, any particular site was chosen which happens to be the most attractive of the stretches of roads used by the largest number of people of the island daily. It is fantastic to say as regards Sandy Lane that overnight all those trees will be cut down, that the woods will disappear and to ask: What will become of all the glamour and beauty of Sandy Lane? That does not arise because the trees are still there and the Government has the power, if there is any idea of pique or spite, to have emergency legislation passed so as to ensure that such an act of vandalism will not take place.

The arguments of the opponents to this proposal would disappear when the woods disappear, but we can have an emergency meeting of the Legislature summoned so as to prevent any such action, if it is felt that the owners of Sandy Lane would try to spite this Legislature or the people of this island by committing such an act as would ensure that this scheme will go through and we will no longer as the representatives of the people be interested in the maintenance of that stretch of Highway 1 which has, for so long, been the most beloved stretch of road in this island used by the largest number of inhabitants of this country.

3.55 p.m.

I would say, Mr. Speaker, that the right of way which I understand is proposed is 20 feet; and the type of person who has indicated that he would patronise this scheme is not the type who is going to appreciate the use of this right of way by the humble inhabitants of this colony. You know that too well. They will provide a right of way but you will realise the inconvenience, obstructions and the snobbery which is going to be practised on the beach and in the woods if people using the highway south or north of this scheme come on to the beach up to high water mark and prostrate themselves in dozens and hundreds on the beach, if coloured young women and men and coloured old women and men lie down there relaxing on the beach.

What do you feel would be the reaction of these segregationists? Do you think they will come back next winter when they find that they have got the highway and the woods but then at least no Government can give them the beach? Any such legislation would be illegal, and would not be approved by Her Majesty; so the beach, up to high water mark, would be used by the same people whom they do not

relish having to use the highway any more. Bear in mind, Mr. Speaker, that a tourist resort is popular today but tomorrow it may well lose its popularity and people go somewhere else. Sometimes there is just rumour of some illness and the tourist ships are diverted. It was only this season when there was a rumour of one yellow fever case in a unit of the Federation, and as soon as there was that rumour - in fact I think there was a case established - of an epidemic, the tourist ships were diverted.

The point I am making is that when or if that happens, that is the end for that season of the tourist trade; but if we had our 400 odd acres of agricultural land and people working it up, no rumour of an epidemic - unless the people themselves became ill - would stop them planting and reaping canes, and keeping themselves employed, and drawing money for such; but what would become of the butlers and waiters in one bad season? What is the provision for that? Tourist business is more uncertain than sugar cane business.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that no one can disagree that sugar canes has been our mainstay. We welcome tourism as a second line provided that in so doing, we are not giving up Barbados to those who would Bermudise it, provided that Barbados is not being turned into a Nassau, provided Barbados is not to become a Miami, a Durban or a Johannesburg. We have to watch out for these things. If these people settle here, those are essentially the type of people, I submit, who are not satisfied not only with the principle of the present hotels, not merely those who have not been able to find accommodation in the hotels, but those who are not satisfied with the racial climate which they find in these hotels, the Marine, the Windsor, the St. Lawrence, the Royal and the Caribbee. They want their own type of place.

That is the sort of thing, Mr. Speaker, which one has to watch very carefully; the result might only be that, when these extravagantly wealthy tourists encamp in Sandy Lane and the poor people go to high water mark in front of their woods, there are going to be endless complaints to the police, some, perhaps, justified, and the majority no doubt unjustified, about the behaviour of Barbadian women and men and the coloured boys and girls on that beach. What they dare not object to is what even Mr. Billy Graham objected to taking place in Hyde Park; they will not object to that taking place at Sandy Lane because they have gone there having assured themselves that even the highway belongs to them, the woods belong to them, and the beaches belong to them and, even the sea they will feel belongs to them. That type of person, Mr. Speaker, with that sort of cheque book feels that there is nothing which he cannot buy, that there is no one whose price is too high, that there is nothing which they cannot purchase with the financial backings which they possess; and despite the Law, Mr. Speaker, you can well realise and envisage the type of complaints that are going to be made to the police, the majority unjustified, about the condition and behaviour of the local people who go to that beach to relax via the 20 foot right of way which they have undertaken to provide.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, it may well become so trying and tiresome for people to avail themselves of the use of that beach, of the sea in front of Sandy Lane and the beach up to high water mark, that despite their right of way, they would find it better not to worry to go there at all, and those people would then achieve what I submit is their objective; they would achieve their objective of ensuring that they had everything to themselves.

4.05 p.m.

And Sandy Lane would only be the beginning. They would turn from there to other spots on the Windward Coast. Anyhow, I am confident that the hon. junior member for St. Andrew will see after them if they try to encroach upon his constituency. But before they get entrenched, we might as well let them know that, because Jamaica does not mind diversions of the highway, it does not follow that we would not look askance to them.

Mr. Speaker, I think I have drawn to this House in my opening remarks the points to which they should direct

their attention. The latter part of the statement of the Hon. Minister is to the effect that in arriving at its decision the Government has given special consideration to the benefits likely to accrue to the economy of the island with special reference to the Tourist Industry. I have already made my comment on that when I pointed out that there can be too great a price to pay for tourism.

With special reference to the Tourist Industry, Mr. Speaker, I may point out that, so far as Government can encourage people in respect of the Tourist Industry, the people who propose to buy Sandy Lane and who are asking for this diversion of the Queen's highway are not the type whom you should encourage. The people whom you should encourage are the middle-class type to whom I have referred earlier. They are the moderate means inhabitants of the United Kingdom who want to visit this island, whose cricketers they have seen, whose players they have watched, whose workers they have seen working and whose students they admire. That is the type of person who would come out here in large numbers if provision was made for them by people who are interested in the Tourist Industry; therefore, I suggest that those who are genuinely interested in the Tourist Industry, who are interested in getting the largest number of people from the United Kingdom to Barbados, should direct their attention to that type of tourist rather than to that type who wants this particular, elaborate, expensive and extravagant scheme.

In paragraph 2 of the Hon. Minister's Statement, he says that, among the benefits, are improved opportunities for all-the-year-round employment of personnel presently employed on agricultural land which form a part of the project. Indeed, it is envisaged that the project will offer direct employment to some 500 people when it is completed.

I am interested to learn from the Hon. Minister of Communications - and he can regard this as my sixth question - how is this figure arrived at. He says that it is envisaged - which means that it is simply a vision - that the project will offer employment to some 500 people. At the moment, you will start off with your buildings. They are going to be substantial. Your buildings are such that they should be able to withstand all but the worst of the hurricanes; so my point is that they will stand there for a long time.

Now, factory workers work every reaping season, and the reaping season is every year; but carpenters, painters and masons and such people who are employed in the building scheme, their labours are completed within a few months as soon as the buildings are finished. That is not an annual scheme or an all-the-year-round scheme; therefore, we have to consider in analysing the ultimate and penultimate sentences of paragraph 2 what is really meant by all-the-year-round employment of personnel presently employed on agricultural land. Automatically, you rule out these skilled artisans; and that leaves you with butlers, chefs, gardeners and other domestic workers.

Will the Hon. Minister make a note of this and let us know something when he speaks on this question? I presume that he will be making a contribution at some stage of this debate. What does he mean when he says all-the-year-round employment of personnel presently employed on agricultural land which will form a part of the project? Do you mean that these people who are now employed will be assured that the agricultural land or most of the agricultural land planted in canes, etc., at this plantation will be continued to be planted in canes, etc.? Does the Hon. Minister mean that? Mr. Speaker, I do not know if he is listening to me or looking at the newspaper in front of him, but I would like at some time or another to hear him reply as to whether personnel presently employed on agricultural land means that the people who are now reaping the canes and tilling the soil will continue to reap the canes and to till the soil; in other words, that most of the acreage now will remain in agriculture. I do not know whether he means that the personnel presently employed on agricultural land will have the opportunity for all-the-year-round employment in some other capacity than the work which they

are now actually engaged on. Will some other type of agricultural work be found for the people who are now planting and cutting canes at Sandy Lane? If other agricultural work is to be found for them, is there really the assurance, the binding guarantee, that that work will provide them with no less financial benefit than they are receiving as workers now on the Sandy Lane Plantation?

4.15 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, with your Trade Union experience, you will readily appreciate my point. It would not be good enough for these people to be provided with employment on agricultural land in place of the employment which they now have, if such employment will be at a rate of remuneration which is much less adequate than that of which they are now in receipt while working at Sandy Lane Plantation. Really Sir, I do not know how you could help us because it would be very inconvenient to do so from your position now; however, as to the Union rate of pay for a gardener in a hotel how does that compare with the earnings of an agricultural labourer who works in the crop time cutting canes? That is the type of worker who would be unemployed and for whom employment would have to be found. When the Hon. Minister speaks of those presently employed on agricultural land, I must insist on enquiring how it is envisaged that these persons will continue to be employed and at what scale of remuneration. It must be a guaranteed scale of remuneration to be at no time less than what these people would have if they had continued to cut and plant the Sandy Lane canes so long as they would be normally able to do.

This is a case in which the Government has the whip hand; if it is within the Government's power to accept or to reject the proposals of a diversion of the highway, then the Government can lay down its conditions and put down the most rigid terms and let those people understand that either they comply with these directions or the Government does not agree with the diversion. I am not saying that the Government should agree with this diversion anyhow; I am saying that this is an ideal opportunity for the Government to acquire the property which is on the market for sale for the use and benefit of the inhabitants of this island. If the Government is advised against acquiring this property and if it is already advanced by the agricultural experts that there is no risk or hardship or disadvantage accruing to the agricultural economy of this island if this diversion is procured if this scheme goes through, then the Government, in acquiescing to the proposal, must make sure that the terms and conditions are such that not one single human being will suffer as the result of the magnitude and the limitless scope of the multi-millionaire's cheque book and the banking house which we understand is behind this scheme. In the ultimate paragraph of this Statement the Hon. Minister assures this House that in granting permission for the diversion of this highway, adequate safeguards have been laid down in the public interest. As my last query I will enquire of the Hon. Minister what are the adequate safeguards which have been laid down in the public interest so that we may, in the spirit of co-operation which always comes from the Opposition, be able to advise the Government as to the inadequacy, if it appears so to us, of any of the safeguards which have been laid down in the public interest.

