THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1961

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 7th February, 1961.

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 12 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. M. E. COX, *(Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour);* His Honour Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P., *(Deputy Speaker);* Hon. R. G. MAPP, *(Minister of Communications, Works and Housing);* Hon. F. E. MILLER, *(Minister of Social Services);* Mr. J. C. TUDOR, M.A.; Hon. D. D. GARNER, *(Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries);* Mr. C. B. SEARLES; Hon. L. ST.A. THORNE, *(Minister of Education);* and Mr. J. W. CORBIN.

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that the Minutes of the meetings held on 31st January, 1961, and 2nd February, 1961 respectively have been printed and circulated amongst hon. members and unless there be any objection, these Minutes will be taken as read and confirmed.

There being no objection, these Minutes are now taken as read and confirmed.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay a Statement regarding the Opening of the Deep Water Harbour.

The Statement reads as follows:-

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the House have copies of this Statement? My reason for asking that is, if there are no copies the Reporter will have to take the Statement as the hon. member reads.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, there is a copy available for the Clerk.

STATEMENT BY THE HONOURABLE MINISTER OF COMMUNICATIONS, WORKS AND HOUSING ON THE OPENING CEREMONY OF THE DEEP WATER HARBOUR

On 28th June, 1960, it was agreed, in consultation with our Consulting Engineers and the Contractors to the Deep Water Harbour, that the Harbour would be ready to be opened early in 1961, and on the 21st July, 1960, the Government agreed to invite the Prime Minister of the West Indies, the Honourable Sir Grantley Adams, C.M.G., M.P., to perform the Official Opening Ceremony.

2. The date now set for the ceremony is Saturday, 6th May, 1961, and the Prime Minister of The West Indies, Sir Grantley Adams, has accepted the Government's invitation to perform the Ceremony.

3. Recently, certain Honourable Members have raised in this House the question of inviting Her Royal Highness The Princess Margaret to perform the Opening Ceremony.

4. While the Government and the People of Barbados will always welcome participation by Members of the Royal Family in events of local importance and significance, yet, it is felt that, on this particular occasion, the services of so distinguished a son of Barbados as Sir Grantley Adams could be sought and that the invitation to perform the Opening Ceremony will be a fitting tribute to one who, from its inception, has shown such a keen interest in the Deep Water Harbour project.

5. It is proposed to extend invitations to the United Kingdom, United States of America and Canadian Governments as well as the Governments of neighbouring territories. Representatives of International Organisations will also be invited to attend the Ceremony.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Resolution:-

Resolution to place the sum of $1,917 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1960-61 Part I - Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1960-61, No. 36, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Bill to amend the Wages Council Act, 1955.

Hon. L. St.A. THORNE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that the Reply to Question No. 9/1961 asked by the hon. senior member for St. Lucy regarding certain pupils of St. Michael's Girls' School who did not write the July L.C.C. Exams is now ready.

Also, Reply to Question No. 14/1961 asked by the hon. senior member for St. Philip regarding the establishment of Faculties of Law and Sociology by the U.C.W.I. is now ready.

Also Reply to Question No. 15/1961 asked by the hon. senior member for St. Lucy regarding the erection of a school in the Delamere Land Area in St. Michael is now ready.

Also Reply to Question No. 22/1961 asked by the hon. senior member for St. Lucy regarding the vacancies for Instructors at the Technical Institute is now ready.

Also Reply to Question No. 25/1961 asked by the hon. senior member for St. Lucy regarding training of private Secondary School Teachers at Erdiston College is now ready.

Also Reply to Question No. 7/1961 asked by the hon. senior member for St. Lucy regarding the employment of Olive Williams and Gertrude Clarke at Combermere School is now ready.

Also Reply to Question No. 19/1961 asked by the hon. senior member for St. Lucy regarding the dismissal of the Laboratory Attendant, Combermere School is now ready.

12.25 p.m.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply at its next meeting to deal with the Money Resolution of which notice has just been given.

QUESTION

Mr. BRANCKER: To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:-

Whether all Vessels plying by sea between Territories of the Caribbean are thoroughly inspected before departure from this Island in respect of seaworthiness and adequacy of their lifesaving equipment according to recognised British Standards?

2. In respect of such equipment, will Government see to it that no such Vessels leave here on "Excursions" or otherwise – without adequate lifesaving equipment, especially having regard to the number of persons being carried on such voyage?

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

On motion of Hon. M. E. COX, seconded by Hon. D. D. GARNER, the Bill to amend the Wages Council Act, 1955, was read a first time.

ORDERS 1 - 5 EXEMPTED FROM PROVISION OF STANDING ORDER

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Orders Nos. 1,2, 3,4, and 5, be exempted from the provisions of Standing Order No. 5.

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

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

RESOLUTION OF SYMPATHY TO HON. F. E. MILLER

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, before proceeding with the Orders of the Day, I would like to ask leave to move the passing of the following Resolution of Sympathy:-

"BE IT RESOLVED that this House place on record their sympathy with the hon. junior member for St. George on the loss sustained by him at the passing of his late wife."

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

Hon. M. E. COX: It is customary on the death of a member of the House or of his close relative to move a Resolution of Sympathy; and, in doing so to the hon. junior member for St. George, I am sure I am voicing the sentiments of all hon. members present when I say how deeply we regretted it, when we learnt of the passing of the hon. member's wife.

We sincerely hope that he would be sincerely strengthened to bear up against that loss. One does know how seriously such a loss can affect him especially at this time when the hon. member is just more or less convalescing from his illness. I, therefore, beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, well may be it that the only measure of agreement today between the Government and the Opposition may be in respect of this Resolution.

I heartily, on our behalf, support the sentiment so concisely expressed by the Hon. Leader of the House. I would add that on occasions like this, we have a respite of the occasional rancour of parliamentary debate, and are given the opportunity of expressing our sincere feelings to members of this Chamber irrespective of party.

As the funeral well attested, the hon. junior member for St. George has the sympathy of a very considerable number of people of this community; and by the diversity of the following on that occasion, the hon. member is assured how widespread was the sympathy felt towards him and his children who are now without their mother.

In this community we can ill afford the loss of a qualified nurse; and that adds even more to the general feeling of grievous loss, the island having been deprived of a leading member of the nursing profession by the death of the late Mrs. Miller. Let the hon. junior member for St. George rest assured that he has our complete sympathy. We are prepared to be even more forgiving than usual today with him, realising that he has not yet fully recovered from the loss which he has undergone.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I say thanks to hon. members for their expressions of sympathy.

The question that the Resolution do now pass, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, hon. members standing in their places for a minute at the request of His Honour the Speaker.

12.35 p.m.

RESOLUTION OF SYMPATHY re DEATH OF RIGHT HONOURABLE VISCOUNT DUNROSSIL

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, the next item is a Resolution of a similar nature to the one which we have just passed. It is in connection with the death of the Right Honourable Viscount Dunrossil, a former Speaker of the House of Commons, who later became the Governor-General of Australia. Through the newspaper we were apprised of his death. A few of us were acquainted with this gentleman in his life time, I believe. As a member of the C.P.A., it is still in order for us to move the passing of a Resolution to his relatives on the occasion of his death. The Resolution which I want to move reads as follows:-

"RESOLVED that this House desires to record its profound regret at the sudden death in Australia of the Rt. Hon. Viscount Dunrossil, Governor-General of that territory, and former Speaker of the British House of Commons.

FURTHER that a copy of this Resolution be despatched by Mr. Speaker to the Viscountess Dunrossil."

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I rise to second the motion which has been moved by the Hon. Premier. It is only on this day that the Rt. Hon. Viscount Dunrossil is being buried in Australia where he has been living only for the past year, having gone there to be Governor-General about this time last year. It is more in his former calibre that he is known. He was, before his appointment as Governor-General of Australia, from 1953 until last year, the Speaker of the British House of Commons. I have had the honour of having met him twice, and he was to those who knew him, a bulwark of Parliamentary life and Government. He was the most knowledgeable Speaker of the House of Commons. His interest in Parliamentary affairs was unbounded; and I believe Your Honour can testify to the deep and abiding

interest which he had in the ancient Parliaments of the Commonwealth of which this Parliament is one. I had the honour on one occasion of seeing him in action when his wit and good humour saved what would have been a nasty situation developing in the House of Commons. It was in 1956 when the Suez Crisis was so much agitating the British public. There was s stormy debate taking place in which the Government and Opposition exchanged discourtesies with each other on certain aspects of foreign policy. I remember that when the clash was about to take place, when the British Prime Minister said that their policy was designed to separate the disputants in the Middle East, Mr. Speaker said: "My policy is to separate the parties in this House." His humour saved the situation on that occasion.

He was a very enthusiastic leader and worker on political platforms so far as democratic institutions are concerned. I know that the Australians will feel his loss keenly, although he has only been with them for a short time. It is with the C.P.A. that his passing will be most keenly felt. I think that this House would wish to associate itself with whatever tributes have been paid to him in other parts of the Commonwealth. I have much pleasure in seconding the motion for the passing of this Resolution.

Mr. SPEAKER: All hon. members will please show their assent to the passing of this Resolution by standing in their places in silence for a minute.

Hon. members stood for a minute on the passing of the Resolution as requested by Mr. SPEAKER.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

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

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply.

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

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair, and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. BRYAN being in the Chair.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE 1960-61 No. 34

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, there are several Heads of the Schedule in connection with this Resolution. These Heads will be taken separately as usual.

HEAD IX - MARKETS

Head IX – Markets – was called.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, under this Head, there are several items, light, water, uniform, cost of living allowance, and there is a new Item "Meat Rack." This has all emanated from the fact that these items are used in the markets generally, and the cost has been increased because of the opening of the new market at Bay Street. I will move that these items stand part of the Schedule, while the Hon. Minister of Agriculture will give the necessary information in seconding the motion. I beg to move that Head IX stand part of the Schedule.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Chairman, in seconding the motion, I would like to give the Committee just a little bit more information as regards these items. In connection with Item 15 - Light - the amount of $400 is required to supplement the provision in the Estimates based on the actual rate of consumption during the year; and it includes provision for the new fish market at Bay Street. I think hon. members know that this market is a new venture; no money was included in the Estimates for this particular fish market. It has been found necessary to supplement the amount now in order that there might be proper lighting facilities there. The sum of $3,000 was originally voted in the Estimates and this sum of $400 is now required. 12.45 p.m.

In connection with Item 16 - Water. Due to the new market, more water has been consumed, and this was not budgeted for in the last Estimates. It is necessary to vote $920 to carry on to the end of the financial year.

With regard to Item 29 - Uniform - an amount of $2,480 was voted, and $320 is now needed to supplement the amount until the end of the financial year.

In connection with Item 28 - Cost of Living Allowance - the sum of $780 is required to supplement the provision in the Estimates to meet the provision of cost of living allowances to the part-time and casual labourers employed at all markets. The original amount provided was inadequate due to a miscalculation of the number of casual labourers involved.

Item 34 - Meat Rack - is new. The Note reads as follows:-

"In the 1959-60 Estimates, provision was included for the installation of racks for the storage of meat at the Fairchild Street refrigerator room. One-half the work was done leaving an unspent balance of $145. The amount of $300 now required is a revote of the unspent balance plus additional provision of $155 to complete the work."

As you will see, Sir, a part of the work was done and the other half remains. There is an amount of $145 left from the original vote and therefore we need a new provision of $155 to complete the work. I think that is all that is necessary for me to say at the moment on this particular Resolution.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the additional provision of $155 to complete the work is due to some unexpected increase in the cost of the meat rack, or whether the meat rack was not budgeted for in the first instance. (Hon. D. D. GARNER: It is due to an increase.) I understand that it is due to an increase in cost. The Hon. Minister should realise from that that as long as the Legislature has sanctioned the expenditure, there should be no delay in putting through the order, otherwise we will find ourselves with increases of cost. I do not remember the Legislature ever having a decrease in the cost of any item which we have ordered, and which has been slow in coming. Anyhow that is unavoidable.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I am wondering whether the Minister can supply us with a little more information on Item 28. The Note states that the sum of $780 is required to supplement the provision in the Estimates to meet the cost of providing cost of living allowances to the part-time and casual labourer employed at all markets. I want to know how many casual and part-time workers there are at the Bay Street Market and how many are employed at the Market in Cheapside. I want to know also how much this cost of living works out to, and how many weeks in the year are these casual and part-time workers employed. Mention is made of miscalculating, Mr. Chairman, so I would just like to hear something of how these miscalculations came about.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Chairman, I do not have any of the information which the hon. member is seeking here with me. It would be better if the hon. member would put those questions down in the usual way because it would involve a lot of research. I do not carry the information in my head nor do I have the files here.

Mr. TUDOR: There is one question, Mr. Chairman, which I would like to ask the Minister. In those provision groceries in the markets when the markets are opened late on Saturday nights, do the people working in them come under the provision of the Shops Order? I would like to know whether the provisions of the Shops Order apply to letting off those attendants.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Yes, Sir. So far as I know, the provisions of the Shops Order apply to these people; but

in many instances the proprietors are the owners of the stalls, and remain there to do business. I believe that in many cases the proprietor carries his family to assist him until these hours. I do not think there is any problem there.

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

HEAD XX - EDUCATION

Head XX – Education (2) Erdiston College – was called.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Item 24 - Travelling - is in connection with Erdiston College. The Minister will give more information concerning this, but I think that hon. members will remember there was a school at Erdiston for the practice and training of teachers in elementary teaching. Due to a recent expansion, that school is no longer there. It is proposed that teachers and students should visit schools probably in the same neighbourhood. This amount for travelling is to pay the expenses in connection with this new venture.

I beg to move that Head XX - Education (2) Erdiston College - stand part.

Hon. L. St.A. THORNE: Mr. Chairman, in seconding the motion that was made by the Hon. Premier, I should like to expand a bit on what he has said. In 1958 Erdiston College was inspected by Dr. Elsa Walters of the U.C.W.I. and Mr. S. A. Hammond, formerly adviser of Education to C.D. & W. The inspection was not a public inquiry but only a sort of education inspection such as normally takes place.
12.55 p.m.

In the case of Erdiston, the services have been more or less changed a bit. There has been quite a lot of re-organisation there and this re-organisation has resulted in an increase of expenditure necessary to meet the cost of travelling.

The mover of the Resolution stated that training at the Erdiston Model School no longer obtains. I would like to correct that by saying that the school is there; and, in addition to that, we are forced to use twenty odd schools in order to provide the necessary teaching practice. The twenty schools are:- The Pine Secondary Modern, the Pine Primary, the Edgehill Memorial, St. Stephen's Mixed, St. Paul's Infants, Westbury Junior, Wesley Hall Junior, Wesley Hall Infants, Holy Innocents' in St. Thomas, Eagle Hall Infants, Buxton Boys', St. Giles Boys', Belmont Girls', St. Mary's Junior, St. Matthias Boys', St. Matthias Girls', Sharon in St. Thomas, Hindsbury Girls', St. Patrick Boys' and St. Lawrence Girls' in Christ Church. There are the twenty-one schools being used for the purpose.

The number of students who go from school to school may vary from seven to three. In the case of Mixed Schools, you get seven students visiting for the purpose of gaining the necessary teaching experience. In the case of St. Paul's, only two or three teachers are there, yet the teachers who go there go for the purpose of getting the opportunity of gaining practice in infant teaching methods. The present vote is inadequate to meet the cost of travelling, and we are seeking to get this supplementary vote.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, valuable as the information which the Hon. Minister of Education has just given, I am afraid that it does not touch the core of the problem; nor is it information on the most important questions which can be asked of the problem. After all, Erdison is a Teachers' Training College, and I would have thought by now, which is probably five or six months after the start of the first one-year course, that the Minister of Education would have been in a position, or felt himself obliged, to give this Committee some idea of how well or successfully that course is running. There are still some people in this island - and I must confess that I am one of them - who are filled with serious doubts of this matter of a one-year course of training; and we would like to be reassured on every conceivable point.

First of all, as regards the course, we get the hint of the radical departure which has taken place in the training of teachers in this island in the explanatory Note to the Resolution itself. It is in this Note that we hear that the Model School is no longer used exclusively for practice-teaching, but that the practice-teaching is spread out among twenty or so schools. I would like to know from the Hon. Minister what exactly the one-year course is, and I would tell you why. Some months ago, before Mr. Moffet retired from the educational services of this island, I went to him and asked him whether I could be furnished with a copy of this proposed course; I was already familiar with the previous two-year course. I was not allowed to have it on the ground that it was private although, mind you, Government's policy on this matter had been decided and everybody had known that the former Principal had been retired or dismissed; and, in the case of Erdiston College, that the two-year course was to be scrapped and this one-year course instituted.

I sincerely hope that the Hon. Minister of Education would tell us what the teachers are taught in the course of a year. I cannot help feeling that the training of teachers is nothing short of a secret. It is so important that it ought to be known for full discussion, not only among teachers, but among the public in general.

Secondly, people must have grave doubts about the shortening of the course if they do not know the nature of the course. My doubt runs along these lines. I have never heard of an emergency course for training doctors, or an emergency training course for engineers; yet, in an important field as training of teachers, we are permitting the emergency training of teachers. To my mind, I think that a course which is cut down and telescoped has got to be good enough as what it is cut from, and that is why I want the fullest information. A lot of serious matters are in it. You are supposed to be training people for a profession in which status means quite a lot, yet it appears that in this profession their status means so little that you are doing things which you would not do in the case of doctors.

Here we are hearing of shortage of doctors in the neighbouring colony of the Federation; but nobody has run into panic to say that we should cut down their training from six to three years. We ask people who are now doctors, who probably are retired, to spread their working time over the department and help out in circumstances where help is needed; but we do not cut in half the period for the training of doctors.

I cannot see the wisdom of Government's policy; and I doubt it is good, not only from my own experience but something else which is worrying me even more. It is after the Director of Education left the island that we read of him saying in a Press interview that he had recommended to the Barbados Government this change.
1.05 p.m.

I should be very sorry if a recommendation like that did not have the most beneficial results, because it would prove that the Minister had delegated his policy-making to a Civil Servant. I had hoped that a policy which is so important, and which brought about so grave a departure, would have been the work of the Cabinet, and particularly that of the Minister himself; and would not have been foisted upon us by a Civil Servant who has gone from here, leaving us with the consequences of the matter, however good his service was. I speak on the professional status of teachers; it seems as if they face more disadvantages than people in almost any other profession.

I will bring home an example. If you take the Premier and the President of the Royal College of Physicians, people will say "there go two doctors". It is recognised that the practitioner and the specialist have had the same basic training, and both of them are doctors, using that term. However, it is not so in the teachers' profession. If you take a teacher from the elementary school and set that teacher next to the Principal of the University College of the West Indies, nobody points at them and says: "there go two teachers;" he will say "there goes an elementary

teacher and there goes Professor Lewis." Why should there be this difference in status? Why should we look upon any two doctors as doctors and not upon any two teachers as teachers? However eminent doctors may become, all doctors have a certain basic training given to them which is not shortened in any emergency. In the case of the teachers, we are saying that we want these teachers to enjoy professional status; and any short cutting put in the way which does not help, will not do well for the profession itself.

I have grave doubts that you can train a teacher properly in one year. As a matter of fact, I doubt whether he could be trained in three years. Anybody who aspires to teaching, if he or she is to be successful, he or she needs a good all-round education. You need training which basically you would be given if you were studying for a University Degree. I make no distinction in the types of school teachers. The Elementary teacher needs no less training than the teacher who is going to teach secondary school children.

I would be sorry to see that there is an excuse for cutting down training which renders a person less competent and at the same time brings a down going in professional status. What I am asking the Minister now is very relevant. As I understand it, a properly-trained teacher should be able to teach any kind of pupil within limits. Mentally defective persons would require a sort of special training, but I am not referring to them. Is it possible so to train a teacher in one year that he can teach arithmetic to infants and seniors in secondary schools or to any one kind of pupil? Is one year sufficient for that? Would not the nature of the task be so great as to require much more experience?

If a teacher knows that in consequence of this short period of training, he has got to do an examination which will qualify him as a trained teacher, would he not be tempted to take the narrowest possible view of the work and do the minimum which would satisfy the examiners so that he could get a certificate of training? This certificate would not be any great guarantee that the teacher would be trained. Today teachers who do well in the secondary schools of this island would run ten miles or further before they would explain the multiplication table to children of the ages of six or seven; they have not got the technique for teaching juniors and yet, in another sphere they will be good. Some of them understand quite a lot about teaching, both theoretically and practically; are you asking us to believe that in one year you can do for a teacher what even some of them, because of a one-year course, did not do? This is a matter on which we should like to have the fullest possible assurance because much is at stake.

When you have finished this Erdiston Training and you turn out people who are not professionally qualified, you have turned them out without claims to status. The whole group of poorly-trained teachers will be reflected in the generation of people whom they teach. Apart from the formal teacher training, there is nothing better than for him to get a good general experience as a Solicitor's Clerk, an attendant in a store in the City, or a foreman in Public Works or something like that. These are public works which bring him into contact with people; and nothing helps teacher-training more than a good general understanding of human nature. To do a thing like that and give the teachers a broad, basic outlook, you have to do much more than provide a one-year course. If this course is really so good that it is justifying itself, that, in itself, is an argument for extending it because it can be made better. My experience is that as regards any young person entering for the first time into the teaching service, he cannot profit from a one-year course. If there is one thing I am sure the Minister understands, it is that; if he does not understand it, then his experience has gone for nothing.
1.15 p.m.

You cannot teach people properly unless you know much more than they do about the subject under discussion; that is a truism. The old time theory that you only have to be one lesson, or one page ahead of the pupil is as disastrous as it can possibly be. Now it seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that possibly the greatest defect of the present method might well be that a teacher who wants to teach English, Arithmetic, History or General Science will have to learn a little bit more about the subject to broaden and deepen his or her knowledge before he can begin to impart it. In the course of a year, how is the teacher to extend his own knowledge of the subject and still find time to understand how it should be imparted?

Mr. Chairman, there are half a dozen ways of teaching Arithmetic. I, as a teacher of History, know that there are four different methods which you can use in imparting a grasp of historical ideas to pupils. With the variety which training calls for, I wonder how it can be done in a year, and that is why I am so interested in this course. I want to know exactly what is being done, and it seems to me that the younger the teacher is the more training he or she needs. A one-year course therefore seems to me to have great justification for the older teachers; they are the people who have had practical experience and who for the most part have had an all round general experience of life; and a little brushing up and a little refreshing of teaching methods would help them. For the young people it seems to me that there is a difference in that the one-year course offers. I would therefore like to hear the Minister in some detail on the difference between the two courses. I would like him to give an interim report of the present one-year course, because that started in September or October and presumably will finish in June or July. This is a convenient point at which he can tell us whether it has justified itself.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to know, too, the sort of teachers who are selected for this course, whether the practice-teaching they do is as much or as little as what would have been done in the two-year course; and, if it is not as much, what proportion of the whole year's course of study is devoted to practice-teaching. I would like also to know whether the course permits teachers to be trained in the various methods of presenting their subjects; whether there is any time left in the course for training of teaching different age ranges of pupils. In other words, what is the extent of the course, how does it compare with the one which it has surplanted, and what does it show now of progress or of failure?