You will appreciate, Mr. Speaker, that in the Resolution of which I have given notice and which last Tuesday I formally moved, I did not off-hand or at all suggest that the scheme should be discarded or rejected without any information being provided us as to the safeguards, for instance, on which the Government was insisting or the exact conditions which the Government was laying down. I suggested clearly in the Resolution that this is a matter for the combined brains not only of members of this Chamber but also of the other Chamber meeting in joint Committee to consider the scheme. With our experience, with our knowledge and our insight into local conditions and also with our knowledge of the psychology of certain foreign visitors to this place we might arrive at our findings in an impartial spirit and make proper recommendations to the Government as a result of our deliberations. Mr. Speaker, I think we should leave this matter entirely

above the field of Party; we will appoint not only members of the various Parties from this Chamber but also members from the other Chamber who would consider the Scheme which the Government has before it and arrive at certain findings and make certain recommendations which would be placed before the Government. If it happens that the result of the findings of this Committee support the attitude which the Government proposes to adopt in this matter, then the Government will be fortified in its position that a non-party Committee of both Branches of the Legislature had approved of the plan which the Government itself has sanctioned. If, on the other hand, the findings of this Committee differ from the present intentions of the Government, or the scheme presently favoured by the Government, at least the Government would have had the advantage of the findings of that Committee before it. That Committee would be, of necessity, a weighty Committee, as weighty a Committee as you could find perhaps in this island, a Committee composed of both Branches of Parliament. There could not be any harm at all; there could only be every possibility or probability accruing to the Government if, in supporting this recommendation the matter goes before a Committee of both Houses of the Legislature. The Government would thereby strengthen its hand and in the event of any future criticisms the Government could always say: "What we did was not only the decision of the Executive Committee; it was the decision arrived at after we had the inestimable benefit and advantage of considering the findings of a Committee of both Branches of the Legislature."

4.25 p.m.

The only pity is, Mr. Speaker, that if such a Committee were to be appointed at this present moment, there would not be available to it the sterling benefit of the services of at least one member of the Other Chamber, the Hon. Mr. Greenidge who is presently out of this island; but I am sure that the Upper Chamber would be able to find one or two worthy substitutes to meet with ourselves in joint conference and thoroughly investigate this scheme in the interest firstly of Barbados, bearing in mind that too high a price can be paid for tourism, and report to Government the result of our findings, and as a consequence any step Government takes will only have been taken after the most serious forethought and after it has had the amplest opportunities of considering all the pros and cons of the scheme.

Mr. Speaker, I think I have already done it formerly, but in case I have not, I beg now formally to move the passing of this Resolution, and that it be resolved that the proposed scheme be submitted for consideration by a Joint Committee of both Houses of the Legislature for its impartial findings and recommendations to be laid before Government. That, Mr. Speaker, so worded would not rule out the co-opting by this Joint Committee of any persons outside the two branches of the Legislature who to the wisdom of the Committee it appeared would be of assistance in its deliberations in arriving at the most sensible findings.

I beg formally to move the passing of this Resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think there is really anything more for me to say at this juncture. I think there has been enough said to provide food for thought in Cabinet circles and for Government to realise that there are two sides to every question; and let it be borne in mind that those persons who are supporting this scheme are not doing it in the interest of Barbados, in the interest of tourism or in the interest of anything else other than making even more money for themselves. Let Government not be deluded by these people that what they are after is giving Barbados the loveliest golf course in the island; what they are after, Mr. Speaker, is a money-making scheme to make the rich even richer and to make themselves even more strongly and financially entrenched than they are today. I have nothing more to say at this stage.

RESUMPTION OF GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

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

At this stage I have the honour to inform the House, before it goes back into Committee, that the Legislative

Council has returned to the Hon. the House of Assembly the Public Trustee, Provost Marshal and Official Assignee (Performance of Duties) Bill, 1959 which has been passed with an amendment.

The amendment which has been returned to us is no more than putting in what has been omitted, regarding the marginal notes: "Reference to Queens Solicitor to be construed as reference to Crown Solicitor."

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, you have read the marginal note which was omitted, and I beg to move that this amendment be considered forthwith.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I beg to second that.

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

On the separate motions of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded in each case by Hon. D. D. GARNER, the amendment was read a first and second time and agreed to.

HOUSE RESUMES COMMITTEE ON BILL re GOVERNMENT SCHOLARSHIPS AND EXHIBITIONS

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House resumed Committee, Mr. BRYAN being in the Chair.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: On the Suspension, the hon. senior member for the City, who is not now in his place, was speaking.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman, both the hon. senior member for St. Lucy and the hon. senior member for the City at great length pointed out to Government, and to this Committee, the grave danger of changing this from what it is today. I agree with them entirely that a Barbados Scholar, after he has won that Scholarship freely, should be treated equally with any other Barbados Scholars for similar studies; and to have any pressure or any direction from the Governor-in-Executive Committee or anybody else or even from the Director of Education to try and channel him into a particular University is wrong.

4.35 p.m.

If Government feels the necessity for having more scholars from Barbados going to the U.C.W.I., it is for them to create more scholarships there. I am sure that there would be no shortage of scholars if the scholarships are provided.

I would like to know from the Hon. Minister of Education particularly what is the reason for this change. He may have something to tell us about it which we have not heard yet. The previous speakers have made out a first class case for allowing the Barbados Scholarship to remain as it was for many years. It is not clear to me why you should say that a particular pupil must consent to go to the U.C.W.I.

I am convinced by the arguments of the hon. senior member for St. Lucy and the hon. senior member for the City why you should not call on them to consent to go. I do hope that the Hon. Minister of Education can enlighten us on the reason for these changes today. I hope he will reply at this stage.

Mr. STRAUGHN: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a slightly different comment from those which have been made on this particular section. However, first of all, let me say that the burden of the arguments which have been put forward by hon. members of the Opposition on this particular Clause does appear, on the strength of what they are saying, that they are reading a personality clause in this section which is not in it at all. The interpretation of it is much different from what they have been putting forward. As they have been putting forward these questions to the Hon. Minister of Education, it is one of the things which the Hon. Minister can answer more directly.

I want to make, as I have said, a comment of a slightly different nature and it is with regard to the value of these various scholarships. That is precisely what this section is all about. Having heard all hon. members of the Opposition, I think hon. members will agree that there has been constant difficulty experienced by Barbados Scholars over the number of years as to the expenses which they incur and other incidentals which have to be met. That, as well as having regard to the fact that Governments talked of the difficulty in getting some of their

trained personnel to return to the West Indies to help them to carry out their work, is something which Government should bear in mind; that these Scholarships should have a particular written value on them to include provision that there should be a return passage as well paid to these scholars.

What happens is that our scholars are sent overseas and they are sort of left out in the wilderness of the world, and very little or no provision at all is made as to any guarantee of their return; therefore, I do believe that is one of the things which can be tangible to them.

I am also wondering if it is not also a good thing for Government to keep what one would call a roster of the various scholars that they have overseas. Government can make ready contact with these scholars wherever they happen to be, in case there is a specialist job available; these scholars should be given first preference. I think that is a sensible thing which should be encouraged.

Hon. L. St. A. THORNE: Mr. Chairman, very much has been said by various hon. members against subsection 2 of Clause 6, and there seems more or less to be some very grave misapprehension about it; and, as a matter of fact, certain hon. members have gone as far as to impute evil in so far as the proposed changes in this particular section are concerned. I want to assure hon. members that there is absolutely nothing so intended; rather, it is intended to make better provisions for scholars who want a scholarship to any University.

Now, from what has been said I gather, first of all, that hon. members are in doubt with respect to the worth of the education at the U.C.W.I.; and in addition to that, they feel that this Government wants to use this awarding of scholarships as a means of securing political patronage from certain persons. In order to dispel that, I shall give you a sort of review of the life of the U.C.W.I.

I shall begin by saying that I presume you will recollect that the U.C.W.I. came into existence as a result of two Reports which were more or less written in 1945. One Report was that of the Commission of Higher Education in the Colonies presided over by Lord Asquith, and that Report is called the Asquith Report. The other Report was made by the Committee of Higher Education in the Colonies which was presided over by Sir James Irvine. In these two Reports it was strongly stressed the necessity or the need for the U.C.W.I.

The Asquith Commission at a very early stage in its Report stated as follows:-

"In the stage preparatory to self-government, Universities have an important part to play." It goes on to say: "they may be said to be indispensable. To them we must look for the production of men and women with the standards of public service and capacity for leadership which self-rule requires. Moreover, Universities serve the double purpose of refining and maintaining all that is best in local traditions and culture and at the same time of providing the means whereby those brought up under the influence of these traditions and cultures may enter and put into the community of the world wide community of intellect."

4.45 p.m.

In that Report, as you will observe, the Commission is stressing the need for the people of the West Indies who more or less have decided to come together to form a nation, to develop their own cultures and so on. In that Report which was made by Sir James Irvine, a similar note has been struck. It is that the need for professional men and specialists, both to fill superior appointments and to train the large bodies of assistants required in these services, is every day apparent, and development will be aimed at until the deficiency is made good. This Commission in its recommendation for the institution of a new University wrote thus:-

"Largely in our providing this much-needed professional training in future there is the fundamental antithesis between liberal and professional education and it is the duty of the University to overcome any such apparent antithesis."

The point I am trying to make is this: we can no longer look at our education from the point of view of Barbados only. We have got to think in terms of the new nation, the West Indies, as a whole; and we have decided to act upon the suggestions which have been made by these two Commissions and the University College has come into existence. We feel, therefore, that we should do everything that lies in our power to give this new seat of learning, this new University, the greatest possible chance of proving its worth. Surely it has proved its worth. It is just a little over ten years old, and, as some hon. member was kind enough to admit, it is holding its own with Universities of very much longer standing. We say, therefore, that it is our duty to do our best to point people to the fact that there exists, I would almost say in our midst, a very important seat of learning to which they can go.

This particular Clause does not say anything about the Government forcing anybody to go to the University College of the West Indies; this is what the Section says:-

"It shall be lawful for the Governor-in-Executive Committee in prescribing the value of Barbados Scholarships to prescribe different values according to whether or not the course of study which the holder of the Scholarship wishes to pursue"

Nobody is saying that a scholar must pursue this course or the other course; the Scholar has the right to choose what course he will pursue. If this course is available at the University College of the West Indies and a scholar decided to go there, or if he decided not to go there but that he will go to the U.K. or any other place overseas - we know from representations made to us that the cost of training varies. If you take your training at the U.C.W.I., the cost of the course would differ from a similar course if it is taken in the U.K.; therefore, if the student chooses to take the course in the U.K., it would be more costly to him and the award of the course in the U.K. would be greater than it would be at the U.C.W.I.

Added to that is the fact that we have been more or less informed by the President of the Students' Union in the U.K. that the cost of these Scholarships in that part of the world is varied. We have been advised that the revised rates in respect of Oxford and Cambridge will certainly involve more than the present maximum limit of £600 per annum, and figures were given to prove and show how this cost varied. They show that for the first year the cost would be roughly £680, in the second year it would be £635 and in the third year it would be £650. There again, you can quite well see the necessity for making this provision flexible so that you will be able to meet the cost as required.

In Clause 10 of this same Bill, hon. members will see that it is suggested that the cost of the Scholarship be raised from £600 to £700. Hon. members were trying to have us believe that there is a sinister move on foot to reduce the cost of the Scholarship; but if you look at this particular Clause, which is Clause 8, you will see that we are suggesting that the value of this Scholarship be increased from \$2,880 to \$3,360 as from January, 1957. There is absolutely no attempt being made on our part to reduce the cost of a scholarship to anybody. If the student takes the course at the U.C.W.I. that would be different from if he takes it at a University in England. That is the main reason for suggesting that the power be given to the Executive Committee more or less to prescribe the value of Barbados Scholarships.