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I agree with the hon. senior member for St. Lucy in this matter of the teachers training college. I have been doing some research work, and found a document among other documents of about 33 years ago - the present Premier would have in those days been associated with the Association which was then talking about workmen's compensation - and among the things they talked about was compulsory education.

Now what I would like to know since there is such a fundamental thing as compulsory education.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: This has nothing to do with compulsory education. This is a supplementary provision.

Mr. WALCOTT: I do not care if it is a supplementary estimate. I am going to say that there should be compulsory education in Barbados. Nobody is going to stop me from saying that.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am not going to entertain any debate on compulsory education.

Mr. WALCOTT: You cannot prevent it. If you really understand the Rules and the position of this, on what basis are you going to prevent it? The Minister said that there is a model school at Erdiston which will no longer be used as a model school, but the teachers will go to elementary schools, the names of which he started calling out. How then can you say that you are not going to entertain this debate? Sometimes the Chairman makes one lose his temper, especially when he comes to this Chamber and does not know how a Resolution should be proceeded with. That brings the House of Assembly into serious disrepute. It inflicts upon a member the duty of respecting the Chair when the Chair is ignorant as to what should be done.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You are now launching an attack on the Chair.

Mr. WALCOTT: Because it is so incompetent.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I said I am not going to entertain any full-dress debate on compulsory education.

Mr. WALCOTT: No Chairman has any right telling any person what he is going to entertain. He has to listen to the speech. What you are going to entertain is your personal affairs. I got up to speak and you are telling me what you are not going to entertain. What am I to do with that? If I break the Rules of the House you have to act, but what you propose to entertain is a matter for you.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will you listen to the Chair now? I repeat I am not going to entertain any full-dress debate on compulosry education. Any reference to compulsory education which is in my opinion related to this Resolution is all right; but if you are going to launch a full-dress debate on compulsory education, I am going to rule you out of order.

Mr. WALCOTT: Do you realise what you are saying? Before I begin to speak, you are telling me that if I am going to do so and so what you are going to do. What kind of judge are you? You have been to the United Kingdom on a Parliamentary course. What has it done for you if you come back here completely incompetent as to what is to take place? (A VOICE: Order.) Order, my neck!

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am speaking to the hon. senior member for St. Peter. You are travelling close on breaking the Rules of the House.

Mr. WALCOTT: We are bound to break the Rules of the House when we have these incompetent Chairmen.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: When you break them, I will deal with you.

Mr. WALCOTT: Oh, yes. I am quite prepared to be dealt with. I do not want you to hypothesize as to what I am going to do.

Thirty-three years ago a document was published in which the Premier of Barbados agreed at that time that there should be compulsory education; and I am saying that it is lamentable today in 1961 to find the same person who never dreamed that he might have been in the position he is today, with more control and more power, tinkling with the teachers training college and giving a one-year course. You are training these teachers, but the children who go to these schools can leave school at 8, 9 or 10 years of age half-baked to go out into a world like this.

There was a statement made by the former Director of Education which involved the Cabinet and the Government of Barbados, to the effect that this Government was not in favour of compulsory education. This gentleman, Mr. Moffet, could go to England and make the statement which he has made, condemning the very idea that compulsory education is anything that should be introduced in Barbados. If we in this community are struggling towards self-Government.....
1.25 p.m.

Hon. M. E. COX: I rise on a point of order. I would just like to quote May's Parliamentary Procedure for the benefit of the Committee. On page 715, on Supplementary and Excess Grants, it states:-

"Debate on supplementary and excess grants is restricted to the particulars contained in the estimates on which those grants are sought, and to the application of the items which compose those grants; and the debate cannot touch the policy or the expenditure sanctioned, on other heads, by the estimate on which the original grant was obtained, except so far as such policy or expenditure is brought before the Committee by the items contained in the supplementary of excess estimates."

Mr. WALCOTT: Now, the hon. member got up on a point of order to interrupt, but he has only advertised his ignorance of what he has read. He does not understand the word "policy" or "dealing with something different"; this deals with the same thing which you are talking about. You are talking on the Erdiston Training College which is bound up with the teaching of school children; and the point which I am making is, with the broad training of teachers for all these schools, by law there should be compulsory education. A child should not come to school on a voluntary basis.

Hon. M. E. COX: That is exactly what I have just said. The debate cannot touch on the policy of expenditure.

Mr. WALCOTT: You are not expending money on compulsory education. There is nothing which can prevent me from saying that you are passing money for travelling allowance for teachers, and that these teachers should be training every child, and that that should be bound by law to go to school. If that is something which Government does not think should be done, it is your business to say so. If the Hon. Minister and the whole Government can underwrite the statement made by Mr. Moffet, that is their business. Do not tell me that I have no right to speak on it.

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to have a debate as to whether there should be compulsory education or not, but we are voting this money for the Teachers' Training College and there is a serious gap in our education. That is something which you cannot ignore. Therefore, whenever a vote on education comes up, I am going to make this statement until such time as we have compulsory education enacted in Barbados.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member will not be singing a solo on this; it is one of the things on which I feel very strongly. I personally agree with the Government's stand on having a one-year course of training for teachers. I do not object to it and I support this part of the Resolution. It is plain commonsense that, if you have not got enough teachers and you have children coming out of grammar schools with the necessary qualifications, but no training, and you want teachers, what is the point of pursuing a two-year course? It does not matter for proper training. If you really need teachers — and there is a dearth of teachers in the country, what are you going to do? As far as I am concerned, it is expedient and the correct thing to do once the Government and the Hon. Minister of Education felt there is a dearth of teachers.

On the other hand, I must say that I do not agree with the Hon. Leader of the House as regards his citation of that part of May's. How can anybody resist the temptation to speak on compulsory education when speaking on this matter? If something is near and dear to your heart, if you feel that education is to free people and that everybody should be put in the position that they can learn to read and write, why then can you not give support to compulsory education.

Sir, you have been into politics long enough. You can well remember that one of the first planks in the platform of progressive people in this country — and the Hon. Premier can testify of this — was, among other things, compulsory education. Everybody, as a matter of fact, agreed that there should be compulsory education. The first time I heard the Hon. Minister of Agriculture spoke, I heard him mad on compulsory education; and that was long before he was in this House. He was a member of the Democratic League at that time.

Sir, originally, you had no training at all for teachers; then you had your Rawle Institute; then you did away with your Rawle Institute and had your Erdiston Training College. It was a one-year training course at first and then it was a two-year course. It is now a one-year course again. I have gone into a school and saw eighty children with one teacher. The wise thing for Government to do if they want more teachers is to cut down the course; but, on the other hand, I do not think the wise thing to do is not to have compulsory education.

When I go through the Governor's speech from the Throne and I see the absence of anything as regards compulsory education, I am moved to think that somebody is underwriting or endorsing what Mr. Moffet said in England. I have sat and discussed things with Mr. Moffet, and I did

tell him that my greatest desire, no matter what it costs, is compulsory education; and, after that, looking after old people. Compulsory education is something in my considered opinion which that Government especially should bring into being. Of course, it is argued that we have the highest standard literacy in the West Indies. (Mr. WALCOTT: That is a joke.) It is no joke from the point of view of reading and writing. Any Government which thinks it can fool people by saying that it offers you education whereby you can learn to read and write and it is free, then I say that it is also doing a disservice to the people when the education is not made compulsory.
1.35 p.m.

Some of the greatest Negroes in history started their education late. How could any Government, especially this Government, decide that it would make a splash of headlines in the *Beacon* about free Secondary Education.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I cannot allow the hon. member to go in for any full-dress debate on this matter; he has already made reference to it.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am coming back to the point. I think Government is right in this case, because I have visited the schools in the municipal area and, if they continue with a two-year course, there will be 120 children in one class and a supernumerary. If you have the material, I think that you could reduce the course. A professedly Socialist Government talks about free secondary education and you have not yet got compulsory education! I would prefer to know that every Barbadian child could read and write than to know that a few children were selected for free secondary education.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is attempting a full-dress debate on free secondary education and compulsory education.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am not attempting to do that. We all stray.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is what I am trying to prevent you from doing.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am supporting the Resolution. I feel that the Government is doing what is right.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I rise to support this supplementary amount of $350. The Minister has already set out to implement the policy which he has laid down, and as a result of that, travelling is necessary. While I am agreeing to this amount, while agreeing that under the present emergency owing to the dearth of teachers, this course has been reduced from a two-year course to a one-year course, I feel that the Minister should also try to maintain the standards and not, as a matter of convenience, turn his back on standards altogether. I feel that a two-fold scheme should be worked out. I am wondering whether, in the case of young teachers, a two-year course should be allowed to remain; and in the case of older teachers, a one-year course would not be ample owing to their experience. If the Minister could work out a scheme like that, having two different sets of teachers being trained, it may be possible for the younger teachers to attend Erdiston for an extra year.

The Model School is being used, but it cannot accommodate all the teachers who are being trained. I should like to hear the Minister on that point.

Hon. L. St.A. THORNE: Mr. Chairman, I have listened very attentively to the criticisms which have been levelled by the various speakers, and I do appreciate the interest which they are showing; they are deeply interested in the educational development of this country. Be that as it may I am forced to say that hon. members have not been able to give sufficient study to the matter which is before us; or perhaps, in a desire to criticise, they have only just got up and spoken without giving careful study to what they wanted to say.

Let me deal with the hon. senior member for St. Lucy first; I appreciate the interest which he is taking in the matter. I do not like to say harsh things, but I would say with deep sorrow and regret at having to say it, that this is the first occasion on which I have heard the hon. member being so poor on this subject. In the course of his remarks the hon. member took an example; he compared the teacher with the doctor. He said that no doctor could be expected to be a better doctor if you were to reduce the time of his study from six years to three years. The hon. member does not see how a teacher could be a better teacher if you reduce his training course from two years to one. That sounds quite reasonable on the face of it; but the hon. member did not remember that the teachers whom we are sending to Erdiston are persons who have been teaching already. Nobody goes to Erdiston unless he has had some years of teaching before.
1.45 p.m.

No individual who essays to become a doctor can start to practise before he is qualified; but teachers are people who are pursuing a job of work, so the comparisons would be rather odious. What I am trying to do is to give those teachers who are already employed a greater idea of the science and art of teaching than they at present possess.

The hon. member is rather anxious with respect to the lowering of standards. No teacher as far as I know, can enter the teaching service today unless he possesses five subjects at "O" level in the G.C.E. - the same qualifications which enables him to enter the clerical branch of the Civil Service.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order. I should not like that to go unnoticed. I would like to correct him by saying that depending on the subjects there can be four, two of them being English and Mathematics. I would not like him to go on the record as saying five subjects and then have it taken up outside the House. I think, Sir, with the greatest respect to the Minister that you must have four subjects and not five, two of which must be English and Mathematics.

Hon. L. St.A. THORNE: I should like to thank the hon. senior member for the City, but I think he was a bit too premature. I was speaking of the first category; you must either have five subjects of the G.C.E. at "O" level or four subjects, one being at Advanced level.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of explanation. I would not like the hon. member to think I am taking him off, but it is with great respect to the hon. member that I am doing this; otherwise, I would wait until he sits down and draw it to his attention. I repeat again, that the qualification is four subjects at Ordinary level.

Hon. L. St.A. THORNE: Mr. Chairman, there is nothing to argue about where that is concerned. All it means is that I can look up the Regulations. The specific point I want to make, however, is that the same qualification which entitles an individual to enter the teaching service and to work in a Primary or Secondary Modern School would entitle the same individual to work in a Grammar School.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Could we hear that again?

Hon. L. St.A. THORNE: There are teachers who enter the service and are qualified on their entry to work in Grammar Schools.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Depending on the subjects.

Hon. L. St.A. THORNE: Teachers who are on List "A" can work in Grammar Schools if they are vacancies; and the same people would be qualified to enter the clerical branch of the Civil Service. We are not really anxious at the moment over the academic side of these teachers; the minimum of academic attainment which they must possess before they can be appointed is taken reasonably good care of. The fact, however, is that they lack the science and art of imparting knowledge; and so this emergency course has been tailored to suit the situation by placing emphasis on the professional side.

The hon. senior member for St. Lucy complained that he approached the Director of Education asking for a copy of the syllabus and was told certain things; he cannot say that he approached the Minister and asked for a syllabus and was turned down. There is nothing we have to hide. If you want to get a copy of the syllabus of the work being done at Erdiston College, you should apply to the Minister of Education and he will see that you get a copy.

Mr. TUDOR: On a point of order. I think I should draw to the Minister's attention that at the time when I asked the Director for a copy of the syllabus, he said he could only give it to me if the Minister approved. I have not since then received it, and I took it for granted that no approval was given to it.

Hon. L. St.A. THORNE: I am very sorry the hon. member has taken that for granted because, he has given the lie to a statement he made earlier. He said he was refused; he did not say that the Director said he would refer it to me.

Mr. TUDOR: On a point of order. I did not say that the Director referred me to the Minister; the Director told me that he would have to clear it with the Minister.

Hon. L. St.A. THORNE: Because of the fact that the Director told you he would have to clear it with the Minister, he did not tell you that he had cleared it with the Minister and the Minister had refused; therefore, you cannot take things like that for granted in a matter like this. No mention was made so far as I recollect of your need to me.

There seems to be a lurking suspicion that we have reduced standards; and the only thing that is going perhaps to satisfy the hon. senior member for St. Lucy, is for him to get an opportunity of seeing the course which is being run now, to compare it with the two-year course. Only then he might be able to have some sort of consolation.

I assure this Hon. House that the institution of an emergency course of teacher-training at Erdiston is nothing novel; it is something that has had to be done in various parts of the world to meet a need; so you need not be worried. I think I know what I am doing. Some person may say that he introduced so and so, but your humble servant does not care who gets the honour. I can do anything and let anybody else go about and get the praise; but I am assuring you that all I want to see is the right thing being done at the right time for the people.

Mr. Chairman, this is the best thing we can do under the circumstances; commonsense tells you that. If we do not do this, you will have your schools being run in the majority by people who are inexperienced and know nothing about the art of teaching; but if we make provision for persons to learn something about the art of teaching, I do not see we are doing anything wrong. Coming back to this matter of training, the hon. member feels that we should have a two-year or three-year course. I could not agree with him more.

1.55 p.m.

I hope that the time is not far distant when we will be able to revert to the two-year course, or possibly introduce a three-year course. No teacher comes into Erdiston fresh from school to undergo training. First of all, he works in some place and only after a few years is he drafted for training at Erdiston.

This course at Erdiston is not the only preparation which we have made with a view of getting rid of the backlog. We are running a special course of training for teachers who are over 40 years, and who by reason of force of circumstances, would not find it possible to take the course at Erdiston; and the teachers themselves testify of the great value which they are deriving from this training course. The proof of the pudding is in the taste. And if you get if from the trainees that they are getting immense benefit from the training course, what more proof you want to its effectiveness?

In so far as staff is concerned for the teaching of this one-year course, it is better than it was before. We have got eight members on the staff now as against five; and these persons who are working are all persons who are knowledgeable, who have had training, and who have been tested, tried, and have proved themselves worthwhile. There is no need to worry about staff.

With the introduction of change as this is, it is known that the average Barbadian by birth is a person who is averse to change — I myself included — but this is the glorious thing about Barbadians: When you introduce your change, as soon as he sees a gleam or worthwhileness in it, he agrees with it. I can assure hon. members that it is going to become so in so far as this course is concerned. I am positively sure. Hon. members must credit me with a little knowledge. I would say this in all meekness and humility: I would be the last man to advocate anything which would be injurious to the educational system of Barbados. Let me say that education is our greatest asset.

SUSPENSION

Mr. CHAIRMAN left the Chair and Mr. SPEAKER took the Chair.

Mr. SPEAKER: It now being 2.00 p.m. of the clock, this sitting now stands suspended until 2.30 p.m.

2.00 p.m.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to draw to your attention that there is no quorum and ask that the Bell be rung.

The Bell was rung and a quorum was obtained.

QUESTION TIME

PUPILS OF THE FIFTH FORM OF ST. MICHAEL'S GIRLS WRITING L.C.C.

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 9.

Mr. TUDOR: To enquire of the Hon. Minister of Education:

"Will the Minister state what decision, if any, he has reached with respect to 5th Form pupils of St. Michael's Girls' School who did not write the London Chamber of Commerce Examinations in July, 1960?"

Hon. L. St.A. THORNE: As soon as the Governing Body of the St. Michael's Girls' School was informed that the pupils of Form VB had not been entered for the L.C.C. Summer Examination, it took appropriate steps to remedy the oversight. The matter was discussed with the pupils; and their parents were invited to see the Headmistress, if they so desired. Twenty-eight of the thirty-four pupils involved would have been returning in September, 1960, in any eventuality. The remaining six who were over age were given permission by the Governing Body to return to school to take the Autumn Examination. All thirty-four pupils were therefore entered for the L.C.C. Autumn Examination. I am satisfied that the Governing Body acted promptly in the matter.

Mr. TUDOR: First of all, Mr. Speaker, can the Hon. Minister tell us what was responsible for this unfortunate lapse?

Hon. L. St.A. THORNE: I was given to understand that the lapse occurred as a result of an oversight on the part of the Headmistress.

Mr. TUDOR: Would the Hon. Minister state what was the nature of the oversight?

Hon. L. St.A. THORNE: The explanation given me was that apparently the forms got lost among other documents.

Mr. TUDOR: Does the Hon. Minister know whether the Governing Body has taken steps to prevent a similar occurence?

Hon. L. StA. THORNE: I would say that the Headmistress was severely reprimanded on the matter. She expressed very deep regret and so on.

Mr. TUDOR: With respect to the children who were allowed to come back to school until the time to write the Autumn Examination, would they be asked to pay fees?

Hon. L. St.A. THORNE: As far as I know, they have paid the fees.

Mr. TUDOR: Since it was no fault of theirs that they did not write the previous examination at the appropriate time, would the Hon. Minister recommend to the Governing Body that these children do not pay the fees?

Hon. L. StA. THORNE: That matter of fees was carefully gone into. I think I am speaking quite correctly when I observe that some of the students were given to understand — as a matter of fact the Chairman of the Governing Body has given me to understand — that the Governing Body had made provision which would take care of any girl or girls who have suffered as a result of not sitting the examination at that time, and, as a result of coming back to school; but no application was made for assistance. If any application should be made, such application would be considered. The parents were informed of what had taken place. Nobody asked for any remittance, and we took it that the matter was in perfect order.
2.35 p.m.

Mr. BRANCKER: Does the Minister agree that, in the circumstances, it would be fair and equitable for fees to be remitted to such pupils who had to return to the school in order to sit the examination, through no fault of their own, but through the negligence of the Headmistress in question?

Hon. L. StA. THORNE: If I take a broad view of the situation, I would be prepared to say that children do not only go to school in order to prepare for examinations. I am sure that those students who had to return to school and got additional instruction, have not made any claim; and why should anybody say that justice should be done when the students themselves did not say so?

Mr. TUDOR: How can the Minister say that justice was done in view of what he said previously?

Hon. L. St.A. THORNE: I was referring to the question of the remittance of fees.

NEW FACULTIES AT THE UNIVERSITY COLLEGE OF THE WEST INDIES

Mr. SPEAKER: The next question ready to be dealt with is Question No. 14, standing in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Philip. I observe that the hon. member is not now in his place.

ERECTION OF SCHOOL IN DELAMERE LAND

Mr. SPEAKER: The next question ready to be dealt with is Question No. 15, standing in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Lucy.

Mr. TUDOR: To enquire of the Hon. Minister of Education:

1. Will the Minister state whether it is the Government's intention to erect a School in Delamere Land area in St. Michael?

2. If the answer is "yes", will he state

(a) what kind of School it will be,

(b) where it will be sited,

(c) whether negotiations have been entered into for the acquisition of the site,

(d) what the cost of the land will be?

Hon. L. St.A. THORNE: In reply to the question asked by the hon. member, I am to say that the possibility of the erection of a school in the Delamere Land Area is being explored. (a) It will be a replacement for the St. Ambrose Girls' School. (b) The location has not been definitely fixed. (c) Preliminary enquiries have been made. (d) The price is not yet known.

Mr. TUDOR: I thank the Minister for his answer. I should like to ask what is the trouble with the St. Ambrose Girls' School at the moment?

Hon. L. St.A. THORNE: That school is rather overcrowded.

VACANCIES OF INSTRUCTORS AT THE TECHNICAL INSTITUTE

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Question ready to be dealt with also stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Lucy.

Mr. TUDOR: To enquire of the Hon. Minister of Education:

Will the Minister state

(a) How many vacancies exist for Instructors at the Technical Institute?

(b) Whether any applications have been received?

(c) Whether any of these are from suitably qualified Barbadians at present overseas?

Hon. L. St.A. THORNE: In reply to the hon. member I am to say that there are four vacancies of which three are at present filled by acting appointments made from the ranks of trainee instructors. Some applications have been received. One application comes from a suitably qualified Barbadian who is at present overseas. It is hoped that he will be soon available.

Mr. TUDOR: Of the three who are acting, are any of them qualified to fill a vacancy?

Hon. L. St.A. THORNE: Speaking offhand, I would be inclined to say that there is that possibility. I think that there is a Mr. Blackman who has reached a sufficiently high standard of attainment which would more or less qualify him.

Mr. TUDOR: With respect to the suitably-qualified Barbadian overseas, would the Minister say what stands in the way of his appointment, if he has applied for a post?

Hon. L. St.A. THORNE: As far as I know, he is somewhere in the Middle East. He is very desirous of coming here; but it has not yet been found possible to relieve him from his duties which he is at present performing. As a matter of fact, we would be glad if he could come here right away.

Mr. TUDOR: In view of the urgency of the matter, will the Minister consider taking steps to contact whoever employs him in order to see whether he could be released as soon as possible so that the work could be proceeded with?

Hon. L. St.A. THORNE: All that ground has been fully covered.

TRAINING AT ERDISTON FOR PRIVATE SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS

Mr. SPEAKER: The next question which is to be dealt with also stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Lucy.

Mr. TUDOR: To enquire of the Hon. Minister of Education:

1. Will the Minister state whether he would be willing to permit persons teaching in Private Secondary Schools to receive Teacher Training at Erdiston College?

2. If the answer is "yes", would he state the circumstances in which he would provide such faculties?

3. If the answer is "no", would he say why not?

Hon. L. St.A. THORNE: In reply to the hon. member, I am to say that under certain conditions there would be no objection to accepting private students at Erdiston College. Admission would depend on a number of factors (a) the qualification of the student (b) the suitability of the course for the student, it being remembered that it is designed particularly for the training of teachers engaged in the teaching of pupils between the ages of five and fourteen, (c) selection by the College (d) the payment by the student of tuition and other fees and (e) availability of places.

Mr. TUDOR: The Minister has not said whether he would consider the matter or not. I would like to know what is his attitude towards it, assuming that all the conditions are fully met in each case.

Hon. L. St.A. THORNE: That goes without saying. I would not have any objection if those conditions could be met.

Mr. TUDOR: In view of the fact that some teachers in secondary schools do teach pupils between the ages of five and fourteen and some of them would be qualified for entry, would the Minister cause his policy to be known and circulated amongst Secondary School Teachers?
2.45 p.m.