I do not know if hon. members have become apprehensive because of what they have seen obtain in the past, but I want to assure them that this method is just an honest-to-goodness attempt more or less to try to implement what was recommended by the Commissions which sat at this seat of learning two years ago. It has been strongly pointed out here by these two Committees, by the Asquith Commission and the Irving Committee, in their suggestions with respect to the future of the University

College and the role which it would play in the West Indies, that the practice of giving Scholarships or Undergraduate Scholarships overseas should be brought to an end. The Irving Committee has urged that the Government should be generous in making provision for scholarship winners to proceed to the College. If the prestige of the new institution is to be maintained and its benefits are to be widely spread, then these Scholarships at graduate level should be tenable only at the University College of the West Indies.
4.55 p.m.

We are not saying that we should have scholarships only at the University College of the West Indies. What we are saying is that our students should be pointed to the possibilities of getting a good education at this new seat of learning; and what is more, we are suggesting that if a student saw fit to take his first degree at the U.C.W.I. he would have an extension of 2 years in which he would go abroad to any University he thought fit and pursue his post-Graduate work. There is absolutely no attempt being made on the part of this Government to prevent students from going to any University which they feel like. All that is being done is that we are pointing then to the possibilities of the U.C.W.I. and leaving it to them to choose whether or not they would go there.

That is our University, and we are talking a lot about having our jobs filled by West Indians and that sort of thing; and this is the time to show that we really believe in what we are capable of, by trying to build our own University. And for that matter, I repeat, there is absolutely nothing in this sub-Section which says that we are going to dictate to anybody at all that he must go to the U.C.W.I.

Now, it is worthy of note that this very Commission in its findings states that it is of the greatest importance to ensure that as many as possible of the ablest young people proceed to the University College of the West Indies; in this way the interest of the College will be advanced; the interest of the West Indian nation will also be advanced. We consider that, to deepen their sense of West Indian nationhood, the ablest young West Indians should proceed for their undergraduate studies to their own university and work and play with their fellow- West Indians from whatever territory and whatever race. The University is indeed an institution which produces graduates, but it should do far more than that.

I do not see that any wickedness can be put to us; I do not see how hon. members can say that we are forcing everybody. We are absolutely not forcing everybody; we are just pointing out that here is our own West Indian University, a University of which we can be justly proud, and a University which has throughout its few years shown that it is capable of turning out some of the best scholars. What is there wrong in pointing out to our students that such a University exists and our encouraging them to make use of it and study together, learn together and grow up together, so to speak, in order that they may have a deeper sense of nationhood? That is in so far as the argument about the need for fixing values is concerned.

I can quite see that a scholarship tenable at the U.C.W.I. would have a different value to that tenable at a College or University in the United Kingdom; and I do not know that hon. members are so deeply concerned about the values. I think that the emphasis is on the quality of the training that you are likely to get at the particular University you see fit to patronise.

Now there was another point made in connection with the possibility - I think this was raised by the hon. junior member for St. Joseph - as to whether Government would see fit to include in the amount for scholarships a sum for defraying the cost of return passage of the student to Barbados. To him I would say that that is a thing which has made a very indelible impression on my mind; and I suppose that it could be considered and when the Regulations are being made relative to this Act, and it is found to be the correct thing to do, some consideration

could be given to it. I cannot say at the moment that that is a matter which has been decided on, but I am saying that it can be given the necessary consideration.

Sometimes, in listening to the speeches, I get the impression that hon. members who are outside of the Government Party do not seem to feel that they could even trust themselves to administer an Act such as this one is suggesting, but I have the confidence that they would do justice because of the fact that I know that we are going to do justice. I do not see myself being prepared to patronise. I always deal with matters on their merit; and with respect to this matter of being willing to deny students the opportunity which they deserve, I want to remind hon. members that, far from trying to deny people the opportunities of getting education, I have always - even to this very day - put my hand in my own pockets and paid. I would not be a party to anything which would tend to be more or less a retrograde step; so I am asking hon. members to believe me that this suggestion has emanated from a very careful study of the Reports which have been made by these Commissions which sat on the subject and which have been responsible for the coming into being of the U.C.W.J.; it has also been made on a careful study of the merits and demerits of the particular University, and I am perfectly satisfied from the Reports that have been given by those who are able to know and from what I have been able to discover for myself, that this seat of learning is a worthwhile one and deserves to have the opportunity of catering to some of our best brains.

5.05 p.m.

Surely, I am at a loss to discover how hon. members could have got the idea that this Government is more or less trying to institute a measure of this sort for the sole purpose of indulging in political patronage. There have been some allegations made with respect to complaints made by various Scholarship holders. I have been very deeply interested in finding out the truth or otherwise of these allegations. Last Tuesday, three or four names were mentioned - I remembered three of them - and I took the trouble of making an investigation as to whether the allegations were true or otherwise. Of the three persons whom I was looking up, number one was Mr. Tom Adams. I heard that name mentioned and I wanted to find out what there was to discover with respect to that case.

From what I have discovered, that student has not received any scholarship fees since we stopped paying for him in September 1954. It seems to me as if he only got fees for four years. The normal thing is that, if you take law, you get three years and an additional year if it is necessary. From my investigation I found out that this young gentleman was fighting his own case for the extension of the payment of the Scholarship because, formerly, he only got fees paid to the end of June of the last year of his course. What I found out was this: it came about that students got their fees paid down to September, the last month of the academic career. I also discovered that although he was the principal mover behind that, he did not share it until a very long time after other people had shared such an extension.

The next case I investigated was young Theodore Brancker. I have discovered that this student is still at his University continuing his studies for the L.L.B. He is at Liverpool University but he is desirous of going up to Oxford to do his B.C.L. From the records I have discovered that if he had gone to Oxford first and taken his L.L.B. there, he could have taken the B.C.L. by remaining there an additional year but, if he wants to go over to Oxford now to take it there, he would be required to spend two years.

Looking this matter up, I also discovered that his father had been given to understand what the conditions were, with the understanding that the Government will be prepared to foot the bill for the first of the two years he spends at Oxford, and he will have to pay for the other year. From what has been pointed out, that is in keeping with the principle which is in practice; that is, three

years if you are doing law and an extra year if it is so necessary. In this youngster's case, he will have to spend two years extra at Oxford.

In the case of Mr. Waldron, I have heard from hon. members that he had done good work in anatomy and that is perfectly true. He proved to be a very brilliant student in that sphere, and it was recommended that he spend more time on that course than he actually would have done; and that he desisted from going on with his studies in medicine, without ascertaining whether the Government would consent to his doing that. The position is this. His scholarship is only tenable for six years. If he is given additional time to pursue studies in anatomy, he would have more than six years. For him to get the concession which he so desires, his scholarship would have to be extended for a longer period than six years; but that is all that can be done.

I have heard other names mentioned today, and I am prepared to delve into the files with a view of discovering what is there with respect to those cases. I am giving you the views as I find them. I have no axe to grind. I have been asked to do a spot of work in this Ministry and I am putting every thing into it. I want to do the job which I have done all my life and where the work in the Ministry is concerned to do, we are prepared to keep everything quite above board.

Again, I am appealing to hon. members to drop the idea that this affair is designed to work hardship on anybody. It is merely an attempt to implement the recommendations which have been made. I have had the privilege of sitting in this room and of hearing hon. members complain that reports have been made of this and of that and no attempts have been made to implement this or that recommendation. I am saying that we of the Ministry of Education are making the necessary attempts to implement reports which we consider are workable; and if we are doing that, please do not think that we are engaged in any underhand business with the result of working hardship on anybody.

I am quite conversant as to the fact that what I am doing is for the good and welfare of the community, and that my own children or grandchildren, as the case may be, will stand or fall by what I do. I am not thinking of the terms of any individual; I am thinking of the greatest good for the greatest number; so it is rather obnoxious to hear hon. members state that this is an Act which we have brought down for the purpose of arming ourselves in order that we may gain political patronage. Where the political side is concerned, if it is humanly possible to keep that out, I will do so.

Education, for me, is something much bigger than any individual or any Party; and I will stand or fall on that. If I make a mistake, I want hon. members to believe me that it will occur with the purest of intentions.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, so far as I know, I think it has been said on this side of the Committee that we impute no dishonest motives to the Hon. Minister of Education.

5.15 p.m.

Hon. L. ST. A. THORNE: On a point of order. I would like to explain to the hon. member that he was not here throughout the whole of this debate. It is quite possible that he might not have heard certain statements which were made. When I said that I was a bit surprised that hon. members were imputing ugly motives to this Bill, I was not referring to the hon. member.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I cannot say that the hon. member's point is well taken. I began to say that, so far as I know, the Minister in endeavouring to answer the allegations made by the Opposition, has set up a number of anti-sallies and then unwittingly he knocked them all down.

I would say that the great proportion of the quotations which he used are entirely inappropriate to the discussion

in so far as the particular points made by the Opposition are concerned. He talks very glibly about enhancing the prestige of the U.C.W.I. and, on that ground, he is on equal ground with us. None of them on that side of the Table is more concerned with enhancing the prestige of the U.C.W.I. than we are.

Hon. members will recall that not so long ago I made a statement on the floor of this House in which I was at pains to point out that the U.C.W.I. was not making the contribution which it should make to the West Indies, and it was our collective duty to see that it did so. I quoted the fact that, serving as the U.C.W.I. does, an area with three million people, it had less than 600 students; whereas two Universities in Puerto Rico only serving two million people had 20,000 students. What the Minister has to ask himself is this: if he says that he is anxious to enhance the prestige of the University and make it more attractive to students in the area, and make it the desire of students in the area to do their studies there, does he not realise that the moment scholarships to the U.C.W.I. are of inferior financial value to Scholarships outside of the U.C.W.I., he is automatically lowering the prestige of the University.

It may be argued, of course, Mr. Chairman, that the cost of studying in Jamaica is less than that of studying in England or in Wales or in Scotland or in Canada. People are accustomed to the Barbados Scholarship being so much and so much; the Hon. Minister himself tells us that in the Bill before us there are different values attached to the Scholarship. If you say that the value of the U.C.W.I. scholarship is "X" pounds and the value of the Scholarship at the University in England is "X" plus "Y" pounds, are you not implying to a person that the U.C.W.I. is an inferior place of learning to the University in the United Kingdom? That is what the Hon. Minister has to consider.

It is all well and good to say that you are trying to point out the value to the young West Indian nation of going to the U.C.W.I., but the determining factor will be the value attached to the Scholarship itself regardless of where it is tenable. In other words, the moment you say that the cost of study is less in Jamaica than it is anywhere else, you are attaching an inferior dignity and status to the U.C.W.I.

Personally, I believe that none of us in these islands is doing all that could or should be done to enhance the prestige of the U.C.W.I. and to increase its usefulness. There is the Faculty of Medicine, there is the Faculty of Arts and there is the Faculty of Agriculture added to the faculties offered by the Imperial College of Tropical Agriculture. Personally, I feel that there should be a Faculty in Barbados, and that Codrington College should be utilised as a Faculty of Law. There is no reason why all the Faculties should be in Jamaica; if Jamaica had medicine and Trinidad had Agriculture we, in this colony, might have Law; and I believe that the faculties at Codrington College lend themselves very easily to the acquisition of a Faculty of Law for the University College of the West Indies. I sincerely hope that the Minister will concern himself with an investigation of such possibilities.

If he says that his Ministry is willing to implement all recommendations and suggestions for extending the scope and influence and usefulness of the Institution, then no stone should be left unturned in his endeavour on the one hand to make the University the centre of educational facilities for the West Indian nation, and on the other hand, to secure for this island some Faculty to be attached to the University College which would provide Barbadians with the possibility, if they so desire, of pursuing a course of study in the particular Faculty right in their island home.

The Section which is before us refers to giving the Governor-in-Executive Committee the power to prescribe the value of the Barbados Scholarship according to whether or not the course of study which the holder

of the Scholarship wants to pursue is offered at the University College of the West Indies, and whether or not the holder of the Scholarship is able to gain admission to the U.C.W.I. So far as I know, I have heard of nothing beyond the planning stage for making a greater number of places available for West Indians who want to go to the University College of the West Indies; and, in my opinion, the Minister should have included in his remarks some explanation as to the plans of the Governing Body of the University, on which I believe he sits as a member, for providing more places at the University.

5.25 p.m.

There is no point, Mr. Chairman, in giving the Government power to say whether or not this or that student should go to the U.C.W.I. if there is not enough accommodation even now for students who want to go there; and therefore, Sir, we certainly would like some information with regard to the plans underway for extending the institution.

One other point which struck me was this: the Minister talked about investigating the question raised by the hon. junior member for St. Joseph of paying return passages for scholarship winners. I am not quite clear in my mind what the hon. member for St. Joseph is driving at. I remember in 1949 when we were extending the number of scholarships and what-not, that the point at issue was whether or not with some of the scholarships, there should be a proviso that under certain conditions the holder of the scholarship should be compelled to serve the island for a certain time. Personally, I believe that in fixing the value of the scholarships such things as passages to and from, living expenses and what not are more or less included; but what is the point in paying the return passage to Barbados if for instance the student does not want to return here and practise? He has no compulsion to return here; he can go wherever he likes.

There may be a few cases in which provision for return passage would be of certain advantage to certain students, but it seems to me that this question of return passage is bound up with the question of whether or not the student is going to be legally compelled under the terms of the scholarship to give a certain number of years' service to the island. I am certainly of the confirmed opinion that, in some of the scholarships we offer, this provision should be made; it is done in other places. And at a time like this when we are willing to do all we can to assist people to get higher education, whether it be at a technical or professional level, it seems to me that the country is entitled to some service from them on the completion of their studies.

There are one or two points which I have been trying to get out of the 1949 debate which, I think, would shed some light on the allegations made on this side of the Chamber, and if I can find them I will refer to them later. I do want to inform the Hon. Minister that everything which has been said with regard to an individual discrimination and the same scholarship winners and what-not by this side of the House can stand the light of the most searching examination; and it is all well and good to talk about some scholars having been to England and the expiration of their studies and their own expense and what-not, but, if he makes a little research, he will discover that some of them would not have been there at all or would not have been there when they went there if certain legislation had not been enacted for the special purpose of getting them there.

I can think of one instance, to which he has made reference, in which the whole of his passage would not have been there at all if the year before the number of scholarships had not been increased; and, as I said before on the floor of this House, it was increased at the time purely to enable these two to get a scholarship. I am not saying that they would not have been increased subsequently, but at the time they were increased - it is open knowledge in Barbados and the Minister cannot deny the knowledge that the increase at that particular time was specifically for the purpose of enabling a particular student to get a scholarship that year.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, the debate which has taken place during the last hour or two before lunch, as well as after Private Members' Business, was a debate on my motion to delete this very contentious Clause; and, as the debate has gone on, I have become more convinced that I was right in moving such a motion. In the interval we have had a very informative and a very honest speech from the Minister of Education, informative because he has told us a lot of what we already knew, and honest and sincere because he absolved himself completely of any of the charges which we had made against the Government.

But in his speech he showed quite clearly that, while he himself was not party to the things we have complained about, the grievances which were suffered by the parents of Barbados Scholars and the Barbados Scholars themselves, yet we on our side of the House have a reason to be suspicious and alarmed because of matters and events which had taken place long before he was even a member of this House, apart from the short time in which he was Minister of Education.

5.35 p.m.

We contend that in this subsection 2 of Clause 6, Government has power which it should not have. The Hon. Minister of Education rebuts our contention by saying that the purpose of the Clause is to feed and keep nourished the U.C.W.I. and to draw the attention of Barbados Scholars, both present and prospective, that there is the U.C.W.I., and, indeed, that its standards are high and that it is in the interest of West Indian students to popularise it by taking their course of study there. With that sentiment, all sides of this House would be in agreement; and there is great attachment to that idea throughout this community; but that is not the point at issue. The U.C.W.I. does not need to be defended here. It does not need the charge or the countercharge to establish its position. Its position is already established.

In answer to the Hon. Minister as regards that point, I say this: If you want to feed the U.C.W.I. and keep it supplied with Barbadian students as you say this Clause envisages, all you have to do is to make this Clause apply to those students who sit for and win scholarships to the U.C.W.I. itself. You have no right to apply the provisions of this Clause to the Barbados Scholarships.

From the time that the Barbados Scholarship was instituted, it was understood that the Scholarship was tenable at any recognised University within the British Commonwealth. The existence of the U.C.W.I. does not in any way alter a long standing principle and a settled understanding. That principle, therefore, should be untouched. It should not be modified even in the light of the existence of the U.C.W.I. The only modification which should be allowed is that the U.C.W.I. has now become one of the recognised places of learning within the Commonwealth and therefore, it is available as the others are available to students who want to go there; but neither by word nor by deed nor by statute law should the Government of Barbados even appear to force people to alter their choice when they may have made up their minds on other institutions of learning.

However impartial in its application the Government may mean it to be, the purpose of this Clause is this: You are saying to students, if you want to do medicine it will cost £450 per annum for six years to do it at the U.C.W.I. If you say you want to do it in Canada, it is going to cost you £550, £600 or £620 per annum to do it there. I cannot make you go to the U.C.W.I., but what we will do is that if you persist in going to Canada, Australia, New Zealand or otherwise, you will get the same £450 per annum as if you went to the U.C.W.I.. That is what this subsection allows Government to do, and that is why we contend that Government should not want that power. It is no use asking people to do what they do not want to do. By holding the purse strings and altering the value of the Scholarships, you make them think otherwise. Such as human nature is, if it so happens that a student decides against the advice of the Government, you may say that he must take the consequences, and that is not a good thing for the U.C.W.I.

It may so happen that if a Barbados Scholar goes somewhere else, it would be very difficult for him to get any concession from the Government because you may argue that he did not go where you wanted to send him, he has gone somewhere else without your wishes, therefore let him stew in his own juice. Therefore, whether you want to or not, you would exercise your authority which you gave yourself under this section.

That is why we say that this particular clause should not form part of this section. If you want to see the U.C.W.I. more popular, give more specific scholarships to the U.C.W.I. Then these students would know, before they sit, that, if they sit and win a scholarship, they cannot go somewhere else because these particular scholarships are tenable at a particular seat of learning. The Barbados Scholarships fall in a different category. They are tenable at any recognised University in the British Commonwealth and that should not be altered; and you should never do anything in this amending Bill to restrict the rights of pupils in this instance.

In order to illustrate what difficulties Barbados Scholars have to undergo over the years, I must draw Government's attention to one or two cases because they illustrate our contention of the difficulties and dangers. I was interested to hear that Mr. Tom Adams only got four years out of the possible six he could have got. The Hon. Minister has the files; I do not have them, but I would advise him to check again and unearth all the relevant material and get equal information. I would suspect that he would find that his first estimate was not as accurate as it should be.

Now, Mr. Chairman, most people in this House and a few others in this community at large will remember in 1945 - and that of course, was the time when there was only one Barbados Scholarship awarded because the increase only came in 1949 or before Mr. Tom Adams won one of the five Scholarships - when Mr. M. O'N. Campbell who is now a doctor and a Professor in Mathematics at the University at Achimoto, was the only person who was awarded the Barbados Scholarship in that year. If the hon. junior member for St. James was a distinguished mathematician, there would be some dispute in my mind if I were referring to him because I do not know Dr. Campbell, but I know the facts of Dr. Campbell's case, and his trouble with the Barbados Government over his scholarship.

He went up to Cambridge University and, when he completed his mathematical degree, the Governing Body of Achimoto College in the Gold Coast wanted a senior mathematical master very badly, and spoke to the Directorate of the University of Cambridge telling them of their situation. The Directorate told them that they could only recommend one man to them who was a Barbados Scholar by the name of Mr. Campbell, but unfortunately, he was now pursuing his postgraduate studies. They told the Directorate that it would be good if they could release him to come to the Achimoto College for two years, and then they would release him to come back to the University College to finish his post-graduate course. Mr. Campbell asked the Government of Barbados for permission to go out to assist the Achimoto College in the Gold Coast for two years and for permission to resume his studies at Cambridge after his two-year contract there had finished. The Barbados Government flatly refused at the time.

The University of Cambridge authorities were so indignant at the meanness of the Barbados Government at what they thought was childishness, that they said to Mr. Campbell: "Go out to Achimoto College and when you complete your two-year contract, come back to Cambridge; we would finance your studies and charge it to the Barbados Scholarship Fund. If they ask us anything about it, we would not take any more scholars from that territory at all. As I have said, I do not know Mr. Campbell, but I know the history of his case. It would be a welcome thing for the Hon. Minister of Education to find out what there is as regards that case.

After all, they cannot do him anything now. I need hardly say that we do not impute this particular trouble

to the present Minister of Education, but we remember that Sir Grantley Adams held that portfolio all those years when we were having trouble of this kind with Barbados Scholars.
5.45 p.m.

Secondly, there is the case of a Barbados Scholar of 1949, the first year that four or five scholarships were awarded. This is a particular case too, because the examiners overseas did not know at the time when they were marking the papers that four or five scholarships were to be awarded; so that when they sent back the recommendations they said: "We recommend that the Barbados Scholarship be awarded to Mr. F. G. Holder." The Executive Committee, when they met, had more than one Scholarship to be awarded and they awarded four or five as the case might be; they could not get them stretched any further.

After Mr. Holder had consulted Mr. Hammond and other people here as to what course of study he should pursue, he finally decided to do Modern Greats at Oxford and take law. Mr. Glendon Reed said that they could not award him two courses here now; they could give him three years and one year. In other words, he would be leaving Barbados assured that at least he would get four years. When he got to England he could consult the Director of Colonial Studies and hear what he said; the recommendation would come back to them and, in process of time, the Government would consider the matter.