Hon. L. St.A. THORNE: If that is desirable I should be willing to do it.

Mr. TUDOR: I am sorry I did not hear that.

Hon. L. St.A. THORNE: I would be willing to do it.

WORKERS AT COMBERMERE SCHOOL

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 7 stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Lucy.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, the question reads as follows:-

"To enquire of the Hon. Minister of Education:

1. Will the Minister state what work was done by Olive Williams and Gertrude Clarke up to October, 1959, at Combermere School?

2. Will he state (a) whether they were required to perform duties additional to their normal work, (b) what those duties were, (c) whether they received extra payment for such work, (d) the amounts due to each, (e) the amounts received by each?"

Hon. L. St.A. THORNE: Mr. Speaker, the answers are as follows:-

Up to October, 1959, Olive Williams and Gertrude Clarke were employed at Combermere School as female labourers. Prior to 1957 they performed certain additional duties; these duties were the cleaning of the sanitary blocks. They received extra payment for the additional work, which after the salary revision in June, 1957, was no longer done by Olive Williams or Gertrude Clarke. The payment due for this work amounted to $174.72 per annum. Each received $87.36 for her share of the additional work.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, is the Minister aware that one of these women, Gertrude Clarke, claims that she received no such payment? Has it been brought to his attention that that is the substance of her complaint?

Hon. L. St.A. THORNE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, that has been brought to my attention. I have been busily engaged in trying to go into the matter. I have had the Headmaster and the Secretary meet me at a meeting sometime about two weeks ago, and from the books which were produced, I was able to discover that one of the workers did not receive what is called "back pay". I am a bit hazy at this moment as to whether the one who is claiming that she did not receive back pay did receive it; but I believe the books did show that this lady, speaking to correction, is the one who received the back pay. I am definitely sure that the books show that only one received back pay.

Mr. TUDOR: Would the Minister say then what would be responsible for such a situation - presumably, if one of them could not sign her name or mark, or if something could not be attached to the Pay Sheet or whatever it was? In other words, I would like the Minister to state whether he has discovered the reason for this strange occurrence; if he has made any investigation into the reason for it, and whether he would care to disclose it.

Hon. L. St.A. THORNE: Mr. Speaker, in the original question which was put to me, I was asked to say what these parties received. I have already said that each of them received $87.36. This question of back pay raises another issue. I would crave your indulgence to remind the hon. member that it would be necessary for me to have a thorough investigation of this section of the question before I could commit myself to the question of back pay.

Mr. TUDOR: I appreciate that, Mr. Speaker, but in view of the fact that one of these women has died, and the other is alive, and it is not certain which received the money, how does the Minister propose, and what machinery is he going to set in motion, to get to the bottom of this matter? If it is not going to be between himself and the Governing Body, how does he propose to straighten it out?

Hon. L. St.A. THORNE: My proposal is to refer the payment to the Governing Body asking that they investigate the situation and report to me their findings.

LABORATORY ATTENDANT AT COMBERMERE SCHOOL

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 19 stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Lucy.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, the question reads as follows:-

"To enquire of the Hon. Minister of Education:

1. Will the Minister state whether the dismissal of the Laboratory Attendant at Combermere School has been drawn to his attention?

2. Has the Minister received a Report on the matter from the Governing Body of the School?

3. Will the Minister state the circumstances leading to the dismissal of this Officer?"

Hon. L. St.A. THORNE: Mr. Speaker, normally the dismissal of one of its servants by the Governing Body would not be reported to me; but, in consequence of the questions, inquiries have been made. The answer to whether the Minister has received a report on the matter from the Governing Body of the School is "yes".

The next question is whether the Minister would state the circumstances leading to the dismissal of the officer. The circumstances are that the Laboratory Attendant who was employed on a month to month basis only, was the subject of a number of complaints over a long period. On investigating a charge of insubordination arising from his failure to carry out the instructions of the Science Master, the Governing Body decided to dispense with his services.

Mr. TUDOR: Is it not a fact, Mr. Speaker, that the incident leading to the dismissal had to do with the refusal of this officer to clean up vomit which had been left by the master in charge after a party?

Hon. L. St.A. THORNE: Mr. Speaker, I was not a member of the party, nor has anybody told me about the occurrence to which the hon. member has just referred.

Mr. TUDOR: Would the Minister say whether it has been brought to his knowledge that the officer concerned was not allowed to defend himself, nor was not given a written statement of the charges preferred against him?

Hon. L. St.A. THORNE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have had that brought to my attention in a letter brought or posted to my office by the Laboratory Attendant.

Mr. TUDOR: In view of the fact then that that was brought to the Minister's attention, did he not think of investigating what would have been a serious miscarriage of justice if the facts as outlined to him in the letter were proved to be true — that the man was dismissed without having been heard in his own defence?

Hon. L. St.A. THORNE: Mr. Speaker, I am to say that I asked the Department some time ago to forward the letter which was written to me, and to make some sort of attempt to get the officer's wishes acceded to, but I have not heard anything more about that.
2.55 p.m.

Mr. TUDOR: It is within the power of the Minister now to implore upon the Government Department to hold another meeting, since there is some suspicion of injustice, and for the case to be tried properly, so to speak, so that the man can be heard in his own defence.

Hon. L. St.A. THORNE: I will promise the hon. member to give some attention to this.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

RESOLUTION re APPOINTMENT OF COMMISSION OF ENQUIRY INTO LABOUR EXCHANGE

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order under Private Members' Business is to resume debate on a Resolution re the appointment of a Commission of Enquiry to look into the workings of the Labour Exchange. On the last occasion, the hon. junior member for St. John was speaking when Government Business was resumed.

Mr. WALCOTT: The Resolution stands in my name and the question can be put; but if the Hon. Minister speaks, I will reserve my right to reply.

Hon. M. E. COX: Sir, I do not know if the hon. member feels that the Government should not say something on this matter, or answer the charges made by the hon. member or other members who have spoken on this matter. I would like to say from the outset that I am not in favour of this Resolution moved by the hon. member for St. Peter. My reason for that is simple; and I shall not tire this House because, frankly speaking, I do not think that the allegations have to any extent been proved. It is not necessary in my opinion to have an enquiry.

What does the hon. member complain of? The hon. member complains that there has been bribery, corruption or whatever you care to call it in the Department. He said that he would be willing to give evidence on what was reported to him as regards the misconduct of some officer or officers of that Department. If an hon. member of this House, or any member of the public, knows of any dishonesty, any corruption or crookery which exist in Government circles, that individual should report that matter to the Attorney General. There is a law on the Statute Book which governs the behaviour of people in the community. If the hon. member will remember, quite recently there was an enquiry into the behaviour of the Vestry of St. Lucy; charges were made; and the Commissioner of the Enquiry pointed out at the time to the individual against whom these charges were made, that it was a matter for the Attorney General whether he would prosecute or not. That is the position as exists today.

The particular Resolution reads as follows:-

"BE IT RESOLVED that this House call upon the Government to set up a Commission of Enquiry to investigate all aspects of the operation of the Labour Exchange."

If corruption is practised by a member of this House, or by a member of the Government, or anybody for that matter, that person is not immuned from prosecution by the Government. Both the Judiciary and the Legal Department, have been put in an independent position so that at any time a prosecution can be brought against anybody in the community by the Attorney General, if the Attorney General feels convinced that a case has been made out. My answer to the question of having an enquiry into this Department is that, since legislation already exists whereby people who misconduct themselves can be prosecuted if members know of it, all that is necessary is for the individual who has the information to pass it on to the Legal Department. It is absolutely unnecessary to have any enquiry.

If I may develop the trend of the argument used by the hon. members who asked for this enquiry, I would say, speaking for myself, I can have no objection; I could not care less whether there is an enquiry or not; but on the facts that have been presented to this House, I am not convinced that there should be an enquiry. No instances have been quoted; there were just a few generalisations of what purports to have taken place which were put to this House.

I have had the unhappy experience myself in hearing from one or two people that demands were made at the Department on them to produce money. When I went into the matter thoroughly with the individuals who were laying those charges, I discovered that the individuals were ignorant of the procedure which obtained in that Department; that is, if an individual is leaving for the United Kingdom, for an example, the Government advances the individual a loan up to $360, but that individual has to produce or show to the Labour Department that he has $72. He has to deposit the $72 there; and when he gets on the other side, he receives that $72, that is to say when he reaches England. The Officer may say to you: "you have to give me $72," but, it is not for his personal benefit. I agree that the cases were not many, but these are the cases represented to me.
3.05 p.m.

A man told me of $54 which he had to carry in. All that happened was that his passage money was less than what was anticipated, and there was the difference between $72 and $54; instead of the deposit being $72, the Labour Commissioner was asking him to deposit $54. All of these things I have to explain. It may be easy for an individual to approach a member of this House and say that people have told him to bring some money, but I had to go a little further and pull out the individual in order to find out how much money he was asked to bring in and why he was asked to bring in this money.

I am aware that there has been, from time to time, cases of people who masquerade as agents of shipping companies and so on. I am also convinced that there have been cases where money has been taken from people by others who promise to send them abroad and the culprits who take the money, got away scot free. We have all heard of cases and cases which took place from time to time years ago when certain people in this community were robbed. No doubt, unfortunately, many years ago we have had one or two dismissals at the Labour Department in the case of two people who got into trouble along those lines.

From my experience in recent years, I may say that I have not been convinced that this is the case today. As a matter of fact, if anybody came to me and said: "I am asked to produce money", I would ask: "Who asked you to produce that money; how much did they ask you for?" and so on. I have always told the individual concerned that if the Government could get one case of this dishonesty or the case of a civil employee taking money from people

in order to get them to any place, or do them any favour which lies within his job, the Government will unhesitatingly have such an employee dismissed. We do not want any dishonest or corrupt people in the Government Service. No case has ever been represented; there may be cases, but I do not know of them. The difficulty is in proving these allegations.

Mr. Speaker, if I may be allowed to digress for a minute, when I was a member of the Hospital Board, people brought many cases of bad treatment to me. I remember telling an individual to put down something in writing and I would be prepared to fight his case. The individual said: " I cannot give you anything because I may have to go into the Hospital again"; I replied that I may have to go the Hospital too, but I was prepared to take the risk. The individual said: "I am not going to write anything" and I told him that in that case I could do nothing. This is a similar thing to what the hon. member posed.

If anybody is bold enough to go to a member and tell him that Mr. "X" demanded money so as to send him to the United States of America, Canada, England, Trinidad, or wherever it is, that individual should be prepared to go to the Attorney General and become a witness for the prosecution. If you have an enquiry and somebody gives evidence to the effect that Mr. "X" is guilty of something, you put him in Court and you will have two exercises instead of one. When the Commissioner in that case in St. Lucy said that it is a matter for the Attorney General to prosecute, that is so. Why should you have all of this enquiry which wastes time so as to get evidence from the same people who complain that they had been asked to put up money in order to get to England, when they would normally have to go into Court in order to get a person who violated the law convicted? It is a simple matter as I said. I have heard many accusation; I am sorry that the hon. junior member for St. John is not here. Of course, I am accustomed to him; there can be nothing truthful in anything he says.

Mr. SPEAKER: I ask the hon. member to withdraw those words; that is a reflection on an hon. member who is not even in his place.

Hon. M. E. COX: I withdraw those words. What is the hon. senior member for St. Lucy getting up for?

Mr. TUDOR: Apart from the resentment of what the Hon. Minister said in the absence of the hon. junior member for St. John, how do I get into the debate?

Hon. M. E. COX: The hon. member attempted to bob up.

Mr. SPEAKER: I ask the hon. member to withdraw those words.

Hon. M. E. COX: I have done so.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member says that he has done so.

Hon. M. E. COX: These things go on record in the debates, and one has to read what is said and the replies to what is said. Even although the hon. junior member for St. John is not in his place....

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is not here; and what is in the record is in the record.

Hon. M. E. COX: On the last occasion the hon. member spoke and said a lot of things which cannot bear examination. I put it mildly in that way.
3.15 p.m.

As far as the Labour Department is concerned, it is not covered by any umbrella of law different from anybody else; not even the Minister. Many years ago, even before there was Ministerial Government, there were people who would at times come and ask you to do something for them, and they believed that the only way it could be done was if they forked out a piece of change. I have had that experience; and see it morning, noon and night; but thank God I have always been able to resist the temptation whether it involves thousands of pounds, a pound or a cent. It is true that all do not resist; but I am able to do so because I have always said, whether or not it may sound like boasting, that I must be in a position at all times to speak freely against my colleague or my worst enemy. People have come to me and told me that they have given Mr. So-and-So so much money for this or that, but I say that is a matter for him; if I do anything for you I regard it as my political duty to the community; I do not want any recompense.

My last comment, however, is that I am not convinced that there is any necessity for an inquiry into that Department. I have found the majority of persons engaged in this type of work very hard-working and very conscientious in that field; and they have given very good service indeed, and still are giving very good service; but it is quite easy for an individual with high expectations, hopes, wishes and desires to get out of the island whether to Canada, United States, or any other place, if he does not get out within the time he hopes to get out, or if somebody gets out before him or her as the case may be, to come along and say "Oh well, I know what has happened; that individual who got out before me paid a piece of change and therefore got a chance before me."

When I was in the Ministry of Communications and Works and I had a road repaired, one stupid man once threw something like that at me because one avenue was repaired before his avenue, and he felt that his should have been done first. If I had told him what I felt about him, he would probably be one of my biggest enemies now. If one person gets a move before another person, he is going to conclude that the fellow who had the move paid for it.

It has got to be told to people that, while you have no guarantee on the behaviour of a person, yet at the same time we could not let it be felt that officers in that Department who give such faithful and yeomen service, and especially where sometimes in the night an officer has to go and knock up people so that they can get ready to leave the following day or something like that, are a bunch of crooks or dishonest people and we cannot trust them; that they are robbing the people, taking away their money, selling jobs and things of that nature. It is not fair to them. We cannot let the public and the world feel that that is what obtains, or is the general pattern of things as was trotted out by some members who spoke on this question.

From my observation of the running of that Department, I am convinced that it is well run under the present circumstances. I emphasize "present circumstances" because anybody who has to deal with the Department knows, or ought to know, that the Department is and has been short staffed for a very long time. It is my intention to have the whole Labour Department, the Labour Exchange re-organised in the very near future. I have been for some time, approximately a year, trying to get quarters where all sections of the Labour Department can be housed under one building; and I hope very soon to have that done. That would give better control than what obtains today.

As you know, we have an office at Queen's Park, the Savings section at the back of the Goodwill League behind Queen's College, one office in Synagogue Lane and the other on the Wharf; and, recently, we have had to appeal to the Ministry of Social Services to allow us to use the quarantine buildings at Lands End to have people examined and so on to expedite matters, because it was not possible to accommodate such a large number of persons at the Enmore Health Centre. I hope very soon from now to be able to come to this House with a Resolution for the purchase of some place to house all sections of the Department and put them under one roof, so to speak, so that there can be greater measure of control. I have to admit that the Department as it is today, being here, there and everywhere, does not make

for the best of control and administration. In addition, as I have said earlier, Mr. Speaker, it is a question of having more efficient staff.
3.25 p.m.

Hon. members, especially the hon. senior member for St. Peter would know that some of the best trained staff have gone elsewhere; that we are operating with a skeleton staff; and that we have new persons who have not got long experience in these matters. With this re-organisation, with the purchase of a property or a building which would be able to house everybody, I feel there will be no doubt a very great improvement in the very near future. That is what I can say we are suffering from.

As far as this dishonesty and all that sort of thing which was trotted out, I am not convinced about it; and, as far as this Government is concerned, we are not prepared to have any investigation into the Department. I repeat, if any hon. member of this House or any member of this community knows of any dishonesty that obtains, there is a law on the Statute Book to punish those persons; and, I repeat, Civil Servants are not protected and immuned from protection.

I think the hon. senior member for St. Peter will remember that in 1949 the Attorney General made it clear that he had the right to prosecute anybody; and the hon. member knows, without saying so in many words, what it was about. The Attorney General has a right to prosecute from the Prime Minister to anybody down the line as long as the information reaches him; and all that I am saying to the hon. member who said that he would go to Court or a Commission or whatever it is, is to go to the Attorney General and also ask any members of the public who have suffered as a result, to give that information to the Attorney General. I have no doubt that the Attorney General will proffer cases against the individuals who violate the law.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I have to be at pains to deal with the speech which has been made by the Hon. Minister. We are aspiring towards self-government, and the Hon. Minister has shown a complete lack of the knowledge of ministerial functioning within self-government.

Now, if the Hon. Minister regards this as an indictment against him personally, it is not. It was a pity to hear the Hon. Minister with such crass ignorance in his telling an hon. member of this House, as if a member is some fishmonger or court pimp, about pimping around the Attorney General to ask him to prosecute somebody; and that a member was not to use this Chamber where something affects a Department, or say that investigation should be made. Do you believe that the Prime Minister of England, if anyone brought in something asking for an investigation into the Department of the Crown, would tell that person that he must go to the Attorney General as if that person is a court pimp? The Hon. Minister has long associations with lawyers. I have been a member of this House longer than I have been in anything else of a public capacity; and I have made a study of the procedure and rules of parliament; it is within the competence of any member of parliament to raise any matter in parliament which affects the public; and it is within the competence of any member of parliament to ask Government to carry out an enquiry into a Department.

The Hon. Minister gave lessons of his personal life. It is not for me to give any reply as regards the hon. member's character; his character was not under consideration; and if the hon. member sees fit to expunge himself in any way, that is purely a matter for him. In so far as associating me with anything which took place - and you have this vague idea of his saying something about it - I must categorically deny that I have any such knowledge with the hon. member of anything that took place.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I was merely referring to what Mr. Whyatt said in 1949 in respect of a particular matter. The hon. member knows what I mean.

Mr. WALCOTT: I categorically, on the floor of the House, deny any idea of anything that he said the two of us know something about. I am disassociating myself from any knowledge of that. If the hon. member does not know how to speak in the House of Assembly, he must learn.

The Attorney General in Barbados and the Attorney General in Great Britain have the right to prosecute without reference to the Cabinet. Of course, the Cabinet has a right to ask him to withdraw the matter if they see that the matter which the Attorney General would be dealing with, was one which was likely to embarrass the Government. A case like that happened in 1924 when Mr. Ramsay MacDonald was Prime Minister. A case was brought against a Mr. J. R. Campbell and Sir Patrick Hastings was called upon - not openly or directly, but he has in his autobiography said so - to withdraw it although it was a good case to put forward; therefore, it is not a case that all times the Attorney General can deal with the matter. I do not know whether the Hon. Minister wants to castigate the Attorney General.

Hon. M. E. COX: Not in the least. I wonder if the hon. member wants to force me to remind him what it was all about. I refer to Mr. Whyatt and to the incident which took place in 1949 on an occasion at which the hon. member was present.

Mr. WALCOTT: I do not want the hon. member to hold back the slightest information, or to give any vague idea that I am hiding from the hon. member; or that he is keeping a secret for me.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I am trying to bear out my argument that the Attorney General has freedom on information to prosecute in respect of anybody, whether it may be the Prime Minister, the Governor, or whoever the person may be.
3.55 p.m.

Mr. WALCOTT: The question which I am raising is nothing to do with whether the Attorney General was prosecuting or not. What the hon. member has set up as his premise is that the proper course for me to take would be to go to the Attorney General's Office and ask him to prosecute. What I am telling the hon. member is that that is not my function; my function is this: If something is of public interest, and if it is in the public interest that an investigation should take place, I feel it is my right to come here, draw it to the attention of the Government and ask them to carry out an investigation.

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order. The hon. member said that he would go to the Court and give evidence. Surely, if he is willing to go to the Court and give evidence in a case, that case would have to originate with the Attorney General. While the hon. member is saying that he is not a Court this, or a court that, yet he would be quite willing to give evidence for the Crown so as to convict the individual who had done wrong.

Mr. WALCOTT: You would have to conclude from that that the hon. member is crazy; only a crazy man could construe this matter in that way. The hon. member is famous for saying that I would be quite willing to go to the Court and give evidence. I said that I would be willing to give evidence before any Commission of Enquiry which is set up by the Government, and call the name of the person who gave me the information. I have plenty of evidence; and I know that the occasion is going to arise for me to make use of it. I ask for the setting up of a Commission of Enquiry, but what is the hon. member deducing from that? He is deducing that I said I would be willing to go before a Court. I am not going to use the word "servant" and say that it comes from the Latin word "servus"; all the Latin I know is what is found at the back of the dictionary. I do not quote Latin *ad lib*, because it is liable that I may quote what I do not know.

Within the context of a Commission of Enquiry, if the word "Court" is used, it does not mean that it is a Court in which you would prosecute somebody; the reference is to a "Court" in the sense that this House of Assembly is used

as a Court. The hon. member said that people come to you and make these allegations; and what he has been accustomed to do, is to examine these people and interrogate them. I wonder if the hon. member believes that he has to interrogate more people than I have to interrogate; my whole life and job is a series of interrogations. I am a responsible man and I take my responsibility seriously. As I said on the last occasion, I do not go in for any witch-hunting; I am not Senator McCarthy. That is why I refrained from mentioning any names, although names were mentioned to me; the mentioning of names would be prejudicing any investigation which you are likely to make.

Since the hon. member was a Minister of the Government, on the floor of this House he made a statement relative to a Department within his portfolio; that statement was to the effect that dishonesty was being practised in that Department and he had taken steps to correct it. (Hon. M. E. COX: What is that?) I said it loudly and distinctly, but the Minister somehow arrogates to himself the right of making strong statements and serious allegations against people, but unto himself he arrogates purity, honesty, chastity and all the virtues!

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order. Can the hon. member say in what Department I said that there was dishonesty and I would try to straighten it out?

Mr. WALCOTT: Yes, the Housing Authority. The hon. member said that there was in that Department people who were having houses built other than by the method which the Housing Authority approved of. They had these houses sold, and some sort of business like that was being conducted.

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order. I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member. I will not have the right to reply, otherwise I would not interrupt him. As regards the Housing Authority, I may say that those persons who built houses and sold them to workers are completely outside the Department.

Mr. WALCOTT: No, Sir. The hon. member was saying that a person who is responsible to the Department knew about these things.

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order. The hon. member has completely forgotten and misunderstood what I said. I told this House that there were people who were building and selling them to workers through the Department, and I have stopped that. I did not say that that was dishonesty and corruption in the Department; what I said was that house agents were building houses and selling them to agricultural workers through the Department. I stopped that.

Mr. WALCOTT: What is the line of demarcation? You say that there is an irregularity being carried out in the Department which you are controlling.

Hon. M. E. COX: I did not say that. I go further and say this: I had given instructions that the Department must build these houses and sell them. My reasons for doing that is that the profits of the middleman would be eliminated. If an individual built a house, he would not sell it at cost price, whereas the Department would sell it at cost price.

Mr. WALCOTT: Well, we do not want to go right over that. The hon. member is saying that what I said is a fact; that he said on the floor of this House that there was something wrong in connection with this Department. If I had said that before the hon. member said it, he would have been quite willing to carry out an investigation and have the matter straightened out.