When Mr. Holder went to England he saw the Director of Colonial Studies who said: "It is alright to take the course but it will depend upon what your Teachers at Oxford say about you and what they will do. If they recommend you to me I intend to recommend you to the Barbados Government." In process of time his teachers and professor at Oxford recommended him. The Director of Colonial Studies got the report from them and recommended him to the Barbados Government; the Barbados Government replied to the Director of Colonial Studies who replied to Mr. Holder as follows:-

Telephone
Abbey 1266

Director of Colonial Studies
15 Victoria Street
S. W. 1.

11007/22455

3 January 1953

Dear Mr. Holder,

With reference to your letter of 2nd October 1952, concerning your wish to read for the Bar Examination instead of the Diploma in Education, we have been asked by your Government to inform you that it is not possible to approve a variation of your Scholarship award which would require an extension of your Scholarship for a further year.

The refusal of your request does not mean that you are compelled to take the Diploma in Education Course, and if you have no wish to take the Diploma in Education Course, your Scholarship will lapse as soon as you have completed the course for the Degree in Philosophy, Politics and Economics.

Yours faithfully,
A. D. P. Howard
for Director.

The same thing happened to Mr. Dennis Williams and one or two other people whose names I cannot remember. I believe it happened to Mr. Henry Forde. There are six cases where the Barbados Government refused over and above the recommendations of the people of this colony, and the Director of Colonial Studies to extend or to permit an extension of courses. And that is what we complain about.

When Mr. Holder found himself debarred from doing his law he either had to use up his fourth year or do some-

thing else. His tutor says: "So long as you are not going to teach there is no point in getting a Diploma in Education." After a little more correspondence, the only alternative left for Mr. Holder to do was to take a Diploma in Agricultural Economics. This is the postscript to Mr. Holder; while he was struggling through that year, angry and embittered at the churlish action of the Barbados Government, his father scraped the bottom of the barrel and lost his work subsequently. In that year when young Holder was struggling through, and when he was taking a course of study which he did not want, his father was starving himself to death and had to do that, so that the young man could do an alternative course of study in Law at the London University.

When young Holder was doing the unwanted course which he had to do in Agriculture at Oxford, he managed, at his father's expense to get his L.L.B. at London University. The fourth year was out; they said that everything was over and young Holder had to seek other fields. Although he was highly qualified, the Barbados Government did not think of getting him over here to be employed in one of their Ministries, but they sent for Mr. Secchi who had the same qualifications as Holder, no better, no worse, and Holder found himself running off to Jamaica to be employed by the Jamaica Government in one of their Ministries there.

That is the story the consequences for which must be laid at the door of the Barbados Government. There is no excuse in all of them saying that they were not there when that happened; that could be led in evidence in the Law Courts; but any Government which carries on the policy of preceding Governments or any one who takes over the Government from the Premier who has just gone especially in the same Party with the same policies, must be held fully responsible for what the previous Government has done.
5.55 p.m.

I would like to tell the Hon. Premier this: it is not good enough when these cases are brought to the attention of the House to shake your head and say that you do not know anything about it. The files are there. Government's policy is always continuous and, except in rare cases, any succeeding Government particularly of the same Party is bound hand and foot by the actions and policies of its predecessors. You cannot get away from this; these things have happened in the past. There were Campbell's case, Waldron's case, the cases of young Brathwaite, Williams, Holder, Forde, Mr. Herman Griffith's son (*To an aside from Government side*) They approached you before you were a Minister and you gave them your support and word that you would tell Adams about it.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member must address the Chair.

Mr. TUDOR: It is curious that you can hear me while on the floor of the House and not hear the asides that are interrupting me. Why don't you stop them?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. member continue to address the Chair?

Mr. TUDOR: As Your Honour pleases. I still reserve myself the right to answer asides when I hear them, unless Your Honour should stop them first.

Now, Sir, I have illustrated by facts, which can be checked, the difficulties and troubles which Barbados Scholars have been having because too much power has rested with the Governor-in-Executive Committee and their immediate subordinates in these matters. I want to warn Government that when these matters come up again - as they must, because they cannot fool anybody that they have power and do not wish to exercise it or that they only put these discreditable features in a Bill because they have been drafted and they cannot alter them - that I hope they are realists enough to admit that, when they have been given power in a Bill, they intend to use it to the utmost and abuse it knowing them as I do. (A VOICE: Like the appointment of Aldermen?) Oh, yes of course.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I should like to remind the hon. senior member for St. Thomas that there is a rule which says that when a member is speaking he must be heard. *(Cheers from Opposition)*

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I have not spoken in this House.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The aside which came from you ...

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, I object to that. I was speaking to the hon. junior member for St. Joseph.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: And the aside was heard. I am asking you to discontinue the asides when a member is speaking.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Asides in Parliament are not meant for the Speaker's ears. I was speaking to the member for St. Joseph and in any Parliament that is allowed.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for St. Lucy may continue.

Mr. TUDOR: I need make no comment on that. You and the hon. member belong to the same Party and you will straighten out that.

The difficulty lies just here: all powers which are put into Bills and Acts of Parliament are meant to be used, and, as a corollary, if not used properly, they will be abused. We are not so naive on this side of the House to believe *(Mr. CHAIRMAN knocked the gavel.)* Mr. Chairman, I would like you to continue discipline in this House. When you have restored order, I am willing to continue.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the question be now put.

Mr. TUDOR: You cannot do that at all.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. senior member for St. Lucy may continue.

Mr. TUDOR: I was saying, Mr. Chairman, when we were both so rudely interrupted, that we are not so naive on this side of the House to believe that if a Government wants to prevent somebody from going to a certain University they will say so in so many words, but you make it so obvious that it is there to prevent the person. There are ways of doing these things. If they want to make it difficult for a prospective scholar to get admission in places other than the University College of the West Indies, all they would have to do is to send word - they know how to do it - to the Director of Colonial Studies in London who would see it circulated in the proper quarters that it is not the policy of the Barbados Government any longer to encourage more than a certain percentage of its scholars to gain entrance in overseas Universities. When scholars apply, the Universities themselves will say "no we cannot take you, we have not got room for you," and they would not have to give any reason to the enquiring student why they do not want him.

The very Bill we are passing in Committee will have its salient and most important features summarised and circulated among the authorities whose business it is to administer and control universities. They will know what the Barbados Government intends about its scholars; the University College of the West Indies will know it, and it will be known in the Colonial Office that it is the intention and wish of the Barbados Government that the U.C.W.I. should have the greatest possible number and proportion of scholarships awarded by the Barbados Government. And when that is known, it would be useless for students to apply elsewhere; they will be refused, and the grounds will be the policy of the Barbados Government.

Mr. Chairman, I well know the illusions on this point that any Government which is intending to have its way in these matters, can have its way because they have got

the numbers; and, unless things change radically, all these contentious bits of legislation that we feel impinge on the liberties of people will pass this House however much we oppose them. I also know that whatever powers which they take are bound to be abused as in the case of the very Aldermen which was part of the aside which we heard when interrupted, and as in the case of the Barbados Scholars whose cases I have cited. They would not be able to help discriminating; they would always find good reasons in the future for dealing in such and such a way with a certain scholar and in another way with another one; and they would have ample justification because they would be acting within the four corners of a law which they themselves have made.

I think a protest ought always to be made against these matters. We should not suffer them to pass in silence. So, Mr. Chairman, our duty has been done by drawing the Committee's attention to what we think are the dangers of this very dangerous piece of legislation. It is a matter entirely for the Committee, the educational authorities and the public at large to pass their judgment on it in any way they think fit.
6.05 p.m.

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Chairman, I have listened to this debate with great interest and to me, education is the most important issue that faces this colony, the West Indian nation, or any other nation in the world. Unfortunately, Sir, I find it necessary to speak at this stage because I find myself in a dilemma. On the one hand, knowing the calibre, character and ability of the present Minister of Education, I am quite willing to go a long way with him but, on the other hand, I regret to say that in these modern days of party politics, it is not very often that a man of character gets very far. Let me say, Sir, that I am not reflecting anything on Barbados or any other part of the world. What is politically wise at any time will be done by any Party under party politics. That is my objection to this particular clause.

This clause, in my opinion, does place in the hands of politicians the future of scholars because, you are on the one hand granting the scholarships and, on the other hand, tying strings on to them. That, Sir, in my opinion is not the intention of a scholarship. In my humble opinion, a scholarship should be an absolute, forthright gift. If the Government finds itself in the position that it wishes to encourage the U.C.W.I., that should be done by other means and methods rather than to interfere with the principle of awarding Barbados Scholarships. It can be done, in my opinion, without forcing the U.C.W.I. down the throats of scholars which can only tend to damage it. I rather see what is happening quite easily now, and that is that the U.C.W.I. makes its own record and consequently, scholarships would follow in that direction.

Taking the Hon. Minister's own argument, I would be perfectly willing to vote for this Clause and that is, too, if I knew that he - and I mean this quite sincerely - was the Government and that he would continue to be the Government *ad infinitum*. That, Sir, is not possible; therefore, while I appreciate the Hon. Minister's sincerity, I must also be practical and realise that when we sit around here and make laws, we are making them not only for the Government existing today, but also for those Governments existing in the future. By that I mean that there may be other Governments existing in the future for which we will be making laws today.

Subsection 2 of Clause 6 definitely changes the picture in so far as the forthright giving of a scholarship is concerned to the Barbados Scholar. It is, in my humble opinion, quite possible to circumvent the situation by giving particular scholarships to the U.C.W.I. It is also quite possible, according to the argument of the Hon. Minister of Education, to find out the rates existing at each particular University, not only for the first year but of the following years, and to give your scholarship along the lines laid down as to what it would cost for the first year at "A" University and what it would cost for the

second year at "B" University or whatever University it may be. It is quite possible for the Government to ascertain from the various Universities their cost and that includes the U.C.W.I., and you can give these scholarships without any comeback whatsoever of the changing value.

I therefore recommend very strongly to this Government that criticisms, such as they heard today, are detrimental to the colony and to the West Indian nation and they are only caused by formulating legislation which allows for such criticisms to be made of that nature. If instead of putting this matter in the hands of the politicians, we have laid down facts, such detrimental criticism as has been made here today would not be made. Let us not fool ourselves that for the past number of years this Government has not got very severe criticism on the matter of Barbados Scholarships.

Now, Sir, I believe that there are certain Barbados Scholars who as the result of certain situations and circumstances governing the award of the Scholarship are dead against this Government. If this Government would take my advice, in making legislation of this kind, they should make it in such a manner as to offset there being one discontented person. I say that because one discontented customer is worse than all the good ones put together. The good ones put together cannot contend with the one discontented customer, no matter how good and strong they are.