Hon. M. E. COX: I object to that. That is a dishonest thing which he has put up before this House. The case of which he thinks is not analogous to his case. It is completely contrary to what I have said, and to what the policy is. 3.45 p.m.

I say that people were building these houses and selling them through the Housing Authority and making a profit, but I stopped that in order to bring the houses to the workers cheaper than what they normally would pay for them. There is no question of dishonesty in that.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, you can clearly see how the hon. member is muddling up himself. He sets up an argument which is my argument; he said that the only thing I have brought to this Chamber in my request to Government to set up an investigation into the Labour Exchange, is the allegation that there is dishonesty. His premise is wrong, so his conclusions are bound to be wrong. You can remember, Mr. Speaker, that the allegations I made were allegations other than that; but now that he proceeds to answer, he starts off by replying to the part of his purity and chastity. I would like him to know that even when he was in charge of a Department, the question of irregularities - and I am using words which can be used in their nicest sense - existed in that Department.

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order. I object to that. I have never complained to the member, or to anybody, about any irregularities.

Mr. WALCOTT: Was it a regular thing for houses to be bought and sold in the Housing Department? Or was it a normal thing for you to make loans to people and therefore houses were erected on the basis that you gave them 25%, saw the frame put up, and then advanced more money? If the hon. senior member for the City was here, he would be able to bear me out to the effect that it was pointed out that Mr. Douglas Haynes who was then Head of Department, was responsible for this; and there was the idea that something hocus-pocus was going on. I did not want to call the gentleman's name. There was the innuendo that this gentleman who was the Head of Department was responsible for these houses being sold, and the middle man was getting the profits and sharing them with other people; and that is why you were going to stop it.

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order. I have never said that.

Mr. WALCOTT: You never said it that way.

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order. I never made a statement to that effect; but if the hon. member wants to say that, it is a matter for him.

Mr. WALCOTT: I just wanted to draw him out; to let him know that there is someone who made that statement. I would say this for him: If there is any person that he dislikes, he would travel around the moon to get him in his dragnet.

Hon. M. E. COX: I would like to object to that. The hon. member should quote again; he claims that I do not like him.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is a little too personal.

Mr. WALCOTT: I believe I am too poor and innocent.

Mr. SPEAKER: That last sentence was personal. You said that the Hon. Minister is such a man that, if he is against you, he will go around the moon to get you in his dragnet.

Mr. WALCOTT: I will withdraw that, but I believe it is universally known. Everybody knows that that is one of his virtues.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us get back to the speech; do not deal with the Minister.

Mr. WALCOTT: The point I am making is that the hon. member started off by saying that the burden of my Resolution is based on my saying that a person is corrupt; and, because there is corruption, therefore you should have an investigation. I did not say that. That is why I said that there should be an investigation into all aspects of the Department. When men were recruited to St. Kitts, they were recruited on the basis that, if they went to St. Kitts, they would be given priority to go to the United States of America; and I

am saying that no person who is recruited has any right to be told that by any Department of Government. Any worker should be recruited on his merits; not on the basis that if he accepts one type of recruitment it would give the opportunity to be recruited elsewhere. That is the allegation which I made and which you have to investigate.

My Resolution reads as follows:-

"BE IT RESOLVED that this House call upon the Government to set up a Commission of Enquiry to investigate all aspects of the operation of the Labour Exchange."

Mr. SPEAKER: I must point out especially to the Minister of Labour that this Resolution is written in very general terms; so I must admit that even if the hon. member did reply to some of the other aspects mentioned by the hon. senior member for St. Peter.....

Hon. M. E. COX: With great respect to Your Honour, I agree that the Resolution is very generally worded. I am not dealing so much with what is in the Resolution; I am dealing with the speech made by the hon. member, because that really brings out the guts, so to speak, of the Resolution - what he really meant, the intent, the purpose behind it, the innuendo and everything. The motive behind the Resolution was in his speech.

I would take this opportunity, with Your Honour's permission, to say that the statement made that if these people went to St. Kitts they would be given priority to go to the United States of America is not true. As a matter of fact, I know that the *Advocate* and other people were telling them that, if they went to St. Kitts, they would not get a chance to go to the United States of America. What we said was that they would not be denied an opportunity of being selected if they went; but we never said that they would be given priority.

Mr. WALCOTT: I did not say "we".

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order. I am speaking for my Department; I know what goes on there. Reports come to me momently as to what goes on there.

Mr. WALCOTT: The Minister is only stupid. He cannot speak for persons, and he cannot undertake to say that... (Hon. M. E. COX: You speak for the Union.) I speak for the Union and not for a person. If one of your servants used some vulgar remark, is it your remark? What we say is that these people were recruited, but the hon. member wants to set up this House to be the Court or the investigating body. I am not asking this House to be the Investigating Committee; I am asking this House to agree that an Investigating Committee should be set up based on the statement put to the House. How could the Minister elect to be Minister, jury and judge in a matter such as this, when it is a matter that should be investigated by an impartial person? 3.55 p.m.

He is taking the situation in hand in a way as if he has to decide what we would act upon. In this case, the Minister is saying that the allegation has no substance.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I did not say that at all.

Mr. WALCOTT: He would not listen carefully. I say that if the Minister had rejected the investigation on the grounds that it had no substance, therefore, he means that it does not arise. The Hon. Minister says that it is not true. I am not saying that it is true, but that it should be something which should be subject to investigation. How does the Hon. Minister know that it is not true? Did he carry out an investigation?

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I am sorry that I have to get up so regularly. When the Americans came here to make a selection of workers for predesignated work, these people were already in St. Kitts; therefore, they could not have been included in the selection. It would be no question that you would have priority. We knew that the selectors were coming, and that the Selectors were coming, and that the Selectors would be operating when these people were in St. Kitts. These people were told that they would not be included, but on a subsequent occasion they would have a chance to be investigated by the selectors or whatever it is that is done.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, if he was an investigator into anything, he would not want to hear the opposite to what was reported to him. Let us analyse his argument. He says that these people were in St. Kitts already. Does he know that some of the same people who went to St. Kitts were subsequently recruited to go to America? (Hon. M. E. COX: Of course, I know that.) When I say what the men who returned from St. Kitts were told, I say that is something which needs investigation.

Furthermore, when the men returned to Barbados from St. Kitts, the recruitment was taking place to go to the United States; and they said that they were rejected because they went to St. Kitts. It was not even a case of their rejectment by the employer. (A VOICE: Who rejected them?) You hear the *sotto voce* remark of "who rejected them". I am not in a position to say who rejected them. It was reported to me when the Americans took over, that it was stated by the recruiting officers that these are some of the fellows who went to St. Kitts; and some of the men stated that it was unfair to them because there was a fracas in St. Kitts, that you should indict all of them.

The third thing is this. When the men returned to Barbados and they were on the boat, Mr. Welch who is now in the U.S.A. and was acting Assistant Labour Commissioner, went on board the ship and told the men that, if they said anything to the Press they would not be recruited again. He said that in the presence of a Government Officer. He refused to let them speak. No Government Official has any right to threaten any worker with freedom of speech. Are you still suggesting, although there have been those strong statements made by people, that this is not subject to investigation? How long since have we been living in a Gestapo? Some of those who spoke were subsequently victimised.

I remember, and Your Honour will remember as a member of this House, that on one occasion the Hon. Minister of Agriculture brought a motion in this House to be dealt with as urgent business against the Commissioner of Police; and it was because the Commissioner of Police had refused to recruit candidates coming from St. Philip inasmuch as a murder had taken place in that parish and the Police could not find the alleged murderer. You will remember that day in this Chamber when you were asked to leave the House of Assembly and go to the Commissioner of Police. You will remember the hon. junior member for St. Philip in his pentecostal style.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Why are you not more responsible?

Mr. WALCOTT: You are Minister now. I do not earn one-half of what you earn now.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: That is not so.

Mr. WALCOTT: My salary is $300 a month.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: What about the perquisites?

Mr. WALCOTT: Plus the perquisites.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am speaking to the hon. senior member for St. Peter. Of course the hon. member is being encouraged by the Government.

Hon. M. E. COX: We apologise.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. senior member for St. Peter is speaking on a Resolution of which he has made a motion. His speech should be given some consideration. Why can't hon. members sit and listen to him? Cannot hon. members just contain themselves for a few minutes and allow the hon. member to reply?
4.05 p.m.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: On a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has nothing to which to reply.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: The hon. member has called my name. If he calls my name, misquotes me, and puts his own interpretation to it, surely I have the right to reply. The hon. member must not think that he alone has the right to reply to people.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member.....

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I am speaking on a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is out of order.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: All right, Sir.

Mr. WALCOTT: I am going to be at pains to teach hon. members the conventions of Government even on the floor of this House. The hon. member, who is the Leader of this House, was at pains to make the point that the matter which I raised was a matter for the Attorney General. I am only drawing an analogy and pointing out to the hon. member my feeling as to what matters are to be brought before the House. Matters which you carry to the Attorney General are matters in which he has to prosecute. In criminal cases you conduct a prosecution against people; but in cases like this, where the statements which are made are statements of a general character - not one statement that people ask you for money whenever you go over there - are matters for an enquiry. If the Minister was satisfied that so many people were only given the impression that they had to produce bribes, there would be no point in going to the Attorney General and asking that a case be brought; the Attorney General could not institute a case based on a person coming and telling him something. That would have to be based on other evidence before the Attorney General could start such a case.

In a Department, the Minister could institute an enquiry if he is satisfied that these statements have been made. We know of cases where departmental enquiries have been carried out. Such enquiries have been carried out at the Department of Highways and Transport because they were losing cement. The Police Department could not bring any case, because all the cement which came to Barbados came in the same looking bag. Anyhow, an Enquiry was carried out.

I see that the Minister is laughing; if you have a Minister who is so ignorant as to the constitutional propriety and does not know when to act with a certain kind of decency, and is trying to laugh on the pretext that this is something scandalous, my only comment is....

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order. May I ask the hon. member if he is referring to any Minister.

Mr. WALCOTT: I am referring to the whole Government.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member said if the Minister were so and so.

Hon. M. E. COX: You can interpret that.

Mr. WALCOTT: I say that any Government which laughs at serious charges on the Government's Constitutional propriety cannot hold good Government. These are statements made by an hon. member of this House; in the place where he has the right to make them. I have made my allegations and all of them can be supported by community spirit, and the community is behind me. They know what I am saying. The people who went to St. Kitts were told that if they went there they would be given priority to go to the United States of America. Some of them returned from St. Kitts and they did not go to the United States of America because they went to St. Kitts. Some of them were met on the boat and told not to say anything about what took place because, if they did so, that would militate against them.

One man came to me in the presence of another man and said that he gave money to one of the officers at the Labour Exchange. Does the hon. member think he is talking to a little primer standard boy? Do you think that a Minister does not know when a man is paying his passage money and when he is giving out money for a drawback? Do you think that the average man does not know when he is offering a bribe? We would be a very helpless community if you could not differentiate between one thing and the other. The man who makes an allegation is the correct man to deal with; the man who makes the allegation has to do a lot of proving.

The Hon. Minister is asking this House not to vote for this investigation to be made, but he did not answer any of the allegations I made; except the one where I said that a man came to me and offered a bribe. In the last Session, the burden of my speech was on the basis of the people who went to St. Kitts.

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order. I was not replying to what the hon. member said last year; I was replying to what he said during this Session.

Mr. WALCOTT: The hon. member will not allow me to finish what I am saying. When it came to this Session, the part of the Resolution which dealt with the St. Kitts affair was deleted, but the part which dealt with the investigation into the Labour Exchange remained. That was done because the whole burden of my speech was to have an investigation made into the aspects of the Labour Exchange. I did not want to raise any debate on the operation of the St. Kitts matter, but as far as the operation of the Labour Exchange was concerned, three of the points were allocated to the St. Kitts affair; and they dealt with other matters showing that this Department is of so much importance to Barbados in relation to employment, that the Government has asked all the Departments to recruit labour of a general character through the Labour Exchange.

4.15 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, you cannot ask private people to do that; you cannot tell a private firm they must recruit people through the Labour Exchange. Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Minister must try and differentiate between the points I make. His Departments cannot deviate from what he informs them they must do, but I can. What I am saying is that if the Labour Exchange becomes a medium for the recruiting of general labour for the various Government Departments, then it is a very important Department.

The Hon. Minister must know that a newspaper happens to be a very important medium in any community; and although the hon. member says he does not care what the newspaper writes, hon. members have brought the newspaper in here on a matter of privilege. If any whipper-snapper puts an article into circulation it does not matter; but if that person has a wide circulation in a big newspaper like the *Advocate*, it must have more effect on you. When a small weekly newspaper says something about you, it is regarded only as a question of vulgarity, as though somebody said something on a street corner about you; but when somebody holds a public meeting in the Lower Green or in Queens Park it is a different thing. When the *Advocate* comes out with these things you cannot ignore them; so why work on the premise that they are not true?

Hon. M. E. COX: I am not working on the premise that these things are not true; I am working on my experience that they can hardly ever tell the truth.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, that is the same newspaper to which the hon. member wrote a long letter trying to explain a matter I raised.

Hon. M. E. COX: If I write a letter it is different from the Editor writing any old thing, or a journalist writing something out of his imagination. I repeat that the statement was a false one; we never told them that. While I am on my feet, and with your permission, I would like to say in reply to what the hon. member said about the people being told that they would not be employed if they talked to the Press, that the employers themselves are the people who come

down and make the selections. Our Department does not look after the selections. I repeat that if they were in St. Kitts, they would not have been here to be recruited, examined and so on.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would like to inform the hon. member that it is about 4.20 p.m. and there will only be ten more minutes left if he wants to conclude.

Mr. WALCOTT: The hon. member has forgotten what he said. The point I wanted to make about the newspaper is that he had so much confidence in it, and having regarded that it reported him correctly, he therefore sent a letter to the newspaper. If he did not have confidence that they would report him correctly, he would not have sent the letter to the Paper; so the same paper in which he had confidence, and to which he sent the letter, is the one that made the statement about people not being recruited if they talked to the Press. The hon. member is setting himself up as a judge, but I would not come here and ask the Minister to be judge; I look upon the Minister in the same light as another politician. Ramsey MacDonald as Prime Minister, caused the Government to fall in 1924 on the same kind of attitude with the Campbell case.

Hon. M. E. COX: Because he was dishonest.

Mr. WALCOTT: Ramsey MacDonald was never dishonest; you do not know what you are talking about. You may be thinking of J. H. Thomas. I have never accused the hon. member of dishonesty, but I may accuse him of foolishness. Ramsey MacDonald's case is similar to that of the hon. member because he was one of those people who believed in that attitude.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is quite interesting, but let us get back to the Resolution.

Mr. WALCOTT: That case, Mr. Speaker, has its local application. The point I have to emphasise, Mr. Speaker, is that the Minister cannot act; and that is why I want him to understand that, while the Government in Great Britain acted on the Campbell case as the Government is acting on this case, I must challenge the Minister's attitude in this House. The Minister looks at Parliament as if it was some sub-division of the Government, and we are so unimportant that Parliament depends on how they think about any matter, even Private Members' Business. When a private member brings a matter to this Chamber and asks for an investigation, the Government does not agree that there should be an investigation based on substance.

The Prime Minister of Great Britain was asked some time ago to have an investigation into something in connection with the Bank rate, because information had leaked out about the Bank rate issue; but the Prime Minister, who is the first Lord of the Treasury, did not get up and say he had confidence in all the Governors at the Treasury and knew who their grandfathers were. He said that the statement was of such seriousness coming from such persons, he would have to carry out an investigation not based on whether or not it was true, but on the premise that the statement having come from such a source, there must be something in it to investigate. The Hon. Minister gets up in this House as if, when you raise a motion, it is for him to decide; and that is why I say he does not understand constitutional propriety.

Mr. SPEAKER: The votes decide everything.

Mr. WALCOTT: A Government that understands constitutional propriety does not ask for a vote to be taken. Mr. Macmillan carried out an investigation into the matter of a leakage over the Bank Rate, not on a vote of whether or not what was said was true. If a member says something on the floor of this House which he knows is true, he would not want an investigation; I would not come here therefore and ask for an investigation; I would come here and say that John Brown, living at such and such a place came and told me that Mr. John X of the Labour Exchange took $55 from him, and that would be the end of it. Members of the Government would then have to do what the Minister of Communications did when he went and asked the Director if it was true that he chased the member for St. Andrew out of his office. That is why I say the Hon. Minister does not understand constitutional propriety, when he asked me to go to the Attorney General as if I were some whore pimp walking about looking for $5.

Hon. M. E. COX: I would not be as silly as he to suggest that he should go to the Attorney General, because it was second hand information; and I understand that this type of second hand information does not hold good. All I was suggesting was that the individual to whom this thing happened, and from whom money was exacted, should go to the Attorney General. What good could he do if he went and told the Attorney General that he heard something; or what could the Attorney General do? I was suggesting that any member of the community who suffers as a result of this should go to the Attorney General.

4.25 p.m.

Mr. WALCOTT: I had the privilege to say something in this island in connection with a school and that matter was attended to. If the Hon. Minister says that he is satisfied that what I am saying in not true, I am satisfied that what I am saying is correct; and that Mr. Welch told the men that they were not to say anything, and those who said something were victimised. I am satisfied that the men who went to St. Kitts were told that if they went they would be given priority to go somewhere else; but when they came back from St. Kitts they were not sent to the U.S.A. because of the fracas in St. Kitts. I am satisfied in my mind from the information given me by two men that they did offer money at the Labour Exchange. When the Hon. Minister says that he is not having an inquiry, he is only part and parcel to something which is going to corrode life in the community of Barbados.

The question that the Resolution do now pass, was put and resolved in the negative the House dividing as follows:–

AYES: Messrs. WALCOTT, CORBIN, TALMA, TUDOR and BRANCKER - 5.

NOES: Hon'bles M. E. COX, D. D. GARNER, R. G. MAPP, L. St.A. THORNE, F. E. MILLER, Mrs. BOURNE, Messrs. SEARLES and STRAUGHN - 8.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER: The House will now revert to Government Business.

RESUMPTION IN COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN: On the suspension, the Hon. Minister of Education was addressing the Chair.

Hon. L. St.A. THORNE: On the suspension, Sir, I was dealing with the question of compulsory education. It was observed that recent happenings as regards the reorganisation of Erdiston Training College and changes in connection with the educational system of this island, could be very well regarded as the thin edge of the wedge of compulsory education. I am in favour of compulsory education. I am not the kind of fellow to say, because we have the greatest standard of literacy in the Caribbean, that that is enough for us to rest on our oars and to be satisfied with the heights we have reached.

However, this Government certainly knows that there are things of greater importance which need to be put right before the introduction of compulsory education at this stage. Let us say that we decided to have compulsory education in Barbados tomorrow; you will only confuse things to a very great extent, in that you do not have the necessary staff to deal with the children which you have in school now. You have not got the necessary school places to build up these important and essential factors of success where the educational system is concerned.

Some hon. member made mention of the question that the Model School at Erdiston is not now being used. I want to correct that statement. The school still functions, and is used to provide a certain amount of opportunity for practice teaching; but by reason of the fact that this emergency course has the emphasis on professional training, of necessity we must be prepared to provide more facilities for practice. In addition to that, there are no two schools which are alike; and it is important for teachers to have opportunities to have training in wider schools, to have wider knowledge of the problems which accrue when they go out on their own; hence the selection of twenty other schools besides the Model School for teacher-training. Eventually, the building which now houses the Model School would have to be requisitioned for class rooms for the student teachers, and it would be necessary to replace that school by another in the area of Government House or thereabouts.

The hon. senior member for St. Lucy is very anxious to hear something of the competence of the emergency course. I shall oblige him by saying this: The main studies are Education, English, Art, Hygiene, Physical Education, School Organisation. Each student will decide whether he or she will take a special course of training in Infants Methods, or teaching in junior or senior schools; and whatever the students' choice, they will also be given some compulsory courses in one or the other of the age-groups; that is to say, if the student decides that he or she would like to specialise in infants teaching, that is accepted, but that student is also required to attend courses on the teaching of juniors or seniors.

Infants Methods students take, in addition, one of the additional subjects of music, civic studies or environmental studies. Teachers who are undertaking junior teaching methods have to take, in addition to the regular studies, one of each of the following: music, civic studies, nature studies with gardening. Those who specialise in senior school methods, in addition to the general subjects, must take one of the following groups: music, civic studies, nature studies with gardening, history, geography. Religious classes are open to all students. Every student must do a special assignment, as a personal study, in one of the following subjects: Education, English, Art, Teaching Methods, Botany with Gardening, History Geography, Religious Knowledge.
4.35 p.m.

Every student must satisfy the staff of his competence as a class teacher during a period of at least five to six weeks of teaching practice in an appropriate school. When you come to the details of the syllabus, education would include the principles of education, child study and psychology, general principles and methods of teaching and individual teaching. School organisation would include the organisation of a school.....

Mr. TUDOR: On a point of order. I would not like to trouble the Minister any longer; I would like to know if he would supply a copy of the syllabus of the school so that I can study it for myself.

Hon. L. St.A THORNE: Very well, I will try and get him a copy of the syllabus.

Mr. WALCOTT: If it is no more than your own policy of teaching, masons building schools would be part of your own policy, apart from education itself; but it is regrettable to hear the hon. member put fundamental education behind everything else.

Hon. L. St.A. THORNE: I would like the hon. member to explain where I have put fundamental education behind everything else.

Mr. WALCOTT: The hon. member said that there are other things which are more important than education.

Hon. L. St.A. THORNE: What I said was that there are other things which require more immediate attention. I would like to be able to boast of the fact that we have a lesser percentage of illiteracy than we have. Merely huddling children in a room like sardines will not help the situation at all. The quality of a nation is largely dependent upon the quality of its teachers. If this system of education is to be improved, if one is to be able to introduce the changes which are necessary, then one must begin at the right point. That point is the training and the recruitment of teachers. If you have a large number of teachers, you can teach the children under a tree; but if you have all elaborate buildings and no teachers, what will happen?

Mr. WALCOTT: I should like to draw to the attention of the hon. member that that argument is invalid. There is nothing at the present time which would prevent every child from being in a school all the time voluntarily. If all of the children went to school now would you have to send them out? That is the problem. Education is given freely now, so that it is not a question of getting the children in school.

Mr. TUDOR: I would like to know from the Hon. Minister, since he says that if a policy of compulsory education is put into effect now it would embarrass the Government as to school buildings and teachers, what is the percentage of children of school age and what proportion of that percentage is not at school? Is the hon. member in a position to give that? The only justification for not pressing for compulsory education is that you feel that, of the whole proportion of children of school age, only a small percentage is outside. If a large percentage of these children is outside, you cannot keep them out on the ground that you have not got the teachers. If you have not got the buildings in which to accommodate these children and the teachers to teach them, that is the fault of this Government. The person who had the portfolio before the Hon. Minister who now has it, has said that he would devote four-fifths of his time to education. That is what Sir Grantley Adams said. If his time has left them in this position, then the Minister will have to rectify that.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I was not here to hear all that was said, but I heard the Hon. Minister say that if we had compulsory education and we had to send all the children to school, you would not have anywhere to put them. I hope that the hon. member has not made that statement seriously. This is something criminal.