Mr. Chairman, I now move that this section be postponed for further consideration. I do so because I do not feel that it is right for any politician to change the value of this particular Scholarship.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I beg to move that the question be now put.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Chairman, I have sat and listened to the speeches on both sides of the House on this section. I would say that I cannot find any accusations made against the Hon. Minister of Education. I would say to the Hon. Minister that if a Barbados Scholar - boy or girl - is desirous of going to a particular university to study, give that scholar his free choice. Whether he is desirous of going to a University in England, Canada, America or the U.C.W.I., you should give him the full allowances of his scholarship. If such things would be taken into consideration by this Government, it would be looked upon in a more respectable way.

Mr. Chairman, this is nothing which we should argue any further. I feel that the time has come now when this section should be passed without any further opposition. I do not see the reason why debate should proceed any further on it. All that the Government needs to consider and to do are those things which are right.

The question that the words proposed to be deleted stand part, was put and resolved in the affirmative the Committee dividing as follows:-

AYES: Hon'bles Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, D.D. GARNER, R.G. MAPP, L. ST. A. THORNE, F. E. MILLER, Messrs SEARLES, T. W. MILLER, STRAUGHN and CORBIN - 9.

NOES: Messrs. DOWDING, TUDOR and BRANCKER - 3.
6.15 p.m.

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

The question is now that Clause 6 stand part of the Bill. Hon. members in favour of that will please say "Aye" those against will please say "No". I think the "Ayes" have it.

A division was taken as follows:-

AYES: Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS; Hon. D. D. GARNER; Hon. R. G. MAPP; Hon. L. ST. A. THORNE; Mr. SEARLES; Hon. F. E. MILLER; Mr. T. W. MILLER; Mr. STRAUGHN and Mr. CORBIN - 9.

NOES: Mr. DOWDING; Mr. TUDOR and Mr. BRANCKER - 3.

Clauses 7 to 12 inclusive were called and passed.

The Schedule was called.

Hon. L. ST. A. THORNE: I beg to move that the Schedule stand part.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I beg to second that.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, again in part 1 of this Schedule in Clause 5 Sub-section (c) this is what is stated:-

"Where the holder of such a Scholarship", referring of course to the Barbados Scholarship, "or exhibition undertakes a course of study elsewhere than at the University College of the West Indies, such Scholarship or exhibition may be extended for such period not exceeding one year as may be approved by the Governor-in-Executive Committee and on such terms and conditions as may be provided by regulations made under this Act, for the purpose of enabling the holder thereof to undertake a course of post-graduate study, not being a course of study for a second or further degree, at such university or other institution for higher education - whether or not within the British Commonwealth - as may be approved by the Governor-in-Executive Committee."

I do not have to argue against this provision as I had to do in the other case because the same principle holds good. This particular Clause of this Schedule says in effect that, when somebody gets a Barbados Scholarship and he goes to a University other than the University College of the West Indies and he wants, after his Degree Course is completed, to pursue further studies, it rests with the Governor-in-Executive Committee to grant him a further year, provided that that further course of study is not for a second or further Degree. In other words, if you do not go to the University College of the West Indies, you get an extra year; you will get an extra year but you cannot use that year for a further or second Degree.

I wonder how, in the name of anything which is good and proper, can we sit here and justify this attempt at dictatorship? You do not only say that you should go to the University College of The West Indies but, in laying out the Regulations for the Scholarships, you say that if you have a Barbados Scholarship and you go to some where other than the University College of the West Indies, you can have an extra year; but you cannot use that year in furthering your studies for a second Degree. However brilliant a scholar is or however highly recommended he is by his Professor, the Barbados Government says: "You will get another year but you cannot get it for a course of study for a second or further Degree."

I see that the Minister of Education is shaking his head, and I would be willing to give way to him so as to let him say what the proper explanation is. Unless you are saying that I cannot understand what I read, or that there is an error in the printing or drafting, the implication is that if you were at the University College of the West Indies you might be allowed another year but since you are at a University other than the University College of the West Indies you will not be allowed to study for a second or further Degree. Mr. Chairman, do you expect me to sit down here and allow this provision to pass without registering my protest against it? I will give way to the Minister, so that I can hear what is the proper explanation.

Hon. L. ST. A. THORNE: Mr. Chairman, at the present time the custom is that where a student is taking a course in Law he is given three years, and if it is recom-

mended by the tutor of the College that he should be given an extra year, he is given that extra year for doing researches. This provision here is the same thing. 6.25 p.m.

What we are saying is that if the student goes to the U.C.W.I. he would get two years instead of one year.

Mr. TUDOR: So, Mr. Chairman, if he goes to the U.C.W.I. he would get two years but, if he goes elsewhere, he can only get one year and only on the provision that it is not for a second degree.

Hon. L. ST. A. THORNE: That is the condition which obtains now.

Mr. TUDOR: But if it obtains now, it is still wrong. It has worked a certain difficulty in the case of Denis Williams who was promised that he would be able to do his Law in addition to the first course. That is a case and I forgot it when I spoke just now. He was promised that he would be allowed to do it, was recommended for it by his tutors, and when he had finished his first course and asked the Barbados Government to honour its obligation and the promise it made, the Government said that the promise was not in writing and therefore he did not get it. I want the Minister to investigate that also.

He was promised here, and recommended there; and when the time came for the promise to be honoured he could not take the second course because the Government said that it was not given in writing. That is what the Colonial Office authorities told him. You cannot tell me Mr. Chairman, that I can just leave it to the good mercies of this Government to deal with scholars as they should be dealt with; to say that all is fair and square and above board.

I accept the Minister's personal assurance, but he is just only one of a larger crowd which does not think always as he does; and if the majority counts with any matter, argument and debate, and if the principle of collective responsibility holds good in the Barbados Government, he will have to do what the majority says. If they say that the interpretation given here is to be taken literally, then no matter how much goodwill he has and how well intentioned his policies are, harm will be worked.

I have quoted the case of Mr. Denis Williams so that he can investigate and see if the facts are there. You have no right to discriminate. You should not say to a scholar, "you are at the U.C.W.I. and you can have two years more, and to another you are not at the U.C.W.I. and you can only get one year more, and you can only get that if you are not going on to a second degree." It means that if a student was so brilliant that he could do in one extra year at Cambridge what another could do in two extra years at U.C.W.I. you would prevent him from reading for a second degree, when you allow two years at the U.C.W.I. If that is not discrimination, I do not know what it is.

I refuse to argue this any more. It seems to me that the whole principle is wrong. If the Minister defends it he is defending it against his better judgment.

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

Hon. L. ST. A. THORNE: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Your Honour do now report the passing of the Bill in Committee.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On the separate motions of Hon. L. ST. A. THORNE seconded in each case by Hon. D. D. GARNER, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Premier: to move the second reading of a Bill to provide for the establishment of a fund re the insurance premiums on certain public property.

PUBLIC PROPERTY INSURANCE ACT, 1959

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, this Order concerns insurance on Government buildings. For some time now the Government has been revising its policy on insurance on Government buildings. The Committee which was set up for that purpose reported that Government should make provision for its own insurance. In fact, quite a sum of money was being paid to Insurance Companies; and, with the same amount, or probably less as an established fund, Government could make provision for its own insurance. That, Sir, is the subject of this Bill which is now before us.

As set out in the Objects and Reasons, this Bill seeks to establish a fund out of which loss of, and damage to, certain public property are to be made good, certain liabilities incurred by the Crown in right of its government of this Island are to be satisfied, and the insurance premiums on certain public property are to be paid.

The money which is now being paid to Insurance Companies will form the basis, along with other things, of the fund out of which Government is to stand the loss or damage to certain public property and certain liabilities incurred by the Crown in right of its government of this Island are to be satisfied. And that refers to a third-party insurance.

Hon. members will remember that, under the Third-party Insurance Law, big concerns which were considered able to carry their own insurance were exempted from third-party insurance; Government has taken advantage of that Clause to establish an insurance fund.

Clause 5 of this Bill provides what moneys are to form part of the fund. Clause 7 provides for payment out of the fund. Clause 6 provides for investment of the fund after it has been set up. Under Clause 6 the money can be invested and certain revenue gained from it. The Bill also makes provision for the establishment of a Committee the members of which are to be appointed by the Governor-in-Executive Committee. 6.35 p.m.

In Clause 4, it provides for the keeping of a list by the Committee which is to contain such items of public property as the Governor-in-Executive Committee from time to time directs to be entered therein. That is to say, all the Government property would be listed by this Committee; and this list is subjected to changes from time to time by the Governor-in-Executive Committee. It would be on the basis of the value of the items of public property contained in this list, that annual withdrawals from the Public Treasury of monies for payment into the fund are to be made. That would be on the list which is to be kept by this Committee. Naturally, withdrawals from the Treasury will be added to this fund. That is to say, that the Treasurer every year will make provision for a certain sum of money to be paid from the Treasury into this fund.

Provision is made in Clause 9 for the insurance by the Committee of such public buildings against such risks as the Governor-in-Executive Committee may think fit.

Clause 10 enables the Governor-in-Executive Committee to make regulations for the purposes of the Act. Clause 11 provides for an annual detailed statement of particulars of the fund to be supplied to the Legislature. That means to say that every year the Committee will issue its report and statement, and these are to be laid on the table of the Legislature for members' information.

Clause 12 provides for the repeal of the Public Buildings (Insurance) Act, of 1890. We have been continuing to insure these buildings as such but, with the passing of this Act, the Public Buildings (Insurance) Act, 1890, will be repealed. Those are the salient points to this Bill.

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

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I beg to second that.

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Speaker, it seems that at a very late date this Government is entering into the insurance business. (Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Better late than never!) I agree with the Government that it is better late than never.

While I personally do not see any wrong in the Government attempting to carry their own insurance, I wonder what advice the Government has had as regards the matter. I do know that a number of firms, even in this part of the world, has attempted to carry their own insurance; many of them have created a large business by carrying their own insurance; but, Sir, in actual fact it means carrying the risk yourself.

I do not know if the Government is perfectly satisfied with what it intends to do. Unfortunately, the Hon. Premier has not gone into sufficient detail to give us the financial implications of this matter. I would have thought that we would have been told what the present insurance premiums are, what is the value of the properties that Government proposes to undertake with their own insurance and the other pertinent details.

I do not think this thing should be entered into lightly. Up to now, there is no Hurricane Organisation functioning properly. Is this going to be building insurance alone? Is it going to be insurance against fire alone? Is it going to be insurance against hurricane, earthquake, riot, civil commotion, fire and all those things? Sir, I think we are really entitled to a little more information on this matter.

I do not intend to speak at length on it. I feel that it is a matter which the Government should have considered years ago. I agree with the Hon. Premier that it is better late than never, but I think the public and hon. members of this House are entitled to have figures which would explain the immensity of this risk. Let me say that when you enter this thing, it is a gamble; you may win or lose.

If the Government advisers in connection with this matter have given sufficient study to it, and the Government after careful consideration has come to the conclusion that it is a calculated choice worthwhile taking the risk, certainly the Hon. Premier has not explained it to us. I suggest this Hon. House should not deal with this matter. I repeat, from personal knowledge, that carrying your own insurance has made firms and broken individuals. It is not a matter to be dealt with lightly at all.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, it is astonishing to hon. members of this House that a matter of such vast importance, so far reaching in detail and in principle, should be dismissed by the Hon. Premier in a speech of less than ten minutes, if so much. The information which one necessarily looks for in discussing a matter like this is not yet forthcoming. I think it is preposterous that in a matter for full debate, and for which you need such a wealth of information, the Minister introducing the Bill just fogs it off on the House as if it were a simple Bill to amend another Act with which we are familiar.

Here it is, you have the Government having the intention of investing a large sum of money in buildings. The Public Works Department has projects now in hand which run into hundreds of thousands of dollars. The Housing Authority stands committed to several million dollars. All those little houses and all the housing estates which are completed, or to be completed, are in fact the property of the Governor-in-Executive Committee, the property of the Crown. All those existing buildings which now are in the hands of the Local Government Authority, and what other buildings they are going to erect, would come within the compass of this Act and this fund.

Several complications arise as regards this matter of insurance and, as I have said, large sums of money

must become involved in it. The extent is so great that, without any information as to the nature of the fund and as how it is going to operate and to carry on, it is impossible to have a proper debate on the matter. It may certainly be all very well for certain backbenchers because they have it as an obligation to vote for these Bills as they come to this House; and if their obligations are limited to just giving support to these matters and they can be silent on it without doing any damage to themselves or to their constituents, certainly, that is not so with other hon. members on this side who want to know everything of all legislation that is passed.

When such a radical departure from present practice is recommended, and when there are so many new aspects for which you need plenty of information, this Bill should not be passing through this House with so little information to back it up.
6.45 p.m.

We do not know whether to oppose or to support this matter because surely it would have rested with the Premier who has introduced this Bill to acquaint the House to the fullest possible extent of the Government's policy and the nature of the matter. He has done neither, but has treated the matter as a routine bit of legislation, meaning nothing and requiring nothing but a motion for the second reading to get it through the House.

We do not take that view at all; the Government will find that in administering this fund, there are snags and hitches of which they never thought; particularly when it comes to deal with projects such as Public Health projects and those already under Housing Authority and other spending and erecting Departments of Government. This is no light matter. I think that the Premier has been guilty of grave discourtesy to this House in proposing this Bill with so little explanation and with the promise of no more to come.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS and Mr. CRAWFORD rose to speak.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, a speech by the Premier at this time might save quite a lot of debate.

Mr. SPEAKER: Under the Rules of this House, before the Hon. Premier replies, I must be very sure that the arguments have been exhausted. The Premier replies after that. I do not think that it would be in the best interest of the debate for the Mover or Introducer of a Bill to reply before he knows everything to which he has to reply.

Mr. CRAWFORD: This is a special case.

Mr. SPEAKER: Not in my view. The Mover of the motion is only allowed one reply. If he wants to speak again he has to do so with the permission of the House.

Mr. CRAWFORD: We will be perfectly willing to give him permission to make another speech because the arguments in support of this Bill have not yet been heard.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am not the Mover of the motion; if I were the Mover of the motion I would know what my position is.

Mr. CRAWFORD: On behalf of the House I would gladly give an assurance that the Mover would be allowed to speak again. It all depends upon what the Mover of the motion wants to do. Speaking on this side of the House, we find it most distressing continually to have to be making complaints about the inadequacy of the presentation of important Government matters in this House.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: On a point of order. I do not think that the hon. member should say that because he is not in a position to say it. He was not in here.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I was at the door when he began to speak. I spoke to somebody there, and I was surprised that, when I came into the House, he had already finished speaking. I was saying, Sir, that a matter of this sort if

it is properly introduced, could not be done under half an hour. The hon. Mover of this Bill, unless he has had the experience and he is a trained student in matters of this sort, could not possibly present a Bill of this importance to the House in a speech lasting under ten minutes.

From time to time there have been suggestions made by hon. members of this House - they have been made by myself for instance - that the Government should undertake certain types of insurance, more especially insurance connected with Workmen's Compensation. I have felt that having regard to the increasingly large sums of money which the Government has to pay from time to time to private underwriters in connection with the insurance of its employees, the insurance might well be undertaken by the Government.

The Bill before us purports to be an Act to provide for the establishment of a fund in connection with the insurance premiums on certain public property. It is supposed to repeal the Public Buildings (Insurance) Act of 1890. The Public Buildings (Insurance) Act of 1890 also provides a fund for the building, repair or replacing any of the public buildings or furniture which may be damaged or destroyed. In the consideration of this Bill the House should be told what are the major points of difference between the present Bill and the Act of 1890, the points at which they differ and the main reasons why it is sought to repeal the Act of 1890 in favour of the present one.

I should like to say that the Objects and Reasons of this Bill are not very clear from a casual perusal, on the purpose of the Bill before us. If Government were embarking on any type of insurance, or on a more comprehensive type of insurance, we, on this side of the House, might have felt more happy in our minds in connection with the matter; but this Bill is apparently only a rehash of the Act of 1890. It seeks to provide the same fund or a similar fund out of which damage to certain public property is to be made good.

Certainly if the Government is merely embarking on insurance it needs to be a more comprehensive and more far-reaching type of insurance than this; this is merely a very slight advance on the type of insurance in effect for the last sixty-nine years.

The Preamble of the Bill before us says that it is an Act to provide for the establishment of a fund out of which loss of, and damage to, certain public property are to be made good, certain liabilities incurred by the Crown in right of its government of this Island are to be satisfied and the insurance premiums on certain public property are to be paid, and to provide for other matters incidental thereto. The Act of 1890 provides that the Governor-in-Executive Committee be authorised by warrant on the Colonial Treasurer annually to draw and appropriate the formation of a Fund to be termed "The Public Buildings (Insurance) Fund" a sum equal to five shillings per one hundred pounds on the estimated values of such public buildings and furniture as the Governor-in-Executive Committee deemed it advisable to insure against loss or damage. In other words, in the 1890 Act the Government was authorised to put into a Fund the sum of five shillings for one hundred pounds of the estimated value of certain public buildings; and that Fund was to be used as an insurance in case of damage to any of its property.

The only difference between the old Act and this one is that we are going to set up a special Committee appointed by the Governor-in-Executive Committee with a Secretary and what not to administer this Fund. This special Committee will not be by any means constituted an insurance Company. Under the old Act the administration of the Fund was in the hands of the Governor-in-Executive Committee and they had the power to draw from the amount of accumulated interest on monies collected for the Fund a sum sufficient to pay in whole, or in part, the annual premium on a policy of insurance on Government buildings and furniture which were damaged in one way or another. The new Committee to be appointed

by the Governor-in-Executive Committee will have similar power; and from the Fund will be paid the administrative expenses and monies required to be paid to maintain a policy of insurance on public buildings concerned, or repair, rebuilding or replacing any public property; and the Committee has power to say how money should be paid from the Fund and investigate claims and things of that nature. I see no difference between the two things.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. SPEAKER: It now being 7 p.m. o'clock, this Sitting now stands suspended until 7.45 p.m. o'clock. 7.00 p.m.

On Resumption,

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to draw your attention to the fact that there is no quorum and ask that you direct the Clerk to ring the Bell.

The Bell was rung and a quorum was formed.

Mr. SPEAKER: On the Suspension, the hon. senior member for St. Philip was addressing the Chair.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I was saying, Sir, that there seems to be very little difference between the old 1890 Act and the present one which seeks to repeal it. The 1890 Act authorises the Governor-in-Executive Committee to pay in whole or in part the annual premium of the policy of insurance on such public buildings and furniture as the Governor-in-Executive Committee may deem advisable against loss or damage as to him may seem fit, while the present Act more or less provides for the same thing. The main difference I see, from a casual glance, is the setting up by the Executive Committee called the Standing Insurance Committee consisting of a Chairman and not less than two other persons to be appointed by the Governor-in-Executive Committee; and this Committee will have a Secretary from the Public Service of the island to perform such duties as laid down by the Committee.

This is not the sort of venture, as I said, Mr. Speaker, into insurance which we have been recommending to the Government. It does not break any new ground, so to speak. Merely the provision of a Fund which is set aside for insurance on public buildings and furniture is not the point at which the Government should stop in its venture into the insurance field. I would very much like to see the Government embark, as I said before, on the insurance of employees under Workmen's Compensation Fund. This is very little advance on what happened 69 years ago. It does seem to me that, in 1959, a progressive Government could with experience and information available, have made a more venturesome, far-reaching experiment into the insurance field. 7.50 p.m.

This is hardly anything more than what was envisaged half a century ago. By no means does it go far enough in comparison with the rightly assumed responsibility of Governments in the twentieth century.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I regard this Bill as an attempt in the right direction but it certainly does not go far enough. If it is the intention of Government to create an insurance scheme, this certainly, is not the way of doing it. When we consider the vast sums of money which Government spends from year to year by way of premiums and payment of Government policies on the insurance of public buildings, housing, fishing launches, or whatever scheme it may be, I think that this Bill, although it is a step in the right direction and the principle is on the right footing, yet does not really establish the principle which we have long ago advocated.

I would say that this Bill in a little way does aim at doing what many members of this Chamber have brought to the attention of this Chamber from time to time but in reality, it does not consummate its intention. It really tinkers around it. It is not a regular insurance scheme established by Government and run by the Government and by which Government can secure enormous savings instead of paying out large sums of money to insurance

companies. That is why I say that it is a step in the right direction but merely the first of a series of steps.

I do not see the object of waiting back. If Government wants to establish its own insurance scheme, and fail to have the necessary experts here to advise them on it, let them import someone to tell them all about it; and then let them train someone to run it for them. If this is all that your financial experts can do by way of the establishment of a Government Insurance Scheme, it is certainly almost valueless.

It would be a good thing if the Hon. Premier, even if he passes this Bill tonight, realises that the intention of this part of the Legislature has not been carried out. The principles which we intended to be involved in this Bill are principles which many members of this House - certainly all in the Official Opposition, the hon. senior member for St. Peter and even Your Honour when you were occupying another seat, fought for; and one of them is a Government Insurance Scheme so as to effect savings for the Government and another so as to create low insurance premiums. Let us take the fishermen and the insurance of powered boats. That has been a big problem because the rates of insurance are high; but if Government establishes its own insurance scheme, these premiums could be put at a very reasonable rate, and the money would be going into the Public Treasury. The same thing could be done with housing.

The time has come when we would have to import someone who knows something of insurance, who is trained in economics, and who understands financing and other business methods. If you are establishing an insurance scheme, this is the wrong way to go about it. While I am in agreement with the principles of this Bill, yet in truth and in fact this is only playing with the problem.