Last week, when we were talking about building more schools, he said that he was building more schools; what he has said today is the most reckless thing to come from anywhere. It is the duty of the state to see that every child gets education. If you say that if you have compulsory education you would not have enough room in which to put the children, that is a joke. That is the same argument which was used by Aubrey Williams and Graham Yearwood. That is not a kind statement coming from the Minister. People approach me regularly, not about getting children into Combermere School or Harrison College, but to ask some headmaster or headmistress to take their children into this school or that school.
4.45 p.m.

The Minister of Communications did not agree with me when I said in here that the cost per head in your secondary schools was too much for this community. In other words, you were paying too much per child for the cost of that school. If we consider what the Minister said today, to the effect that if there was compulsory education there would be nowhere to hold the children, he is actually damning the other children, asking them to stay ignorant, and saying that it does not matter if they cannot read at all. That kind of statement coming from the Minister is very unkind, especially since the Minister himself came through the channels of being an elementary schoolmaster and has seen what he has seen. Are you suggesting that the colour of the walls at the Ministerial Buildings has changed your political heart or your conscience? How can you say that if you have compulsory education you would have nowhere to put the children? When you became a Minister.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am asking the hon. member to address the Chair and not the Minister.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am addressing the Chair and not the Minister. Do you mean, because I look over there and point, that I am not addressing you?

Hon. L. St.A. THORNE: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I want to tell my friend, the hon. senior member for the City, that all the shouting he can do cannot frighten me. I have said what is true: that if you brought about compulsory education now, the present accommodation which you have got in terms of school buildings could not adequately accommodate them. The school population this year alone is 1,700 odd in excess of what it was last year. Is it my fault? Can I prevent people from getting children?

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am going to tell the Hon. Minister something. It is not for me to tell you if you are bankrupt of ideas. You have taught people who have become teachers or schoolmasters; and there is an injunction in Holy Writ " suffer the little children to come unto me". Rather than let children be born and not have education, you should open the Church doors and teach them. I have advocated that all my life, because I know what it is to be able to read and write. When, in another country, a man once asked me to write a letter for him, I realised what my country had done for me. Do you know what it means? The hon. member says it is not his fault if people get children; but, if they are here, are you going to suggest drowning them because you say you cannot find room for them?

When I said last week that you had not done one single thing as far as new schools were concerned, you said that you had provided so many more places. (Hon. L. St.A. THORNE: It is true.) But you have not provided enough places. When the hon. member talked about my shouting to frighten him, I cannot frighten the hon. member. If he looks across at me he will realise that a lot of young women look at me. I am not an ugly man, so you are making fun.

I have known the Minister for a long time, and I do not think that his going to Bay Street has changed his political conscience; if you open his conscience tonight you will see what he really feels, having taught in elementary schools and having seen children loafing around schools; but now they are telling us after 300 years that it is the conservatives like the Yearwood and the Hawkins regime who are responsible for this. Do you realise that, since you were in power, and in another six years, children who were born at that time will be able to vote, and you are asking them not to be able to read and write? You yourself have said that you are going to give free secondary education, and yet you would not even put yourself in a position to provide for compulsory education. I am ashamed to hear the hon. member make such a statement. I believe it is a slip.

Hon. L. St.A. THORNE: On a point of order. I do not want the hon. member to offer an excuse for me. I want him to rant and tear and say all he has to say. The thing that is worrying the hon. member is the fact that this Government has got the guts to come forward with a pronouncement of free secondary education.

Mr. MOTTLEY: This Government has got the guts to come forward and fool people that they are going to give free secondary education. I am not offering any excuse for the Hon. Minister, but I say that he should not get up and say that they are going to give free secondary education when they are not doing enough to provide primary education for the children. I condemn the hon. member for that remark, though I agree with the idea of reducing the two-year course to a one-year course. I agree with the principle primarily because it is a matter of expediency. If I did not feel so, I would say so.

While we are on this subject, I want to tell you this: a few years ago, Mr. Chairman, I criticised this Government for taking advantage of a lot of primary school teachers; and I was given the assurance by the now Prime Minister of the West Indies that they would make it right. Let me tell you what you are doing now. You are taking greater advantage of them.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I should like to say to the hon. senior member for the City.....

Mr. MOTTLEY: *(To the Clerk)* Are you a member of this House, or the Clerk?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I should like to tell the hon. member that he has made the point in reply to the Minister about compulsory education, but he is now going too far outside the scope of the Resolution.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am not going any further on that; I am just telling the hon. member that some of these Relief Teachers are being paid for one month on the 26th of the following month; and some are being kept two months before they get their money; so you are not treating them right. I am sorry if I made any mistake with the Clerk. I did not refer to him as a servant because that word is out of the Barbadian language; that is why I say he is an employee of the House.
4.55 p.m.

There are two things which are dear to me politically: compulsory education and reduction in the age for old age pension. I have the idea that I may live to become old, and, as you know, you cannot boast of tomorrow because you do not know what the future holds for you.

I do not like to see children suffer. I do not like to see that you are in power and do not legislate for compulsory education. I have often said that we differ on a tremendous number of things, but cannot differ on compulsory education. Do not put up all these monuments. Let it be able to say that you said that every child must be able to learn to read and write. I have seen in this Municipality, before you took over and built a school, that they carried on teaching from the 3rd to the 7th form in the Church because the school was too small. I would like to hear any Religious Minister saying that you could not use his Church to carry on school. You can use the Moravian, the Anglican or any Church. It would just take a little initiative and a little know-how as to how to do it. When you say that you do not have any room to put children, you just do not care, you are not interested.

Hon. L. St.A. THORNE: Does the hon. member know what he is talking about? Does he expect that he knows more of this than I? He is talking through his hat.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am not talking through my hat; I am talking through my mouth. I notice the Hon. Minister is getting very hot.

Hon. L. St.A. THORNE: I do not like this crass ignorance.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am speaking to the Hon. Minister.

Hon. L. St.A. THORNE: I am speaking of the crass ignorance which the hon. member is making in his speech.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I like that! When I deal kindly with my opponents and I see that they become offensive and aggressive, there is nobody who can get more aggressive and more offensive than I. The hon. member may know more of education than I, but he cannot know more of people than I do.

Hon. L. St.A. THORNE: I have been dealing with people from the time I was thirteen years of age. I have never done anything to insult people. Serving people is my calling. I am never happier.

Mr. MOTTLEY: That is not a point of order. There is a difference between serving people and serving them well. The hon. member was in the category of serving people. He could not serve them according to his conscience. I just want the Hon. Minister to know how I feel about compulsory education. If the Hon. Minister gets aggressive, I will get more aggressive. I say again, that the Hon. Minister has no right making that statement in here.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, the Hon. Minister of Education said a moment ago that the trouble with Barbados is that everybody thinks himself an expert.

Hon. L. St.A. THORNE: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. The hon. member would not even allow me to say what I want to say. I wanted to say how it is that everybody thinks himself an expert on the things he knows.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, the point is this. If everybody is an expert on education, it is because education is the one matter in which everybody can be an expert; everybody has been a child and everybody has parents; so it is quite in order that any layman can give his opinion on education.

I think the Hon. Minister is out of place to make the statement which he made. I am of the opinion that no matter what the Minister holds is the right thing to do, he has blundered very badly with that statement. If you have to defend the policy of not having complusory education in Barbados, the only good way of defending that policy is to say that there are so many people who are now taking advantage of primary education, those who are not are but a small fraction of the School age. Say that so many are now in school, that those who are out are a negligible and infinitesimal proportion. If you said that you cannot have it because if you have it, the classes will be bursting to capacity, it is the worse possible thing that you could have said. It is an indictment on the Government. I think it was before 1952 that you needed fifty new teachers in the Teaching Service and Sir Grantley Adams laughed it to scorn. Had he taken it to heart, you probably may have had 100 teachers.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry to hear the Hon. Minister of Education make that statement; the Hon. Minister is getting into representing an age which we thought we had passed: when they used to say in the same context that people believed that they were experts and everybody believed them. It is just as if the Minister says that for one to be a Minister of Agriculture, he must know of digging cane holes; and for one to be a Minister of Works he should be able to drive a road roller. If that were so, people today would not know about Government, and would not know of running countries.
5.05 p.m.

Hon. L. St.A. THORNE: I am not afraid of defending myself; I know I am right. I should like to say that anything which is taken out of its context can be made into anything else. I said that I am in favour of compulsory education. If you want to teach the people's children then you must get teachers. If you have not got the teachers, how are you going to teach the children?

I particularly said that if hon. members would use their eyes, they would discover that the changes and the reorganisation which are taking place are the thin edge of the wedge; and we are working up to what is wanted. I have made a very careful analysis of the educational requirements of this country. I am saying that if we are given the necessary means, the Ministry and the Department of Education can provide the remedial measures which would put things where they should be. For us to talk about things and not know how to go about them, is something regrettable.

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

HEAD XXIII - MEDICAL (2) GENERAL HOSPITAL

Head XXIII – Medical (2) General Hospital – was called.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I am asking leave to deal with this Resolution further in the absence of the Hon. Premier.

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

Hon. M. E. COX: In connection with this Head, there is the Item "Furniture and Equipment". The Note explains quite clearly the purpose of this additional amount of $7,000 which is required. On account of the inadequacy of the provision for the financial year 1959-60, it was necessary to bring forward into 1960-61 expenditure amounting to $7,023 in respect of maintenance and replacement of furniture at the General Hospital. In addition, it was necessary during the year to incur extraordinary expenditure on the purchase of furniture for the recently completed extension of the Out-Patient Department. I beg to move that Head XXIII - Medical (2) General Hospital - stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I will ask one question which needs an answer and I will sit down. On the last occasion I asked about the Hospital Report but the Hon. Minister of Social Services was not here. He is here now; and while I do not want to trouble him too much, will he tell us something about the Hospital Report? Will he tell us when it will be laid? I counsel hon. members of the Opposition not to press for anything or ask anything in the circumstances.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I was going to ask the Hon. Minister if he could say what has caused the delay in the release of the Report on the Hospital.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, as to the request which has been made by the hon. senior member for St. Lucy, I should like to say that there is no question of delay in laying the Report. Something is wrong about the whole matter: and when it is discussed by the Cabinet, there will be the decision as to whether or not the Report will be released for publication. This Report is not the result of a Commission of Enquiry; this Report has not been the request from Parliament or anybody like that; the request for this information was that of the Minister who wanted to be advised on what could be done for the new hospital. This Report happens to be one of several Reports within the last few years on the Hospital.

You cannot run a Government without advice; and therefore I must be left free to take the matter to the Cabinet. We have established a Records Department; we have had advice on the reconstruction of the hospital, and we are waiting on the decision of the Cabinet as to whether or not this Report will be released.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, did the Minister say that this is one of several Reports on the Hospital? If he said that, it is not true. That Report has been paid for by the people of Barbados; and it is a Report on the working of the present Hospital. The Hon. Minister made a statement to the effect that this Report is a Report on the new Hospital, but it is a Report on the working of the present General Hospital.

The question that Head XXIII – Medical (2) General Hospital – stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD XXIII - MEDICAL (3) MENTAL HOSPITAL

Head XXIII – Medical (3) Mental Hospital – was called.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, under this Head there is also the Item "Furniture and Equipment". The explanatory Note reads as follows:-

"The amount of $6,000 provided to meet repairs and replacement of furniture and equipment at the Mental Hospital has proved to be insufficient and experience has proved that the minimum amount which should be provided to meet the requirements of the Hospital is $8,000. The largest single item of expenditure under this vote is $5,000 for repairs and replacement of cots; the volume of this work varies with the intensity of violence of the patients and cannot be subject to normal or institutional control.

Also it is essential to have at least one full-time carpenter on the staff to undertake necessary repairs etc. This work has in the past been done mainly by Male Nurses with the necessary skill and by such patients as are able to do the work. This method is no longer either satisfactory or practicable and it has been necessary to employ a carpenter on a full-time basis for the whole of the present financial year in order that urgent and necessary work could be carried out. His wages for the year will be $1,210."

As I said, Mr. Chairman, this is just a single item of expenditure and the amount required is $3,210. I beg to move that Head XXIII - Medical (3) Mental Hospital - stand part of the Schedule.

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

5.15 p.m.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate that the Hon. Leader of the House is dealing with something which does not come within his portfolio, and therefore he was not as au fait with it as he is accustomed in respect of matters which come under his care and attention. Nothwithstanding, I would like him and other members of the House to understand that, in respect of his reading of the Note, there is not a single member on this side of the House who cannot read and write. There is not a single member on this side of the House who does not prepare his work so long as he has sufficient time, and who does not read his Notes to Estimates. Of course, I believe he had an eye on his backbenchers when he was reading the note to this Item.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Chairman, on a point or order. I think the hon. member's syntax is bad! I can assure him that some can read and some cannot understand!

Mr. BRANCKER: I obviously made no reference to the hon. member's backbenchers because I did not want to hurt their feelings! In respect of the vote itself, the Note says that it is essential to have at least one full-time carpenter on the staff. I would like the hon. member to explain that if he can; and, if he cannot, I would understand his difficulty with this matter, because the note gives the impression that they have decided to put on the staff a full-time carpenter, a man who would be permanently employed on the staff in that capacity. Later on, the Note says that it has been necessary to employ a carpenter on a full-time basis for the whole of the present financial year in order that urgent and necessary work could be carried out, and that his wages for the year would be $1,210. That of course would, I take it, mean to the end of the current financial year.

What I would like to know if the Minister can help me is this: is this a man who has been taken on permanently on the establishment, and has he arrived at an age which has caused him to resign? Or is it just somebody who is brought to work as a whole-time carpenter up to the end of the financial year and then he will be laid off? I should also like the Minister to inform us whether this rate of pay proposed is in accordance with the rate of pay for workmen of the particular category of this carpenter. I do not know whether he is Grade A, Grade B or Grade C; but I would like to be assured that he is not paid less than a man of his standing would be paid in private employ; and whether or not he is the person who has been taken on and is now permanently a member of the staff.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, in employing and recruiting staff to the Mental Hospital, the idea was to get strong able-bodies people to take care of the patients in that institution; today, that approach has been entirely changed; and we are concerned with training people in Mental Nursing. Hitherto, we would employ a man and call him a Male Nurse who was skilled to do any work in carpentry; today we have not got that; and for that reason we are employing a full-time carpenter. I do not know whether this appointment will be handled through an Establishment Order or in the Estimates in another month or two. As is set out in the Note, this work was done by Male Nurses, and by some of the patients who were skilled to do the work. We are now training people in Male Nursing rather than taking on able-bodied persons.

The amount of $1,210 works out at about $25 a week, if you are thinking of a carpenter based on what are the standard rates for an "A" class man working on a five day week. I hope that will satisfy the hon. member.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, you will recall that earlier today I assured the Hon. Minister of Health that we of the Opposition did not intend troubling him at all, but would let him rest in peace for the balance of this day's Session. I do not want to upset his equilibrium; and I suggest that if he early this evening seeks to retire, there would be no adverse comment made on this side of the House. I cannot however speak for the backbenchers.

What I really want to find out is whether this carpenter is being taken on permenently as from the day he was first brought there, and whether he remains a member of the Staff. Will he be a whole-time regular man on the staff of the Mental Hospital as from now on, or as from whatever day he was first engaged in connection with this work? If so, will this be amongst the pensionable posts of that Institution? That is what I was seeking to find out. The hon. member has not been in touch lately with his Department; we know that he has been ill, and has been grievously afflicted otherwise, and we will forgive him this time. As a matter of fact, if he will lay the Hospital Report on the Table of this House, we will give him a month's holiday from the House.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I will warn you that if it is not brought in I will bring it.

Hon. M. E. COX: There are a lot of things we can show too.

Mr. MOTTLEY: You can show anything you like. Mr. Chairman, I am warning the Minister that if the Report is not laid in the House, I will bring one here. *(Mr. CHAIRMAN knocked the gavel)* I am not a ventriloquist, and therefore the voices you hear, Mr. Chairman, are coming from over there. (A VOICE: We can ignore you.) You did not ignore the hon. junior member for St. Philip, so how can you ignore me?

Mr. Chairman, the amount which you are paying to the carpenter is $23.26 a week, and I heard the Hon. Minister refer to a five day week. Actually, I think it is a five and a half day week; and if it is that, that is not the rate for an "A" class carpenter. Such a carpenter receives $4.50 or $4.65 a day. I am sure that if you have a carpenter doing technical work, he could not get less than $5 a day.

The question that Head XXIII – Medical (3) Mental Hospital – stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

5.25 p.m.

HEAD XXIII - MEDICAL (6) HEALTH CENTRES

Head XXIII – Medical (6) Health Centres – was called.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, we are asking for $5,000 under this Head to supplement the vote under Item 51 for drugs, dressings and disinfectants.

I beg to move that this Head stand part.

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

The question that Head XXIII – Medical (6) Health Centres, stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD XXIX - MISCELLANEOUS SERVICES

Head XXIX – Miscellaneous Services – was called.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that this Head stand part.

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

Mr. BRANCKER: Sir, in respect of this medical aid scheme, and the Notes in connection with Miss Germaine Gay and Mrs. Adina Ward, I notice that it is there stated that approval has been given to the granting of assistance to the extent of $2,000 to Mrs. Adina Ward who has also gone to Edinburgh for Neuro-surgery.

In this second case, I recall to mind a query which I posed to the Hon. Minister of Health as long as February, 1959, to which he replied on the 21st July, that year, to the

effect that the Barbados General Hospital does possess the necessary equipment for brain surgery; that they did have such equipment. He went on to say that there is not at present a brain specialist at the General Hospital. That reply was given in July year before last.

Well, Mr. Chairman, since then we have had these two cases; and in respect of them what we have voted, and we are asked to vote, amount to a total of $5,500. You must also bear in mind that if we had anyone to do this job that that person would not only be required to attend to cases such as this, but would be also entitled to charge fees and substantial fees in case of neuro-surgery to the people who now go abroad to get such treatment and such surgery. I refer to the people of the well-to-do; it is not only people in the lower classes who require neuro-surgery.

Incidentally, I wonder when the Hospital of the U.C.W.I. would be in a position to attend to such cases, instead of our having to send people as far as Edinburgh. Perhaps the hon. senior member for St. John can shed some light on this. Of course, Edinburgh University is the greatest school of learning in the English speaking countries, but it would be interesting to hear that it is expected that the Hospital of the U.C.W.I. would be able to deal with cases such as this. I know the Hon. Minister of Education would try and relieve the Hon. Minister of Health of any unnecessary strain. We are not trying to impose any strain on him.

However, Sir, I would like some more information about the case of Mrs. Ward, as regards where it is stated that approval has recently been given to the granting of assistance to the extent of $2,000. I understand that her expenses are not likely to come to less than $3,350. There is the question of the return passage which is about $1,300; and there is the period of time which she will be there to be paid for; and that may come to about $2,000 which is based on the figures of $115 per week for seventeen weeks and contingencies of $95 which would make the total of $3,350.

I know quite a few members of that family, and they are in no position to make up that difference between $2,000 and $3,350. I also understand that apart from that, there is the Surgeon's fee for the operation, which is exclusive of the fee for hospitalisation or remaining as a patient in the Hospital for the long number of weeks as one has to do usually in a case of that kind. I wonder if there is any reason why the Government has not been disposed to display more magnanimity on this occasion; it would be far from being misplaced generosity. I think that this is a very deserving case and the people concerned are not able to meet the balance, unless they mortgage and sell everything they have to raise this amount.

Sir, I recall seeing a photograph of yourself almost lifting the lady in pain to the plane. Of course, that is because the lady comes from St. Michael - although I do not think you would have done it if she had come from St. Lucy. I looked for a picture of your colleague, but I understand that he was busy in another form of activity along the same lines.

It is since October, 1960, that representations were made in connection with this case, and this lady has only been recently shipped abroad. I would like to know myself what is the reason why the Government has only asked us to provide this $2,000. Is it because they feel scared of asking for more? I think that they can have a little Cabinet meeting there now and decide to ask for the adequate amount rather than to let the relatives feel that they do not know how the remainder of the money will be forthcoming. I understand that the fund for this purpose is not going so well. It was since July, 1959, when the Hon. Minister of Health expressed that statement, and I think he may well reconsider the view he expressed then, of there being no likelihood of sufficient work to attract and retain a Brain Specialist at the General Hospital.
5.35 p.m.

If that service is made available, certain financial categories of people would cease to go abroad for such operations, and you could charge them whatever is reasonable for performing any such operation. We would thereby recoup the Treasury what we would be paying this Brain Surgeon whom we feel it would be an economy to have on the spot; we would also be saving people all the worry as to whether the Government will be sympathetic towards them or not.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I think that you should render to Caesar what is Caesar's. This is a most commendable thing, but I have some criticisms to make. There are just a few Brain Specialists in the world today, so that the matter is not as easy as is thought by the hon. member who has just sat down. The last person to whom I was talking on this question told me that he was allowed to see a case of brain surgery from morning until afternoon. Mr. Chairman, little did you know that I was behind the scenes before you started on this matter; and I knew the representation which you made in this respect. This is a very poor woman who could ill-afford to have anything done to her.

In our discussions with West Indian Doctors, we saw that there is in Trinidad a Brain Specialist who had performed a tremendous operation on the wife of a senator from Venezuela and the description and the size of the tumour which was taken out was given in the Press. There was a tremendous amount of praise showered on the surgeon and so on. As I understand it, it is not only the surgeon who performs the operation, but it is the question of the equipment, the type of room and so on. My first question is this: is there supposed to be a free medical service in England of any sort? My next question is: does this not apply similarly as national assistance would apply to any British subject getting medical services?

This lady, Mrs. Adina Ward, was given assistance to go to Edinburgh for neuro-surgery. I can quite see the reason for voting this money. Mind you, Mr. Chairman, I am one hundred per cent in favour of it; but I would like to say this: all over the world where you have national Airlines there are mercy lifts. I could not be a member of this Assembly who would vote money annually to subsidise such a national Airline as B.W.I.A. and they did not render some assistance of this sort. I want to find out whether there is a mercy lift. If they cannot give a mercy lift, but a sixteenth cousin who is going abroad can pay ten per cent of the required passage money, do you not think it is better for representation to be made and see if there are other people who feel that in the same way that you can have a sixteenth cousin paying ten per cent of the passage money and getting to England, why should they take up this money to assist in the passage of this woman going abroad? Tell me if the Government has made any representation for this mercy lift; which means that it would be done in whole or in part.

I know that you, Mr. Chairman, could use your influence with the Minister of Communications, who would use his influence with the Company in order to assist this poor woman to go abroad for treatment. We are subsidising this Airways Company; I say, let us render to Caesar the things which are Caesar's. This is the case of a poor woman. There are those who masquerade as specialists and they draw a lot of money for it too. (Mr. WALCOTT: Dr. Bostic?) You have some who are worse than Dr. Bostic.
5.45 p.m.

Hon. members on that side know that what I am saying is true. I would prefer to know that some woman from Bawdens, or from Pie Corner, which the hon. member would prefer who was suffering from some ailment.....

Mr. TUDOR: I would not prefer, but I would be glad if somebody from my constituency could get that kind of help if he needed it; not that I would like him to have that affliction.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, we feel very strongly on this matter. There are not cases like this every week; and, if the company can lift people for sixty dollars to and from England who do not even work with the company, but may be the cousin or grandmother of someone working with the Company, there is no reason why the Company should not lift these needy cases. We are subsidising the Company

with the cents and pennies of some of these same women who walk about bare-footed with an Ethiopian great toe.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: I would like first of all to reply to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition in connection with the Brain Specialist for our Hospital. I was at pains to point out when asked that question, that I had done quite a bit of work about it. If it means anything to him, I will tell him that we are at the moment handling 300 cases in the four surgeries at the Hospital, and our Surgeon Specialist there is responsible for 150 of the operations performed, roughly five a day, 30 days a months. Would the hon. member for the City still say that is not enough, when he thinks of the requirements of a Brain Specialist? It is also true that we can probably find money and advertise overseas to bring a Specialist to Barbados; but I was at pains to point out that we are not even likely to attract an Ear Specialist to Barbados.

Mr. Chairman, while in England, I visited a big hospital and observed that they operate in teams; usually, the Registrar with seven or more years' experience, and two or three nurses; they never move without that team. We could not attract him here because his work is very delicate. He has to be practising every day, otherwise he loses his sense of balance; so that if you could not give him sixty or one hundred cases per month, we could not attract such a Specialist to the West Indies. The salary which we are paying could not attract a Brain Specialist either; he would be the kind of Specialist who would perform operations which may be considered as brain tumours, but which may be far from the brain.

I have discussed this question with interest in the United Kingdom as well as the United States of America; and, as a matter of fact, the Specialist operating at the hospital in Boston, I think, did serve with United Nations on one or more occasions. Even if we arrange to have the equipment, it is not likely that he would fly to Barbados to handle these cases.

With regard to the question raised by the hon. senior member for the City in connection with the mercy lifts and what not, long before this appeared, in the Estimates there was $3,000 which was more or less a token vote for medical aid. This was not intended to pay the cost of the operations, but it was intended as an aid whereby we could help. I have had, in the Ministry, to turn down more than one genuine case which, when we investigated, found that the individual was drawing a pension but enjoying the facility of an automobile. There are a number of these applications which come in, but which I would not send on to the Cabinet because I think the Ministry can handle them there. I think the hon. senior member for the City should be told that behind the scenes, we have been using Pan American Airways, Trans-Canada and British West Indian Airways for mercy lifts. Is it reasonable, because we are subsidising a company operating through Barbados, to ask them to provide a free service for charity? You have no idea of the number of cases that could benefit from operations overseas.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order. I should like to say that it is not only a question of subsidising it; you are also giving them a preferential between the islands; you say that nobody can come here and take up passengers and so on. If you are subsidising them and giving them a preferential in order to make money, you are doing it out of the people's money; so if you get two mercy lifts a year, what difference would that make to the Company? I do not like you to make that defence of any airline.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: I am not defending any airline. I did say that I used all the Companies operating through Barbados for mercy lifts, but we never publicised it. It was only because we were up against it, and there was a case of need, that I thought it advisable to go to the Cabinet; and we got $3,000 as a token. There is the other case of the lady who returned here with the successful operation. It is true she would have had to be domiciled in the United Kingdom to be regarded as a British subject, but in her case we had to pay the cost of the hospitalization, pay for tests, pay the Pathologist and all that; and we did get the Specialist doctor to waive his fees.

In the case of Mrs. Ward, the Government really matched what her son promised he could collect. As the result of a letter written to her son, he came to the Ministry and discussed the matter and gave the understanding that he could raise $2,000 on the property where this old lady lives. It is improper to discuss this anyhow; but we got the undertaking from her son that he could find some funds, so the Cabinet decided that we would make $2,000 available.

5. 55 p.m.

The cost of her passage has already been paid from sources other than the Government. If the Government is unable, or it you have to come to the rescue of an individual, the Government can commandeer any airline; we are building an Airport for them; and we are spending a fortune every year to keep the Airport open. If you are going to reduce the number of charity cases, well then, there must be some limit as to how far we should go.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I do not think the Hon. Minister's statements are altogether accurate. You seem to have suffered a loss of memory.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: I am not suffering from any loss of memory.

Mr. MOTTLEY: You are. However, do not get into any argument with me. There was no representation that these people should find $2,000. I know that the hon. junior member for St. Michael has a lot of biscuit tins all about the place to get pennies put down in!

I maintain that if any country can subsidise an airline, and not only subsidise it but gives it protection and preference from the point of view that no other airline can run here to take up passengers — if you have two cases - and I do not see more than two per year — which are emergency cases, you can have a mercy lift.

I must correct the Hon. Minister when he talked about doing sixty cases of brain surgery in a month.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: Sir, I rise on a point of order. I must correct that statement. A surgeon would have to be sure of not 30, 40 or 50, but enough cases to keep him busy; if not, he would not be attracted. In other words, the money is not the answer.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I would like the Hon. Minister to know that I take a very serious interest in his portfolio. A surgeon cannot attend to 60 cases in a month. That is not true. On all these operations, it takes almost from seven to seven to do them. I am sure his colleague would tell him that that is correct; brain surgery is an eight-hour operation.

Sir, when these cases come before the Ministry and the Ministry is satisfied that it is a necessitous case, no representation made by the hon. junior member for St. Michael or myself for a mercy lift can work. For a mercy lift to work, it must come from the Government to an airline. It would not work otherwise. Therefore, my contention is that when a case comes up before the Ministry and the Director of Medical Services has investigated it, and is satisfied that the operation cannot be done successfully in Barbados, and the Social Welfare Department has investigated the circumstances of the patient and is satisfied that the person cannot raise the money, then the Government should act and ask for a mercy lift. The Minister asked whether it would be fair for Government to go and ask for a mercy lift when Government can find money. My answer is that the Government protects you by seeing that no other airline can come in and collect passengers between here and St. Vincent and all around the West Indies. Pan American cannot come and collect passengers between here and other countries of the West Indies. If you protect these people with your regulations, is it asking too much to say when one of your people cannot pay that you want a mercy lift? It is only lack of making representations that it has not been done. After all, members of the Opposition will hear about it. In other countries, just like the U.S.A., you have mercy lifts for people from places where you do not have medical

universities to the places where there are medical universities with the professors working.

I do not like to bring people's private business in public, but what is this idea of Government matching $2,000 with $2,000. I know a lot about this case. I was at a loss to hear that money had to be found for this humble woman's passage to England; because, I feel that all that the Hon. Premier had to do was to make representation to Mr. Wood in Trinidad and tell him that he was satisfied that this operation could not be performed in Barbados, or in any place in this territory, and that he was satisfied that this woman has not one red cent and is suffering and, therefore, he is asking for a mercy lift.
6.05 p.m.

None of us here would want such a lift; but as to the people who send us here to help them, if they want a mercy lift, we should give them rather than people whom the airlines are giving passages to. A mercy lift does not cost them one single cent. If the case is an urgent one, they would put you in if they have room.

Mr. BRANCKER: I wonder if the hon. senior member could help us with that information as to whether the U.C.W.I. Hospital will be in a position to deal with such matters. In this case, these people cannot raise dollar for dollar.

Hon. L. St.A. THORNE: The most I can say is that the U.C.W.I. is working feverishly with their hospital in order to bring it up to scratch. It is all with a view that the hospital will be brought up to scratch within two years. That is the most I can say.

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

HEAD XLVI - LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Head XLVI – Local Government – was called.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to move that Head XLVI stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. TALMA: The Note to this item states that the expenses of the preliminary work which was started during January, 1961, on the preparation of a new Register of Electors for the year 1961-62, have to be met before the expiration of the current financial year. The enumerators have been appointed and they are going on with the preliminary work which is being done on the compilation of this Register. I want to know if enough publicity has been given to this matter. I want to know if a list of the enumerators could be published in the daily newspapers of this island so that every person who has attained his or her majority, would be informed of it. I am suggesting that more publicity should be given to this matter; that these enumerators are going around and taking names in order to compile this new Register. I am suggesting that a list of the enumerators of the respective districts be published in the newspapers of this island so that people will be aware of this new list which is being compiled. When the Conservatives were in power, the practice was to try and keep as many people off the register as possible, especially those people whom they thought were opposed to them.

Mr. Chairman, I am not suggesting that that is happening now; but I do suggest that there should not be any hush-hush policy in connection with it. I am also suggesting that the itinerary of the enumerators should be definitely set out so that you will know when they will be in your district. I am not making any charge against the enumerators, but I want this question of the enumerators and their work be made as widely known as possible.

I am not in a position to say how many enumerators there are, and where they are working; I have not seen one up to now. For all I know, I may not be registered and that is not good enough. I want the Hon. Leader of the House to pay attention to what I am saying. In another few months you will hear that the Register has been closed, and you will also hear that thousands of people who should be on the Register are not on it. It is not good enough to send around people like Nicodemus in the dead of night when people are not available to give information, and then later on you will find that thousands of people are not on the Register. It may be that an Election might be won in that way! *(Laughter)* There are many and devious ways of winning an Election! *(Laughter.)*

I want to say that unless we start and have a new and comprehensive Register, well, there is no knowing who may win the Election. It is not good enough to have political stooges of the Government or of any other Party, for that matter, going around and feeling that I was registered with "X". There are a lot of political stooges who feel that their only means of survival is being first-rate stooges; it is not good enough for us to have a handful of hand-picked enumerators. I want to know that we have a full register; and let the Election be run on proper lines.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I represent a rural constituency. The crop will be in full swing during the course of next week, and does the Government believe that they will get a full register during the crop season when people are going to work overtime? Let the Government call an Election in the crop months and you will see what will happen. The Federal Election was an example for us. I want to say that no Registering Officer has been to my home. I do not know who is the Registering Officer in my district; if I am not registered I do not know where I can go and be registered. The Information Officer says that you have up to this end of this month to get registered, but get registered where? Some people say that they have voted before and they cannot register again. Nobody knows how these enumerators are working, where their offices are and where you can find them.
6.15 p.m.

I am not accusing the Registering Officer of nepotism or favouritism, but I believe there are a lot of people who believe that as soon as they hear a little odd job going, they should run as one of Government supporters; and in these jobs of registering people, they believe they are registering support for the Government.

An election is one of the most serious things with which anybody can play. It is not fun; it is blood; so if anybody believes that he can fool with an election he is looking for trouble. I have been to about four areas in my constituency already, and I find that the registration of voters is being mixed up with another survey which you are carrying out, where you are asking people how many fowls they have, how many cows and how many coal-pots in the yard; and some of the people are saying that is it none of your business. We want to make sure that people are being registered; and I would like to know now if the Minister can give us any progress report on the registration.

I want to know where I can be registered and who is the Registering Officer in my district; I have not seen any names published. *(ASIDES)* I bet I will hear you saying the same thing you said in St. Peter last time. I heard that you spent a lot of time in St. Peter; that is because you hang out clothes down there. (Hon. D. D. GARNER: You vote in St. Michael.) I may run in St. Michael too, but not myself; and that is not as spurious as it sounds. *(Cheers.)* This is a different going down this time; nobody is sitting in the corner because every man is a man. Mr. Chairman, since the whole island was my parish in the Federal Elections, it will be my parish in the coming elections.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. Did the hon. member say that the whole island will be his parish? Does he mean the City too? Boy, you are now looking for trouble!

Mr. WALCOTT: I am always looking for trouble! We never know how we are barking until we bark!

When it comes to registration in Barbados, Barbados is a small place and all the newspapers should carry a list

of the Registering Officers and their districts as was done in Trinidad. We should be able to read in the newspaper that the Registering Officer is Mr. John Brown living at Black Rock, and I should be able to get in touch with him. You should take up two pages in the *Sunday Advocate* to put these things in so that people can read them. Mr. Chairman, I say that because all of us are involved. Voting is a man's precious right, and we should do everything we can to encourage people to register.

I do not believe in this idea of leaving it to people to go and register themselves. I do not like this idea of the enumerators registering people; because, if he goes in a gap and does not find a person at home, we do not know how often he is going to return to that house; he is being paid so much for every person he registers, and not for the number of times he goes to a home. If he has to go three times to register a person for which he is going to get the same amount of money, he will leave that out.

I do not know if you have an adequate number of people, but I feel that it is a short job; and you should put on large numbers for the short space of time, instead of having too few numbers and spreading it over a long period. I would prefer you to put on three hundred or four hundred enumerators so that you can get all the people registered rather than put on too few and not have the work done, because under the law it is very difficult for a man to go and register if he loses his chance to do so. I understand that he can do it now, but he has to wait until the list is already published; but where can he find the Officer?

Mr. Chairman, the average elector is not going to be as interested in his name on the list as we would be as legislators. If a man went and found that he was not registered, or even if he was registered and for some reason or another the Polling Clerk in the room did not see his name on the list, do you know that he cannot vote? If you saw your name on a list and the Clerk made a mistake and insisted that he did not have your name on the list, you are disenfranchised. A man can lose an election by a vote. In Trinidad one vote caused a man to lose an election, so he is out for five years. The Government should give us and the electorate the assurance that everything will be done to see that every man who is eligible does not lose the opportunity to be registered.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, the points which have been made by the hon. senior member for Christ Church and the hon. member who has just sat down are very important indeed; and I would just like to add these points to the ones they have made. It should be possible in this island to devise a system of registration which is convenient both to the people who have to register people and the people who have to be registered.

Now, in my constituency, it has been drawn to my attention that on some occasions when the Registering Officer has been into a district, the people were not home, or all of them were not at home, and he has had to return on another occasion to meet them. Well now, that is all right, and probably is quite convenient in small areas where people know each other; where the Registering Officer is well known, and where he can come into contact in a day or two with the people he has missed today. It might not work so well in a larger constituency, because the enumerator might well feel that he has got so much ground to cover, that he might be a little careless or remiss in going back to put on the people whom he had forgotten or from whom he did not get sufficient information. 6.25 p.m.

I think the trouble is, Mr. Chairman, that enough has not been told to the people by the media of information about these things; and it is quite true that a lot of people have been mixing up certain enquiries which have come upon them within a few weeks of each other. The census which has been undertaken by the Statistical Department has been mixed up with the Registration of Voters and *vice versa*./ An consequently, a lot of confusion has come about. I do not think the media of Rediffusion has been used sufficiently enough. It is true that the Government Information Officer and the Supervisor of the Elections have made one or two appeals for people to get registered, but I suspect that those appeals have not been taken sufficiently serious. If you want to make people aware of what is happening, you have to start long before what is going to happen to get the people ready; and by repeated announcements you make them aware of what is coming to past.

One way to avoid the possibility of leaving anybody out - and it would cost the Government nothing much - is to have a simple form printed which can be left in the home of each householder to be filled out subsequently. On this form, you will ask for the number of people of voting age, their ages, occupation and the information you require. The enumerator could leave this form and call back for it and fill it in in the next few days in his register. He would be able to use that information as his basis.

A lot of people are being left out, and people are not having their names put on the voting list; that is something which can happen and happen in good faith. It happens with the person giving in a name by which he is familiarly known, but when he goes to vote he gives the name which is on his baptismal register. The people should be honest and give the name which appears on their birth and baptismal certificate to the enumerator, so that that name would be registered and they will not be told that that name is not on the register when they go to vote.

The next point is that there could be a more systematic and methodical way to keep the register up-to-date. I wonder, for instance, if there is any co-ordination between the emigration authorities and the Supervisor of Elections; or between the Registrar and the Supervisor of Elections. What I feel should happen is that as soon as anybody leaves the island - and the Police know it, because it is an emigration matter - in a day, or even 48 hours, that information should be forwarded to the Supervisor of Elections to to the effect that Mr. John Smith has left for the United Kingdom on emigration. Of course, I do not mean a person who has left on holiday. It would be a case of workers going on contract. If you had that information it would avoid a person using the name of any person out of the island.

Similarly, when deaths are registered, it should be incumbent on the Registrar of Deaths as soon as he receives the Death Certificate, to inform the Supervisor of Elections that he has received a certificate of death of Mr. John Smith; and what the Supervisor of Elections has to do is to see that Mr. John Smith's name is removed from the Register. I feel if proper check is kept between the emigration authorities, the Registrar of Deaths and the Supervisor of Elections, a lot of false information which probably appears on voting registers would be eliminated and there would be less likelihood of people impersonating people for the purpose of permitting an election fraud.

The Register of Voters is so important that any amount spent on having it done properly is money not wasted. It is right for people to be registered if they so desire; and a further right that the information given for voting purposes is accurate; and certainly it should not be in the case of a person registered in good faith and who has given his real name and address being prevented from voting because of some unsavoury practice or compilation of the Register. These things are important; and, probably hon. members would not be here in this House unless we had all in our individual capacities seen to it that people who claimed that they had given in their names were in fact on the Register. It should not be incumbent upon individual members of this House to make good this deficiency in their standards; it should be the competence of the Supervisor of Elections and his staff to see that any method which makes for efficiency is employed; that the Government gives him all that is required for the proper preparation of the Voting Register. I draw that to the attention of the Government because there is going to be considerable difficulty over this matter.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, in reply to some of the points raised, I must first of all confess that I was not listening as attentively as perhaps I should be. I would like to say that I share some of the views of hon. members; that is, that the widest publicity should be given in order that every individual who desires to be registered should have the opportunity to be registered. I, like the hon. senior member for St. George as well as the hon. senior member for St. Peter, have not been registered yet as far as I know. Nobody passed my way. I do not know if it was deliberate; but I can assure you that I have a means of registering because, as hon. members know, as far as the first registration takes place, the names have to be posted in conspicious places, such as churches and so on; and all potential electors have got a right to look upon those publications to see whether or not their names are inserted on those posters. If their names are not there, they can go to the Registering Officer and get registered.

I agree with the member or members who said that the names of the enumerators should be known. I think it would be very helpful because there are some people who may not always be at home and may lose the opportunity of becoming registered.
6.35 p.m.

If these people know the names of the enumerators who are responsible for the particular areas and are willing to become registered, they will go to these persons who are responsible and have their names put on the list. I quite agree with that, and I will take up the matter in the proper quarter. No doubt some people do not seem to appreciate the importance of the matter; it is very important to those who know, who have regard for the vote, and who give the vote its due weight and consideration.

As far as we are concerned, the vote brings every individual on an equal footing with the other; no matter how wealthy a man may be, he has the same vote as any other individual, and he votes for the person whom he feels will represent him faithfully and well. It is true that there are some people who are not desirous of becoming registered and, for some reason or other, some of those who feel that they should be registered do not decide to be registered at the proper time. However, when the election fever gets going, then they will find that they are too late to be registered.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to refer to the question raised about Government stooges, and so on. I do not know who are the Registering Officers; the Government has not had anything to do with the appointment of these Officers. I have been told that some of these enumerators are Sanitary Inspectors. I am sure that what I have said is true; no one could accuse the Government of appointing its stooges or anything like that. The person who is responsible for the appointment of these people, I mean the enumerators, is the Local Government Commissioner.

As to the question asked by the hon. senior member for St. Peter about a progress report, I should like to say that we have been informed that 93,973 persons have been registered to date and that seven parishes have been completed. The other four parishes, we hope, will be completed somewhere around the middle of this month. (A MEMBER: I am doubtful about that.) I have my doubts myself as to whether they will be completed during this month. However, Sir, that is the information which we have.

It has been said that the number of electors may fall slightly short of the last electoral roll. (Mr. MOTTLEY: By how many?) That has not been stated, but it is felt that as a result of the large-scale emigration, many people will not be on the list. I must confess that I am not satisfied about that; I am not satisfied that the exodus of people to the United Kingdom or elsewhere must necessarily result in a reduction in the number of persons who are likely to vote at the next election. Since I have seen that statement, I am prepared again to have a word with the Local Government Commissioner and ask him to do his best to publicise this matter and try to encourage people to be registered.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I suppose I suffer as a result of bad registration more than any other member, in that my Party was defeated at the last election. I will say that for wilful reasons people in the City were not registered. I thank God that I am in a position to say the new Supervisor of Elections, who has superseded the last dunderhead which we had, has shown, from what I have observed, the greatest amount of integrity and impartiality. I think that he was very strict in his warning to his men as to what they should do and what they should not do; therefore, as far as that Officer is concerned, I am quite satisfied.

I am not one of those who walk about asking for favours. I want to say that actual registration today is not a matter of signing your name. The enumerator comes to your house and if he sees your servant he will enquire of that servant who lives there, how many people are grown up and how many are not grown up. He will enquire as to how old each one is and so on.
6.45 p.m.
I agree with the hon. senior member for St. Lucy and the hon. senior member for Christ Church that the Government should go out of its way to give this more publicity. As the hon. member for St. Peter said, because of the other inquiry which is going on about how many fowls and ducks a person has, and people seem to take serious objection to this, as soon as somebody approaches them, they will say they do not want to see him because he is prying into their business; and they are not telling him anything.

I feel, Mr. Chairman, that the Hon. Minister should have a word in the absence of the Premier with the Supervisor of Elections, Mr. Ramsey, and give as much publicity as possible to this matter. Incidentally, I would like to say this, if it is not known to the Minister: The publicity which you give is given at the wrong time. People are more interested in "Pepperpot" than they are in hearing Beethoven, or any of those fancy talks. (Hon. D. D. GARNER: Beethoven?) Shut up, you idiot! I am talking about "Sparrow"! People are more interested in the "Pepperpot" hour or listening to "Chi-Chi" in the programme "Life can be Beautiful" than in any of the other programmes; and if you can bring this over at that time, it would be very interesting. Those of us who know about running elections, have already gone out of our way to publicise in the areas in which we are interested why people should be registered; because, if they do not register now, when the time comes, and the election fever is on, they would not be able to vote.

The hon. member mentioned that the most of this registration is done by Sanitary Inspectors. I would just like to say that on the last occasion every Sanitary Inspector in the municipal area was ruled out, and that is the reason why people did not get registered. The Minister said it would be a good idea to let people know all the enumerators, but that would be very difficult; because, you would give an enumerator say, the Hackett Hall district, and you would find that unlike in the case when it was first done when a man was given an area in which he worked as an inspector, he might be living at Cave Hill. You may take a man who lives at Jack-My-Nanny Gap and send him into Chelsea Road. You know that is true, Mr. Chairman, and so does the Minister.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I do not agree with the hon. member that you should state where the man lives. I said you should know who was the enumerator for the particular area.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, if hon. members would take time out to be interested in it, they would find that beside the Supervisor of Elections, in every parish you have appointed a Registering Officer. For instance, the Registering Officer for the constituency of St. Michael, is, I believe, Mr. L. B. Waithe. I think the Minister should pay some attention to this, because he should be able to tell the public that under the Regulations, as soon as the

registering is declared closed, a person still has fourteen days to go and be registered. There was a publication to the effect that this would close at the end of January, but I knew it was impossible. It might have been all right for a parish like St. Joseph or even St. Andrew, but in a constituency like St. Michael, it would not be possible to close before the end of February, because you would leave a tremendous lot of people out. If you give the neccesary publication over the radio and in the Press, I am sure that you will exceed the number for 1956. I believe that our growth of population must exceed these emigrants who have left here; and therefore when the figure given to us is 93,000, I would prefer to think that you are going to have many more than in 1956.
6.55 p.m.