Mr. Speaker, I will not oppose the Bill, but, at the same time, I hope that the Hon. Premier will regard this as the first in the series of steps with the ultimate intention that, in the not too distant future, he will bring down a more comprehensive Bill to establish a Government insurance scheme so that Government will stop frittering away thousands of dollars in the building up of private insurance companies in this island; at the same time to charge reasonable premiums to the poor classes whom, I take it, the majority of us in here are anxious to protect.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. senior member for St. Philip, as well as the hon. senior member for St. George, did mention something about the figures with respect to the insurance of Government Buildings and so forth. I will say that the value of Government Buildings and furniture and equipment in their estimation, as are insured with Henry Head & Co., is as follows: Government buildings \$15,360,000; furniture and equipment \$4,000,342.40, making a total of \$19,360,342.40. They are insured against fire, earthquake, hurricane, riot and civil commotion. The maximum claim which can be made is only £100,000 equal to \$480,000.

As I have said, a Committee was set up to go into the question of Government insurance. They advised that Government should undertake its own insurance and that should Government insure its buildings against hurricane and fire directly caused thereby. The premium is reduced by \$4,800. As I have said earlier, this also includes motor vehicles in connection with third-party insurance.

At the 31st March, 1958, the figure stood at \$837,000. That was under the Public Insurance Fund but, today, it must be very much more than that.
8.00 p.m.

Mr. CRAWFORD: On a point of order. Perhaps the hon. member will tell us why it is necessary to set up another fund when they have a fund under the 1890 Act.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: This will not be another fund. As a matter of fact, the amount of this previous fund will be paid into or rather transferred to the fund under this new Act.

As I said earlier, there will be an annual payment made to this new fund in addition to this \$837,000, and in that way the fund will be kept growing and growing and becoming stronger. I think that that is all set out in the Objects and Reasons of the Bill.

Clause 5 provides for the establishment of the fund, and Clause 7 provides for payments out of the fund. Clause 6 provides for the investment of the fund. I think that I have given the figures for which hon. members have been asking.

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

On the motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. D. D. GARNER, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. BRYAN being in the Chair.

Clauses 1 to 11 were called and passed.

Clause 12 was called

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 12 stand part of the Bill.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I beg to second that.

Mr. TALMA: Before you put the question, Sir, I want to say that I did not hear what the Hon. Premier said when he introduced this Bill; but, in the course of his reply, he made no mention of anything to clarify the point that, when the Regulations are drafted, whether they will include the matter of reducing the insurance premiums on powered boats. This is a golden opportunity for the Government to assist the fishermen in that the Government is the creditor, so to speak. There are sums of money advanced for fishermen towards the repair of their boats and so on. You have instalments plus insurance premiums and I can tell you that the average boat owner is finding it very difficult in the absence of cold storage and having a guaranteed price for fish.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: We are now dealing with Clause 12.

Mr. TALMA: I am dealing with the Regulations.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: We have already passed the Clause which deals with the Regulations. That is Clause 10. We are now discussing Clause 12.

Mr. TALMA: I am just asking the Premier to say what will become of the owners of the powered boats, also with regard to the matter of the Housing Schemes, are you giving the Housing Schemes all they want and the powered boats all they want? This is the opportunity for the Government to say what is going to be done. The Premier has not mentioned anything about it and I am asking him to say what he intends to do in these matters.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The hon. senior member anticipated me in respect of housing. In respect of fishing boats, housing and Government employees under the Workman's Compensation Act, these are three matters in connection with which the Government can save money and render a service to certain sections of the public by making this scheme embracing enough as to include insurance in the various directions.
8.10 p.m.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, if you will permit me, I will say that, when the hon. senior member for Christ Church spoke a while ago, he realised, as he said, that this was the beginning of a series of steps in connection with insurance. I thought that the hon. member had realised.....

Mr. TALMA: On a point of order. I said that I hope it is the first step in a series of steps.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I also thought that he had seen and read the Bill; had seen that this was in-

surance for public buildings and third-party insurance.
The question that Clause 12 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

On the motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. D. D. GARNER, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Bill in Committee, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On the separate motions of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded in each case by Hon. D. D. GARNER, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Premier: to move the passing of a Resolution to sanction the decision of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to close the Belmont Police Station.

RESOLUTION re CLOSING OF BELMONT POLICE STATION

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: For some time, Sir, it has been recommended by the Commissioner of Police that the Belmont Police Station be closed. The building itself is in a very bad state of disrepair, plus the fact that it is uncomfortable and inconvenient; policemen can no longer be properly housed there. It is proposed that, with the improvement of additional means of transportation, the Belmont Police Station could be run from the Central Station.

As set out here, the accommodation at this Station is below standard, and the cost of replacing it is not justifiable. In addition, too, it might be well to improve the road in that area by removing the blind corner.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I beg to second that.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Communications, Works and Housing to move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Post Office Act, 1911.

THE POST OFFICE (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1959

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, I think hon. members opposite and the House as a whole will find the Objects and Reasons pretty full, setting out not only the purposes of this Bill, but the arrangements under which these will be made and carried out.

Hon. members will see that we want to make an arrangement whereby the different Post Offices will accept overseas telegrams on behalf of Cable and Wireless Limited; and, in order to do so, we have to amend the Post Office Act, 1911. These arrangements have to be agreed to by contract between the Executive Committee and Cable and Wireless Limited.

As hon. members will see from the Objects and Reasons, the scheme proposed is that officers of the several post offices will receive messages from the public and telephone the contents of those messages to the Telegraph Office of Cable and Wireless Limited at St. Lawrence. The operator there, on breaking the call, will telephone back to the officer at the Post Office the number of words and the charge so as to enable the officer to collect the fee from the sender and keep a proper record of the transaction. When these sums are collected as fees they will be paid into general revenue in return for providing these facilities.

The number of calls are not very numerous. I do not think it would throw any particular heavy, additional burden on the staff of the General Post Office; nor do I think that this will be particularly difficult to carry out.

I therefore beg to commend to this House anything we

can do to accommodate people. There have been an increasing number of calls put through to England with increased emigration in the recent past; and, instead of people having to journey down to Lower Broad Street to Cable and Wireless Office or up to St. Lawrence, they can go to the nearest Post Office and register their call. It is a facility which we are affording the public. Government does not lose anything by it.

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

Hon. L. ST. A. THORNE: I beg to second that.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Before you put the question, Sir, it does appear as if it may be necessary to have a special staff, at least at the Central Post Office to deal exclusively with cable messages. In the cases of the Branch Post Offices wherever they are situated, I cannot visualise the number of calls being so excessive that additional help may be required; but, certainly, at the Central Post Office in town, you may have to have a Telegram Clerk, I cannot visualise the number of messages being so small as not to incur a fairly intolerable burden on the present staff. And then, Mr. Speaker, the general *modus operandi* appears to be very cumbersome.

8.20 p.m.

In the Objects and Reasons, the scheme proposes that the Officers of the several Post Offices would receive messages from the public and telephone the contents of those messages to the Telegraph Office of Cable and Wireless (West Indies) Limited at St. Lawrence. The Operator there on breaking the call will telephone back to the Officer at the Post Office the number of words and the charge so as to enable the Officer to collect the fee from the sender and keep a proper record in the transaction.

That seems to me to be completely childish. You go to a Post Office to send a telegram and the intelligent postal Clerk takes your message. Then he must telephone the Cable Office at St. Lawrence for the Telegraph Clerk to tell you what you must pay. You do not pay for a telegram according to the colour of your skin; you pay a fixed rate. If you are sending a message to Surinam or Honolulu or Australia, there is a fixed rate. All the Post Office needs to have is a schedule of the fixed rates set up there, and then any intelligent postal clerk can tell you what it would cost. Why take up your time waiting for the postal clerk to telephone the Cable Office? Why waste the time of the postal clerk to make the telephone call?

If you go to the Post Office to post a letter to British Guiana or to New Zealand or to Jamaica, there is a fixed rate of postal charges set up there. The postal clerk refers to the rate and to the weight of the letter and sees whether it is to go by airmail or surface mail. He tells you that it will cost you so and so and you pay the appropriate amount in stamps. The operator at St. Lawrence is no genius and there is no reason why, in the same way he can tell you what it would cost, the postal clerk could not tell you the same thing. This is totally cumbersome and unnecessary. Can you imagine the Postmaster or the Hon. Minister himself agreeing to this additional phase of the transaction? I really cannot.

Cable and Wireless have their fixed rates to all parts of the world and their fixed rates for every type of telegram. You have a special night rate or a special full rate or what they call ordinary L rate. Presumably, the operator at Cable and Wireless does not carry all these things in his head; he must have a telegram rate sheet. Send a telegram rate sheet to the Post Office and the postal clerk would be able to take your message and say that it is ten or fourteen words to go ordinary L rate and that it would cost you so much. Do not waste your time for the postal clerk to telephone to Cable and Wireless. That is really silly. I am sure it will eliminate time wasted.

If you want to facilitate the public by expediting the entire transaction and incurring less time on the person sending the telegram and the time of the postal clerk at

the Post Office, all you need to do is to have a telegram rate sheet posted up at the Post Office.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I can well see that the object of this Bill is to grant a certain measure of facilities to the public. That is the general intention of this Bill. On the face of it, it is a good intention; but the question which really engages my mind is the risk involved. I hope the Hon. Minister will pay some attention to what I am saying.

Sir, I am looking at it by way of the legal aspect. I am thinking of the risk involved insofar as some mistake arising between the postal clerk and the Cable and Wireless clerk. In the case of some mistake arising, at whose door would the damages lie? Let us, for instance, assume that one of the big business places was ordering, say, 2,000 bags of rice, or any other commodity, and, through some mistake by the Post Office Clerk or some misunderstanding, on the other hand what normally should be 2,000 bags is interpreted as 200 bags. On whose shoulders would the blame rest? Who would be liable for damages for the loss sustained through the misunderstanding or the mistake?

The door is wide open here. Government may find itself in a very awkward position because, as we all know, even written orders and written notes are misinterpreted. Even manuscripts are open to some mistake or some misapprehension arising; and, as far as a message over the telephone is concerned, one can well imagine the great risk involved through some misinterpretation of what was said from one end or the other. There is that danger.

I am just trying to assist the Hon. Minister. I am not criticising this Bill. The intention is good, but I am asking, in the case of a mistake or misinterpretation arising, who would be ultimately liable and who would be responsible by way of damages. Who would have to pay for the loss sustained? Would it be the Government, Cable and Wireless Limited, or would it be the Clerk

of the Post Office or the Clerk at Cable and Wireless Limited? One has to consider all these things.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is now 8.30 o'clock. Does any hon. member want to oppose this Bill? If so, please tell me. If that is the case, we will have to cut short the debate on it now and go to Unopposed Business.

Mr. TALMA: Speaking on my behalf, I see many pitfalls although I am not really opposing it.

Mr. CRAWFORD: We want more points cleared up.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is now opposition to the Bill.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, I was made to understand that no hon. member was opposing this Bill; therefore, I considered that this was Unopposed Business.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have not been made to understand that from what the hon. members are now saying.

Is there any Unopposed Business to be disposed of? *(After a pause.)* There being no unopposed business, it is time for the adjournment.

THE ADJOURNMENT

The Order Paper having been fixed,

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next, 7th July, 1959, at 12 o'clock noon.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I beg to second that.

The question that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next, 7th July, 1959, at 12 o'clock noon was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.
8.40 p.m.