Mr. WALCOTT: What the Hon. Minister has revealed does not reveal the facts. There is more political consciousness in 1961 than there was in 1956. I have no doubt about that, because the mere presence of three political parties would reveal that. The population which is going to the U.S.A. from here cannot be measured by those facts. The number of people leaving the island as compared with the number of people reaching the voting age since the last election is smaller. The natural growth of the population of Barbados is over 2,000 a year; so you would have some 10,000 people added to your population on an average of five years. If the voting list is smaller, with the greater political consciousness, than it was in 1956, then it would be a matter that the enumeration is not as effective as the enumeration of 1956. It may be that the enumerators today are not interested, or the amount of money which is paid them is not attractive and; therefore, you will find that they do not go after people and ask them to be registered. Another thing may be is that, when they go to the home of an agricultural worker and nobody is at home, there is no return made by him. In St. Michael, I do not believe that the voters list represents the population growth of the parish. I have been all over St. Michael from the point of view of political meetings, and there is no time you hold a political meeting in St. Michael that you do not get an audience; therefore, that is indicative of the consciousness of the people to politics. These people are not going to attend political meetings unless they want to become registered voters. It is not even today like in the old time days when we had a very high percentage of people registered on income.

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

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that this Resolution for the sum of $32,286 do now pass.

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

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN left the Chair and Mr. SPEAKER took the Chair.

SUSPENSION

Mr. SPEAKER: It now being 7 o'clock, the sitting of the House now stands suspended until 7.45 'clock.
7.00 p.m.

On resumption.

Hon. L. St.A. THORNE: Mr. Speaker, there is no quorum and I ask that the Bell be rung.

The Bell was rung and a quorum was obtained.

RESUMPTION OF COMMITTEE

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES, 1960-61, NO. 35
DEEP WATER HARBOUR

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, hon. members will see from the Schedule in the 1960-61 Estimates that we voted $4,120,000 for the Deep Water Harbour. At the time, we did not anticipate the progress which has been made on the project and, as a result of this progress, we underestimated by the amount of $638,080 now to be voted. As the Addendum says: "The sum of $1,040,592 is required to supplement the amount voted under the Capital Estimates for continuation of work on the Deep Water Harbour. The work has progressed ahead of schedule and the sums provided for Contractors and Consultants' fees are inadequate to meet the demands to the end of the financial year. Amounts of $550,000 and $88,080 respectively are required for these fees. In addition, the sum of $352.512 is required for work in connection with drainage of the reclaimed land aback of Fontabelle, and $50,000 for commencement of construction of buildings in the Harbour area for which token provision of $1 was made in the current estimates. Of the total amount required, $688,080 will be met from loan funds and $352,512 from surplus balances."

Of this amount, hon. members will notice Item 5, (new) Drainage, for which the sum of $352,512 is required. Drainage in this area has always presented some difficulty; and with the building of the Deep Water Harbour, this difficulty has increased rather than diminished. For instance, along Fontabelle where previously people would deposit or might throw out certain things which the ebb and flow of the tide took care of, you will find that, with the building of the Deep Water Harbour, it is not so now; and now it is exposed to the air, and as a result, you have all kinds of smells and odours. The same thing has happened with the Emmerton drain. A lot of night soil which was deposited in the sea before is now deposited in that drain because the Harbour is there. The engineers have taken temporary measures to deal with this problem, and, of course, it requires special work in order that the whole process will be adequately dealt with. To provide a proper drainage for the Emmerton and Fontabelle areas, we intend to do so by a process of electrial pumping which we will be done by two large pumps and one small pump.
7.50 p.m.

There will be recurrent expenditure involved of an estimated $8,000 per annum through this electrical pump. Engineers have been consulted in the matter, as well as other Heads of Departments such as the Director of Public Works, the Director of Highways and Transport, the Housing Authority, the Chief Public Health Inspector and the World Health Organisation. All of these people have entered into the discussions on this matter; and after these discussions, this scheme of drainage was arrived at.

In so far as these buildings are concerned, the amount estimated is $50,000 for the commencement of the construction of the buildings in the Harbour area. These buildings include the Administrative Offices, the Mechanical Workshop and the Passenger and Duty Free Shop.

The amount for the drainage will come from surplus balances, because, although it is true that the Harbour added to the difficulties, nevertheless it is an old problem in that area. While the Harbour has aggravated the problem, nevertheless it is a problem which we have, and we have to apply ourselves to it, It is not only a matter which concerns this generation, but it is a matter which concerns other generations which are to come. The other amount will come from loan funds. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to move, Mr. Chairman, that you do now report the passing of two Resolutions in Committee.

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

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

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

On motions of Hon. M. E. COX, seconded by Hon. D. D. GARNER in each case, the Resolutions passed in Committee were read a first and second time and agreed to.

HOLIDAYS WITH PAY (AMENDMENT) BILL

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Leader of the House: To move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Holidays with Pay Act, 1951.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, this Bill has for its object amending the Holidays with Pay Act. Hon. members will see from the "Objects and Reasons" that it seeks (a) to redefine the expressions "employee", "average pay" and "total remuneration." (b) to provide that annual holidays be given and taken in one period or in two separate periods by agreement; that the employer shall give the employee fourteen days' notice of the date of the commencement of annual holidays; and that notice of termination of employment give immediately prior to or during holidays shall be void. Under the present Act, the employer gives the employee seven days' notice. This Bill also seeks to provide that in the case of employees taking annual holidays in two periods, a proportionate part of the average pay will be paid in respect of each period.
8.00 p.m.

If the employee is taking his holiday in two parts, on the eve of his taking the holiday he must be paid his week's wage; and then when he is taking the second period, he must again be paid immediately before leaving for his holiday. In other words, if he is taking his holiday from, say, Monday, he should be paid at the latest on Saturday before he leaves work.

The Bill also seeks to provide for "average pay" where employment is terminated after three months' continuous employment as specified in the case of employees other than monthly employees. In other words, what happens today is that an individual has to work for a minimum of say three months or ninety days in order to qualify for average pay. Under this amendment, the individual will qualify for average pay provided he does at least sixteen days in three consecutive months. If he does forty-eight days in three consecutive months, that is, sixteen days each month, that individual will qualify for average pay instead of having to work for ninety days as under the old 1951 Act.

An opportunity is also being taken, Mr. Speaker, to require employers to keep proper records of remuneration, periods of employment and holidays of every employee in such form as the Labour Commissioner may prescribe. Paragraph (f) in the Objects and Reasons also seeks to empower a magistrate, on conviction of an employer for refusing to allow an employee to take a holiday to which he is entitled, or for failing to pay an employee average pay, to order the employer to pay the employee any payments which may be due to him under the provisions of the Act. That means that if, for example, holiday with pay is due to an individual, or rather if sums or any sum due under this Holiday with Pay Act to an individual is not paid to him and he brings the employer before the Court, the magistrate is in addition to convicting him for contravening the Act, can also compel him to pay to the employee his just due at the particular time. This is similar to what we passed here last week in the case of the domestic servants where, instead of the employee having to bring a civil action against an employer, which no doubt may be expensive and in some cases inconvenient to many employees, the magistrate can order him to pay the individual so much at the same time.

You will see, Sir, from the definition that "employee" under the old 1951 Act means "any person who is in receipt of or entitled to any remuneration for labour or services performed for an employer." Mr. Matthews from I.L.O whom we had down here some time ago to investigate and recommend a labour code, suggested a much wider definition of "employee." I would like to tell this House that on these provisions we have consulted the Barbados Workers' Union and the Employers' Organisation, and they have all agreed to the proposals which we have here. An "employee in this present Bill means "any person who has entered into or works under a contract of service or apprenticeship with an employer whether the contract is expressed or implied, oral or in writing, and whether the remuneration is calculated by time or work done."

Of course, it goes on to point out that it does not include an outworker. That is to say, if for example, you give a tailor a piece of cloth into which we was to make a suit for you, then he does not fall under this because he is not directly employed by you; you regard him as an outworker. A member of the employer's family does not qualify either.

Under the old Act "average pay" in respect of any period of employment, means one-twenty-sixth of the employee's total remuneration for that period of employment; and it did not include what might be certain perquisites which an individual might be getting at the time. Under this new Bill this is how "average pay" is defined; "average pay" in respect of any period of employment means one twenty-sixth of the employee's total remuneration for that period of employment. Further on the Bill states that "total remuneration" in respect of any period of employment means all basic wages which the employee is paid or is entitled to be paid by his employer in respect of the labour or services which he has performed for his employer during the period of employment and includes the cash value of any board or lodging provided by his employer, but shall not include any overtime payments, commissions or bonuses. For the purposes of this definition, the cash value of any board or lodging shall be deemed to be the amount fixed as such by or under the terms of the employee's employment; or, if it is not so fixed, shall be computed at the rate of one dollar and fifty cents per week for board and fifty cents for lodging.
8.18 p.m.

This amendment reads as follows:-

' "average pay" in respect of any period of employment means one twenty-sixth of the employees' total remuneration for that period of employment except that, where an employee by virtue of his contract of service by custom or by collective agreement, is entitled to a longer period of annual holiday with pay than two weeks, average pay in respect of that employee shall mean the fraction of the employee's total remuneration corresponding to the proportion that the period of holiday to which he is entitled calculated in weeks bears to fifty-two weeks: Provided that in the case of an employee who is employed on a weekly, fortnightly or monthly basis, average pay in respect of the period of his holiday shall not be less than the actual remuneration he received for the said period immediately prior to the commencement of his holiday;'

All that means, for example, is this: The law says that the individual must get one twenty-sixth which means two weeks pay; and if you have entered into an agreement with the individual that he should get four weeks' pay, then it will be four of fifty-two instead of two of fifty-two which will bring it to one-thirteenth instead of one-twenty-sixth.

There is one more important provision which is made under this Act; it is that when one earns his holiday, dismissal from his job, when his holiday becomes due, shall not be simultaneous with his holiday. At least on three occasions it has been drawn to my attention that some large employers have taken advantage of their workers by dismissing them at the same time that they would have given that worker his holiday. In other words, a worker earns his holiday, let us say at the end of November, and when he

should go home for two weeks in December, instead of your allowing him to take his holiday, you dismiss him at the end of November and, therefore, you only pay him two weeks. In other words, if the individual had to be ordinarily dismissed, you would have given him if he works by the week, a week's notice; therefore, by dismissing him at that particular time, that is to say when his holiday came due, you only gave him his two weeks' holiday pay and you deprived him of that week which you would have to pay him for what can be regarded as notice of termination of employment. Provision is also made in this Bill that any dismissal which may take place simultaneously with holiday period shall be null and void. You can dismiss the man, but you will have to pay him. Holidays do not form part of the period which notice is given for the dismissal. That is, perhaps, the most important change in this particular Bill.

Mr. Speaker, I think I have outlined quite clearly the purpose of this Bill. As I pointed out earlier, the people directly concerned are the Employers' Organisation as well as the Barbados Workers' Union, and they have all agreed to these proposals before the actual legislation was drafted. This is one of the bits of legislation proposed under the Matthews' Code. As I mentioned some time ago, we are prepared to implement Mr. Matthews' Code in stages; and this is another stage of the implementation of the Labour Code as recommended by Mr. Matthews.

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

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

Mr. STRAUGHN: Mr. Speaker, can the Hon. Minister tell us in respect of that admirable clause about termination of employment being null and void immediately prior to the commencement or during an annual holiday, whether there is any law at all under the Act in force now which can permit an employer to give the employee a pay period in lieu of notice? In other words, can you get either a week, fortnight or month's salary for notice to termination? If that is so, how is it affected with this particular clause? Is it possible at the beginning of an employee's holiday for the employer to say: "I am going to give you an extra month's pay plus your vacation and your services are terminated." Is that notice also of no effect in a situation like that?

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I can only answer that by saying: it all depends on the contract. If the individual is on a monthly basis, then a month's notice is allowed. You will see the provision made under Clause 3. It says: "Any notice of the termination of employment given by an employer to an employee immediately prior to or during an annual holiday shall be void and of no effect." In other words, while the individual must accept the notice of termination of employment, it does not relieve the employer of his duty to pay the individual what is due to him; you will still have to comply with the requirement of the law.
8.20 p.m.

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

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee on this Bill.

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

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

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

Clauses 1 to 7 inclusive were called and passed

On motion of Hon. M. E. COX, seconded by Hon. L. ST.A. THORNE, the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Bill in Committee.

Mr SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On motions of Hon. M. E. COX, seconded by Hon. D. D. GARNER in each case, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

HOUSING (AMENDMENT) BILL

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 Housing Act, 1955.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, this Bill is an attempt to assist — we hope to do it to a greater extent than is envisaged here — persons who have contributed largely to the economy of the island in their young days by their labours in the principal industry of this island, which is the sugar industry. We feel that one of the least things we can do is to ensure that those retired workers who have reached old age should have a shelter over their heads. We have, therefore, brought down this Bill to amend the Act so as to make that possible. In order that we can grant this facility to these workers, that is, to rent them houses at a peppercorn rent, it is necessary that Section 48 (3) of the Housing Act, 1955, should be amended. We are asking that this Act be amended so as to exempt the Housing Authority from the restrictions imposed by that particular Section.

In so far as the mechanics of this new Bill is concerned, we have envisaged, although we cannot accurately estimate it, the number of people who would be affected by this Bill. We are making provision for about twenty-five houses per annum; and that is within the limit of our resources. This money is coming from the Labour Welfare Fund; and, already, we are committed through Labour Welfare to certain stated amounts every year with regard to housing. As hon. members know, we are building a new Hospital, we are doing other things, and the limit to which we can go is $30,000 a year. That is the estimate of twenty-five houses annually. The qualifying age will be no less than sixty years.

We have also taken the opportunity to amend the Bill so that it will be left to the Executive Committee, or the Cabinet, to fix an age at which people should be eligible for loans from the Housing Authority. Opportunity has also been taken to delete from the definition of "person of the working class" the reference to the arbitary figure of $30 for determining the income qualification of a person of the working class. We know that the value of money usually falls nowadays; and what was $30 as a working class income yesterday may well be $35 tomorrow.
8.30 p.m.

We will also be coming down with a cost of living allowance; and I believe that the Union has just obtained increases for sugar workers; which means that with the fluctuation of the incomes of those concerned, rather than keep it rigid as the present Act does, I think the House should agree to this amendment to leave it to the Government by an easy method to alter that figure. We have had people coming to us for loans under the Act who worked for just about $30 and cannot get loans; there are members of the working class who are exempted from getting a loan because they are paid more than $30; and we are asking the House to agree to this amendment, so that we will have that degree of flexibility which the situation demands. That means that we will not have to come down from time to time to amend the Act. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I am sure the Minister would not expect me, if nobody else, to agree to this. There are many reasons why I cannot agree to this. We are living in changed circumstances; and I have already said that the Labour Welfare Fund should no longer be administered by

the Cabinet. The Cabinet has taken on a completely different role from the role of the Governor-in-Executive Committee in the old days. The Cabinet are those gentlemen over there who are administrators in every sense of the word today.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this is not their money; this is money in which the workers have an interest; and Barbados is the only territory where the Labour Welfare Fund is controlled by the Cabinet. It is not controlled by the Jamaica Cabinet, by the Trinidad Cabinet, by the British Guiana Cabinet or by any other Cabinet. In 1947 when this Fund was created against the background of what existed in Barbados, there was the Governor-in-Executive Committee; and therefore, in those days, members did not hold the power they now hold; their position was advising the Governor. Today, their position is no longer advising the Governor; they are controlling the country; so they need not be the persons to say how this money should be spent. They should set a policy after which the idea of determining certain things should be left to appropriate Committees. They set policies in Education, but they do not go and decide what schools should go where, or where to put up a toilet and so forth.

Another reason why I cannot agree with this is that the Barbados Workers' Union is invited to meet the Ministry of Trade, Industry and Labour tomorrow to discuss the question of a Provident Fund; but the Government has not seen fit to increase the amounts, in dealing with the same people who are aged, to what the Union has asked. There is no secret in this. The Union has asked the Government for $3 million to set up a Provident Fund to provide for sickness, old age, severance, and superannuation which would mean...

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order. Mr. Speaker, I am sure the rules of etiquette do not permit or admit of this sort of disclosure. We have had discussions on this question with the Union and the Sugar Producers' Association, and these discussions have not yet been finalised. As the hon. member has said, he has to meet the Minister tomorrow to have further discussions; and I do not think it is fair to say what these discussions are at this stage. I would have no objection to his saying what the results were if they had been finished; and I do not think it is fair to come and tell the House now, because after all the House of Assembly is a place for debating Bills and Resolutions, and not for the Union to air something which is still under discussion with the Ministry.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is fond of anticipating me. The reason why I am not voting for this is precisely what the Minister has said. I am not disclosing anything; I have only made a statement of what we have proposed to the Government. The reason why I cannot vote for this is because it impinges on what we are discussing; and the Minister knows that what we are discussing in relation to the aged has a very important effect on what we are doing. If we agree to a Provident Fund which would include the aged, then the aged in the sugar industry would be treated in a manner in which, problems such as would require this, would no longer require it. The aged in the sugar industry have no provision for old age other than what they get as old age pension.

Mr. Speaker, all we are doing is trying to prevent the aged who have qualified in the sugar industry from being destitute. I would not have raised this question if we had not been meeting tomorrow; but this deals with the Labour Welfare Fund, and the Minister knows our feeling on it. The Minister knows that we have been as conservative about the utilisation of the Labour Welfare Fund as we possibly could be; and it seems to me that although Government has not concluded its negotiations with the Union on this matter, it is coming down to do something out of the same fund. The matter we have to discuss with the Minister tomorrow supercedes this in importance in relation to the aged; that is the issue that should be settled. Moreover I feel that the Government should not as a matter of policy undertake to bring down a measure such as this that deals with the Labour Welfare Fund.

8.40 p.m.

The Government knows when they were about to deal with the hospital that the Barbados Workers' Union was consulted as regards the proposal to utilise the money to build the hospital. They ask us: "are you in favour of using some of this money for the building of the hospital?" The Trade Union agreed. In this Bill, the Government is acting on its own. It is going to make a further use of Labour Welfare Fund to carry out this scheme.

We are happy to say that we are the accredited organisation which represents the sugar workers of this colony; and it should not be a question of your giving them something, it should be a question of a settled policy to give them something after consultation with the people who represent them. We are the ones who have to go out and tell the workers that they have to pay back the money. Last night we were out in Josey Hill. We are performing our task. We went further and made suggestions; we are satisfied that every worker who makes a loan should honour every application; it therefore cannot be said that we are shirking our responsibility.

The hon. member could not expect me to agree to a Bill which gives the Executive Committee and the Cabinet these sort of prescribed rights to determine these conditions for workers, when we are not the participants. We want to be quite frank. We feel that we are more qualified to deal with these things because we are at the call of the workers everyday. We are not afraid to say that we are their servants. I cannot support this Bill for those important reasons.

Moreover, the Hon. Minister should be aware that I have been asking the Government to remove the nonsense whereby a worker must have a percentage of the money which he wants to borrow. The Government should remove completely any restriction on the question of a person getting a loan. These restrictions were quite all right when they were put at the beginning, since you were dealing with a fund which you did not know how it would break. But that fund was going from 1947 to this date; therefore, there is no valid reason for you to say to a sugar worker today that he is qualified to receive a loan but if he wants to borrow $1,000, he must have a percentage of it to show; which means to say that before you can borrow, you must show that you have something. The whole idea of the system is aimed at helping you to purchase something.

Some Americans now have the sort of thinking whereby they give you a suit of clothes and tell you to put it on and wear it and pay for it later. There is no representative of workers in Barbados today who would say, even despite the difficulty which arises when some workers do not pay back in time, that there should be non-payment of loans. There was somebody, who for political reasons, did advocate that this money which was made as a loan should be made as a gift, but that man has gone to the Great Beyond. Purely ordinary simple arithmetic would show you that if you have 22,000 people coming to you to borrow money, if you gave everybody what they wanted as a gift, the money would soon disappear. If we are putting it alongside the Rehabilitation Fund for factories, we are wrong; the circumstances are different and the principles are different. The factory owners have to put up some money along with what they get from the Rehabilitation Fund.

I think the Government should now give serious consideration to the setting up of a Labour Welfare Fund Committee similar to what is set up in other territories with, may be, the Financial Secretary as Chairman of the Board, so as to have these things dealt with in the manner in which they should be dealt with. It should be administered in that way, and should not be left to the Cabinet. This is not the sort of thing that the Government should now determine in view of the constitutional changes which you now have. For example, if you take the Housing Authority and other authorities, they have more money than this to administer, but it is not controlled by the Cabinet. Why should the Cabinet today determine what should be done for the sugar workers when these people have a powerful organisation to represent them? We have as powerful an organisation represent-

ing sugar workers in Barbados today as the people in Jamaica. In Jamaica, the workers are divided between three Unions. We have here one Union which represents all the sugar workers.

I think that you should have an analysis of what you are doing. I represent a rural constituency. Apart from Speightstown, or a few places around here, you cannot carry houses and say that you are going to rent them out; because, as you know, people do not rent houses as a general rule in country areas. House rent is something unknown in some rural constituencies. The Government had its problem with that when they went to St. Andrew and put down a housing scheme. They could not get anybody to rent those houses in St. Andrew; and it was simply because those people do not rent houses. Ask the hon. junior member for St. James how many people are they to whom he rents houses in Orange Hill. What happens is that a man tries to get a spot of land, and then his mission is to build an 18' x 9' to put on it. You do not get slum areas in the country; you get areas with poor people houses. If these people are going to have rent houses available to them at a peppercorn rent, you have to analyse it with a view as to whether it would not be better to give them a money value to the value in which these rents are paid; so that if they have to rent, they would rent according to the value which you have given them.
8.50 p.m.

The majority of Government houses which are rented are rented at $2 or $2.50 a week; and this is the proper analysis which you have to take: How many of the aged are alone and destitute as compared with the aged who live with a son or a daughter? Very few of these old people will live in a house alone, because that is a dangerous thing. What are the prescriptions you are going to make? You are renting the aged a house at a peppercorn rent and will nobody be in the house but the aged? This matter is not as simple as it looks; you have to think of all these things.

Mr. Chairman, I could not support this Bill at this time because I would like to have some more discussion with the Government in connection with it. What is behind all of this? I could not pin down myself to agreeing to this Bill and then tomorrow to be told by the Minister: "You have just passed a Bill last night which deals with another matter and therefore you have dealt with this matter;" We say that we have submitted a Memorandum to the Minister based on these things. I have put it forward to the Minister, and it has been agreed, to raise the levy from forty cents per ton to one dollar per ton; but the other things have not been agreed upon. We want benefit fund, provident fund, maternity leave and severance pay; and we have put all of these things to the Minister because these people are the backbone of the country.

If this is to be part of a scheme, then it must be a part of a grand scheme. I will give the Government ideas, if they want them, and they will pay an economist and a Planning Unit money which they do not pay me. What is wrong about consulting us in these matters? We have stopped plantations talking about substantive workers; you cannot employ a man who is not able to work.

The Minister should see that it would be better to postpone the further consideration of this Bill. In view of the fact that we are going to have discussions on this matter tomorrow – I would not say the details which we have to discuss – it is not in fairness to these discussions that this Bill should be passed. The Trade Union who represents these people should be given an opportunity to have further consultation with the Government with regard to this proposal, because it is likely to conflict in an over-all way with what we are doing.

The Union has plans in mind to the effect that there will be a large Provident Fund; and the Union will support legislation which has for its object calling upon workmen to contribute to their own benefit. We are therefore coordinating these things and we want to have a big fund. We want to have a corporate scheme which will even include people like taxi drivers and fishermen. If the hon. member is thinking of twenty-five people per annum, that is nothing to worry about; we have about nine hundred people going through the eddoes, so that when you talk about twenty-five people, that is like a mosquito going through the rind of a rhinoceros.

Let the Cabinet leave this question of a peppercorn rent to peppercorn boys. This is something for a Committee; or rather this is something to be dealt with by a person who is not accustomed to putting on clothes. Let him put on clothes and deal with this. We do not want to do any small-way thinking. In view of what the Union is discussing tomorrow, I am submitting that this Bill should be postponed in order to give us an opportunity to deal with this big overall question of the Labour Welfare Fund.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I too regard the general approach to this matter as more or less nibbling at a problem. I agree with the principle of the Bill, and the proposed housing scheme which is set out in this Bill. The object of this Bill. The object of this Bill, as I see it, is to assist those aged workers who have been engaged in the sugar industry of this island.
9.00 p.m.

I feel, Sir, that this is a very urgent matter and desires our support; but I feel also that greater study should be given to this matter in that it is a bigger scheme than has been anticipated. From what the Minister has said, it seems as though there are many aged who have worked for the greater part of their lives in the sugar industry and have applied for loans, but who, owing to their age, have not been granted loans. Now I do not know the provision nor the age limit, but the Minister said sixty years.

I feel, Sir, that this is a move in the right direction whereby each man's home would be regarded as his own almshouse. It is a means of assisting the ones who would otherwise find themselves in the almshouse; and from that point of view, I am going to support the passing of this Bill, even though it has certain patent defects. When I say that, I refer merely to the Clause dealing with the vesting of even more power in the Governor-in-Executive Committee.

The Governor-in-Executive Committee is already seized with the power of fixing the income qualification; so, in reality, when all is said and done, this does not really give the Governor-in-Executive Committee any more power than they have at present; but it is still making it in such a way that the Governor-in-Executive Committee will not be accountable to Parliament. In other words, they will not have to come here and say anything at all. They will just *ad lib* in their office and ignore the House.

This Labour Welfare Fund has been referred to as the Governor-in-Executive Committee Fund, but whether it is the Governor-in-Executive Committee Fund, or the Labour Welfare Fund, already the Governor-in-Executive Committee has power to say what the income qualifications should be, and they can change the income qualification of $30 to any figure they think fit. That being the case, I hardly think that what we are asking here will really matter much.

I agree with the remarks of the hon. senior member for St. Peter in that no harm would be done in postponing this Bill tonight, and appointing a Committee to go into this whole question of administering the Labour Welfare Fund, as well as to make recommendations to the Governor-in-Executive Committee as to the handling of this Fund. I feel that the Cabinet already has enough to do. The Labour Welfare Fund should be administered by a Committee like the Fancy Molasses Board and the various other Boards. I do not see why we cannot have a Committee administering this Fund also.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, I really did not anticipate that the hon. senior member for St. Peter would have taken the line he has taken; for the simple reason that the Housing Authority had actually gone into this matter which arose previously out of questions asked in this House. The Housing Authority, as hon. members will know, has the

President of the Barbados Workers' Union among its members – he was one of the members who considered this and agreed to it – as well as a member from the planting community and other members nominated by the Government.

I appreciate the fact that the hon. member is not opposing the Bill in principle; but he is saying that it should be postponed so that the method may be slightly altered, and to give the Union time to finalise certain discussions which they are having on the future of the Fund. Now, Sir, I hope that what I say will further enlighten certain members of the House on these matters; this is the first time that I have heard that the Labour Welfare Fund will be the principal Fund to be affected by the discussions now taking place.

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order. The hon. member must remember that legislation was passed affecting this as far back as 1956, imposing a levy of 40 cents per ton of sugar; and I think it was to come from the Labour Welfare Fund. The Minister can correct me if I am wrong. That was agreed to when the hon. senior member for Christ Church was then Minister of Agriculture. (Hon. M. E. COX: It was the Price Stabilisation Fund.) The levy of $13.20 includes part of the Labour Welfare Fund.
9.10 p.m.

I think why they did that was because they did not want to reduce the Labour Welfare Fund by this amount. They preferred to attack other funds.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I can assure the hon. member that if that was so, we would not be considering this Bill at this time. It is absolutely no question of the Labour Welfare Fund being affected by this. This matter has absolutely no bearing on the negotiations between Government and the Union. It is true that the Price Stabilisation Fund is not controlled by the Cabinet.

Mr. WALCOTT: I rise on a point of order. When the hon. member says that it has no bearing, I cannot accept that because the discussion is not confined to any fund but to certain amounts. What I am saying is if they do not use the Labour Welfare Fund, it is because they do not want to touch it; they have it reserved for something else. If you say that that is earmarked for something else, I can understand you. I want the Hon. Minister to see that the discussion which went on with him and which is still going on does not exclude any specific fund; the only thing which I know is excluded is the Rehabilitation Fund which the factories are using.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I would like to assure the hon. member that this amount which we will spend on this matter will come from the amount paid from the Labour Welfare Fund to the Housing Authority; and will not in any way upset the apportionment of these funds to any purpose or any schemes now being discussed or already discussed.

There is absolutely no danger that any fund or else will not be available because of this for provident schemes to sugar workers, or funds which might otherwise be available will not be available, or will be reduced. I think if I give that assurance it will take care of the hon. member's expressed fears, or those not expressed.

I have no reason to feel that the workers of Barbados have anything to fear because this fund is operated by this Government; we have seen how these funds have been disbursed as compared with similar funds in the other islands, and the workers of Barbados have come off better than those in the case of Jamaica, Trinidad and some of the other places.

The Cabinet will not be concerned with the collection of rentals. Where you have a Board handling these things, presumably the part that is going to housing will still go to housing; and presumably you will still have the Housing Authority to handle this. The Housing Authority will continue to collect rents and disburse them. The peppercorn rental was simply imposed because the houses would remain the property of the Authority; and there would be no danger that the purpose of this Bill would be defeated by some Board.

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

On motion of Hon. R. G. MAPP, seconded by Hon. L. ST.A. THORNE, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. BRYAN in the Chair.

Clause 1 was called and passed.

Clause 2 was called.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 2 stand part.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I will take this opportunity to make myself crystal clear. As I have said before, I cannot support the Bill and I am not going to support it. In reply to remarks which I made, the Hon. Minister said that the President of the Union is a member of the Housing Board; that is true. He is up against many other people who do not represent labour. The same Housing Authority refused a suggestion which came from the Union to remove completely the idea of asking the sugar workers to put up money. The Government has no kind of direction because, if the Government gives a direction to the Housing Authority that no person needs to look for money to put up, I cannot see how you can say that you are interested to help someone with peppercorn rent and at the same time you are not making it easy by removing the restriction for anyone to put up money.
9.20 p.m.

By passing this Bill, all that will happen is that the Minister will find it impossible to carry out its terms. As far as I am concerned, I would be adamant now. I am saying that not a single penny less than what we ask for could be justified. If you can show this liberality to these people now, you will have to show your liberality to them in the sense that it is not just a question of begging.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: On a point of order. Would the hon. member say if the Union had put up a suggestion to the Housing Authority that the whole loan should be given and it was refused?

Mr. WALCOTT: We tried to get the Board to do it.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Is the hon. member aware that the deposit was reduced?

Mr. WALCOTT: It went from 25% down to 10%. What the Government is more interested in is collecting what is being loaned; not in restricting what is to be loaned. If you have a maximum amount of $1,000.00 you will not make it $1,010.00. I like to be kind to people; I do not like to be hard on them.

I find that on many of these Boards you try to get your best people, but when it comes to broad public duties, you have not got any clue. Unless you have a good administrator, people will go messing around with things before they can get down to business. I should like to ask if in the parish of St. Joseph, you think you will get any houses rented; do you think the Minister of Agriculture would build a house in St. Philip and get it rented out? Everybody has his little house.

We are not opposed to helping people; Mr. Lashley has told me that he has quite a number of people applying for houses to rent; he says that he has more applications for houses for rent than he has houses. I would say that a man would want to live in his own house; I believe that the only place where you have houses vacant is down in the parish of St. Andrew. That is the only place where you will find houses advertised for rent.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to know on what basis are these people going to get these houses. I doubt very much that anybody will ever leave a Government house, unless you have to chuck him out for the non-payment of rent. People come to me asking me for assistance in recommending them to get a house. I passed Sayes Court yesterday and, incidentally, I may say that the houses up there look as if they want some washing. In St. Philip, the Hon. Minister of Agriculture has some nice house spots, but somebody could tell that man up there that he should remove that old motor car. However that is by the way.

If people apply for loans, giving them houses is not the answer; they must be living somewhere so that they can apply for loans. If you are giving them houses at a peppercorn rent, which is really giving them rent-free houses, what kind of houses are you going to make available to them on the basis of a peppercorn rent? If the peppercorn rent is ten cents per week, how many rooms will be in these houses? How are you going to arrive at $20,000 and what rent will you charge as a peppercorn rent? All of these things you would have to examine.

Are you thinking in terms of social security for these workers? If you are giving these people these houses at a peppercorn rent and you are working at $20,000, if you are giving people all that, how much of this social security in cash do you think these people should have? If you are giving $20,000 per annum to twenty-five people, that is an annual value of $800. If you are giving $800 per annum as a subsidy for a house, you are telling us that the intention of the Government is to build an $800 house for a man who is old and then you will prescribe the age. An unscrupulous man can say that you are giving an old man a rent-free house; the politicians will run rings through this idea and you will see more than hell in getting the rent. As soon as you start to justify giving a man a rent-free house, you will have to spend a lot of money on bailiffs. It has no financial benefit attached to it.
9.30 p.m.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am sure the hon. member cannot complain about the latitude I have given. In the first instance I notice that the Section dealing with peppercorn rent is Section 3, and therefore you have been straying quite far from Section 2. I just draw that to your attention so that you can get back to Section 2.

Mr. WALCOTT: If you read Section 2 you will see that this is being amended; and all I am pointing out is that Section 2 has the same meaning as the Section you are talking about. All it is doing is including people in the Section for this purpose and changing the values; and I took the opportunity to point out that Section 3 gives the Governor-in-Executive Committee power to do something that is not in this. I take a different view from the hon. senior member for Christ Church. When you are passing legislation, it does not mean that because prior legislation gave the Cabinet or the Governor-in-Executive Committee power to do A, B or C that if they want to do D and E you should not know about it; but if you want me to deal with it under Section 3, I will do that.

The question that Clause 2 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clause 3 was called.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, in moving Clause 3 I would just like to say this briefly: The Agricultural Society has given the assurance that they will provide spots of land for the accommodation of houses for workers at pepper-corn rent. I think I have already said that these houses will be kept by aged sugar workers until their death. As the houses will be the property of the Housing Authority, they can be sold to other sugar workers at the death of the occupant. Eventually there will be sufficient houses to satisfy the need of those who have never benefited from the Labour Welfare Fund. There are workers who I do not think would be taken care of by any Provident Fund which will come into existence now. There are people who resigned seven or eight years ago who are still alive and suffering and who may want a house like this; so I really can see nothing wrong.

Mr. Chairman, I was glad to hear the hon. member stress that he has been and still is attempting from the platform to point out the necessity of really making this a revolving fund, and getting people to repay the loan and so on; because, if even a quarter of the outstanding loans were paid back, you could easily make provision for this. Sir, the Labour Welfare Fund has gone such a long way to meeting housing needs that you can safely make provision for this and not intrude on any other source; so the Union need have no fear whatever about the funds. Naturally, there will be a loss of funds; but only to the extent of depreciation on houses during the time they are occupied by aged workers who would be unable to make any payments.

I beg to move that Clause 3 stand part.

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

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, before you put the question, I think I heard the Minister say that these houses will be erected on lands which will be allocated by the Agricultural Society.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: On a point of order. I think the hon. member put it badly. They can only give the assurance speaking for plantations generally - and a lot of these workers live on plantation lands - that the house spots would be rented at pepper-corn rent.

Mr. TALMA: The Minister was more specific. He said that land would be provided by plantations which will be under the supervision or direction of the Agricultural Society. Now admirable as that may seem, and although that could be implemented in part, provided the Housing Authority is going to build chattel houses and not wall houses which I think is the policy of the Housing Authority, we all know that if we build a wall house on other people's land, the owner of the land is the owner of the house. In administering a scheme of this sort, Mr. Chairman, you should look into the numerous applications which you have from the various districts; you will have some from St. John, St. Peter, St. Lucy, St. George, Christ Church, St. Philip and so on. In fact you will have agricultural workers from each parish in this island making a demand for these houses when it becomes known. You probably already have numerous applications on the file of the Housing Authority for the past few years from people who have not qualified from virtue of their age or by some other disability. What could be more feasible than to erect these houses on an island-wide basis depending on the number of applications you have had?

Mr. Chairman, I take it that the idea is to help the aged and infirm who have worked from the cradle to the grave, so to speak; and you will have to consider the respective applications and not merely take full advantage of any offer made by the Agricultural Society or any other Society. I think it is the Housing Authority's business to see that it has parcels of land in the various parishes for the erection of these houses. In my constituency, I can state that we have been fortunate to have acquired no less than about 25 acres of land in the Silver Hill area. This was done when the Minister of Trade was the Minister in charge of this portfolio. This land was bought specifically with the intention of housing the very poorest; by that I mean those who were asked to move after the election when they had disclosed for whom they had voted.
9.40 p.m.

That land is still there, and I understand that it is soon to be developed; but I would not like the Minister only to see fit to erect these houses for the very poor, aged and infirmed on plantation land in the district; whereas, in my parish, there is an area of land specifically set aside for that purpose already. This question of erecting Government houses on plantation land is something which we have been trying to get away from.

I will ask the Hon. Minister, although I hardly ex-

pect any result from him, that if he goes to Christ Church and is considering that parish in this scheme, not to consider erecting Government houses on plantation land no matter how amiable and kind a plantation owner might appear to be. We have 25 acres and upwards of land to utilise in Silver Hill. Let us try to develop that area. Christ Church being a salubrious place, it will be well if you can erect more houses for the poor people in that area.

Mr. WALCOTT: This is a question of future policy. I cannot agree to this, because my mind may be working in a different way from the Minister's. It is true that we are in a poor community and it may appear that our thinking is poor. Now, you are going to build these houses at about $800 each. This means that they are going to be chattel houses, therefore, we are going to further invest in wood ants. This is only a palliative.

What policy of housing are you enunciating when you have in Barbados an annual increase in population of over 2,000 a year; and you are going to build 25 houses per annum only for these old people? When you are only building 25 houses per annum, that is on a basis of less three per parish. Are you going to build them like what you did in St. Peter where you could not find place for a playing field for the last fourteen years? What kind of houses can you expect to build for these people other than chattel house? This seems to me to be another aspect of poor relief. This is another almshouse business. You are taking the almshouses from the respective places and putting them on plantation land. This is like the sort of slave houses which you had built on plantation land, because you are going to have a 99-year lease of the land.

I do not like to throw away money. I personally feel that you are wasting $20,000 when the year comes on this scheme. What hon. members must realise is that they must be prepared to speak on policy; and if housing is your policy, go for housing in a big way; but this is peddling business. I would say in passing that I think Christ Church is treated liberally when it comes to housing schemes. Of course, Oistin is a town, therefore you ought to have something adjacent as regards a housing scheme for the people. However, you do not want to go and say that you should carry this problem of housing all over the country areas. Why is it that you are embarking on a scheme like this which is not directly a housing scheme? Twenty-five houses per year cannot house the aged. Let us be frank about that. When it comes to the tasks which we have to perform, we have some department heads who are not fit for these tasks. Of course, I do not mean that Mr. Lashley is not a good man.

Now, you say that you want to build houses for the aged. How many aged persons are they? Do not let us go in for this thing in a slip-shod manner. You say in the Bill:-

"Provided also that it shall be lawful for the Authority, in accordance with directions given from time to time by the Governor-in-Executive Committee, to fix a pepper corn rent in respect of houses provided by the Authority for occupation by persons complying with the requirements specified by the Governor-in-Executive Committee in directions given as aforesaid."

What are these requirements which you are going to specify? Is it that the person must be 60 years of age in straitened circumstances? Is there going to be a means test, and if he is drawing old age pension he cannot get a house for nothing? How can we agree to pass a Bill and you do not know what would be specified? What are the first specifications? I do not mean those which you would make from time to time. Let us leave that to the future. What are the specifications for a man to get one of these houses at a pepper corn rent. Must it be that he must work 25 years and do not draw any money at all from the plantation? If he has any children and one is in Panama or one in America, he will not be able to get it. Let us know. Tell us tonight.

Do not say that you are going to make a house available to the aged at a pepper-corn rent because every man over sixty is going to line up for a house. There are some people here who really do not need old age pension but they take it. As I have said earlier, we should make provision to help people in their old age; anybody who is destitute, we should help with a house; but we are passing legislation; it is not a question of charity.

9.50 p.m.

We have reached the stage where these are matters which local government members should be dealing with; housing should be in their jurisdiction, inasmuch as they will know the people and they will get in contact with them. This is what I regard as social work for the local authorities to perform. One of the problems which you have in Barbados is that the Housing Authority is a centralised authority and not a local authority in the local area.

What you are finding as a difficulty is that an administrative body, a board cannot work as effectively as it would be able to work if you had been dealing with this matter on a local basis. When you localise these things, you have people who know something about them. Mr. Chairman, I cannot see on what basis they are going to give these people these houses. What is the qualification and on what basis do they become eligible for these houses? What is the means test that you are going to institute? You cannot give them these houses on the basis that they worked on the plantations. Suppose a man had a stroke at the age of fifty-five or fifty-eight? What would happen? For how much do you rent the houses at a pepper-corn rent? If a chattel house is at the rate of a dollar per week then the pepper-corn rent would be five cents per week. I can see what is happening.

The plantation people are conscious of their responsibilities and they are giving the land, but what land are they giving? They are giving the rab land which is in the back, and then the people will worry the Minister to run a water main down there. You will carry a chattel house costing $800 in the back, and when you have to install lighting and put down a water main, that will cost you more than the house. It is cheaper to bring all the houses to the front than to lay down a four-inch main to serve the people. As soon as you start to build a tenantry road, then the people will tell you that they want you to put down a main.

I would like to point out that some of these places are places which have been left as a legacy to us, and you will see what these things will cost you when you have to increase the wages of Civil Servants. I feel that this is one of the reasons why we cannot have compulsory education in this island. We had no proper planning some sixty years ago, and we have grown around a system in which you are carrying services to people in places where there are no proper roads laid out.

Mr. Chairman, I will bet my bottom dollar that where the plantations have given the land, it will cost you about sixty thousand dollars a year to spend twenty thousand dollars. I am asking the Minister to see that, so far as I am concerned, we have reached the stage where we can do something better than that. You should postpone the further consideration of this matter until you can do what you want to do. This is the year 1961, and before we reach the year 1981 would you be able to add ten houses in a parish? This is not housing, this is really Almshouse relief. You should increase your building programme; you want to have a concerted policy. In 1924 there was no cohesion under the regime of Mr. Mc.Donald, and one fellow said that he did not know who was who until he read it in the newspaper. The position here is just like that.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: You are filibustering.

Mr. WALCOTT: Imagine a Minister looking at me and saying that I am filibustering! That is something which really has no substance in it; and I am giving you my point of view. I am not agreeing to this Bill, and I am going home now because I cannot support it. I am only

dealing with the particular Clause in order to show the Minister that he really cannot solve this problem.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, I thought that this matter was quite a simple one, but it seems to me that it is either too complicated for hon. members on the one hand, or on the other hand, there is something which has slipped me.
10.00 p.m.

Now, Mr. Chairman, why should there be all this heavy weather over what to my mind is just a simple request to alter the provisions of the Act so as to assist these needy persons in this matter of housing? The position today is that the Authority cannot help an aged person who has retired from the sugar industry, either by making a loan to repair her house or to build; because, under Section 48 of ther present Act, the Authority must, in fixing the rent, take into consideration the rents ordinarily payable by persons of the working classes in the locality. Under the definition of "person of the working class" will come retired workers and those who are needy. (Mr. WALCOTT: Nobody wants a house at 65 years of age.)

Mr. Chairman, I go to my constituency regularly - I hope other members visit theirs regularly too - and am often approached by old people who own land and have houses, but their houses are in need of repairs, and they cannot afford to repair them; they cannot take advantage of the provisions of the Act because they are repudiated by that Section. All we are asking you to do in cases of that sort is to give the Authority power to repair the houses; or if the houses are too bad, to build houses and charge a pepper-corn rent for them; the house would belong to the Authority in that case.

What the hon. senior member for Christ Church said was nonsense; he said he did not expect the Minister to come to Christ Church and do that. I should resign from the Ministry and let him carry out the stupidness he is suggesting. Here it is you may find two old, retired, needy people living on a particular piece of land, but the Authority must buy land at the other end of the parish and move them there.

Mr. TALMA: If the Minister would listen, he would probably understand. What I tried to tell him was that in the case of Christ Church he does not need to buy land, or put people on plantation land; we have already bought land for that purpose. If you care to buy land in St. Thomas, that is a matter for you; but we have land for development purposes, and for protecting those who were thrown off the land by the plantation owners and managers after the 1951 elections after they diclosed whom they voted for. At the time I got the then Minister to purchase land to protect people like that. Now it will be the reverse; you will have some people going back to live on plantation land.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I wonder if the hon. member realise what he is saying. We have land at Gall Hill and at Silver Hill, but does that answer my point? Is the hon. member saying "there may be an old person living at the extreme end of the parish, let us say, five miles from Gall Hill or the housing estate; you might not be able to find land in Christ Church at all, but you must purchase land because you do not want them to live on plantation land, as they may go and vote for somebody else and the plantation owner may put them off again! It does not matter how far away the old person is living, you should dislocate his entire life!"

Mr. TALMA: If the Minister wants to do that in the other parishes, that is a matter for him. I simply said that when he goes to Christ Church, if he goes there, that we have land lying idle for development purposes. We have one parcel at Kendal Hill near the Silver Hill area and another parcel of land, which I understand, will be used for a school near the Sayes Court Scheme. You do not need to settle Christ Church people on plantation land.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: The hon. member is trying to get out of it, so I will not continue with the argument. He does not admit to my point neither does his point commend itself to me; and it never will so long as I am Minister of this portfolio; so he can rest assured that I will not mean that we are going to bring people from all over the parish and settle them at Gall Hill.

Now, Sir, may I remind the hon. senior member for St. Peter that we are building at the Housing Authority a house out of concrete which can be removed just like any chattel house at a cost of $800? It was exhibited at the last Exhibition; I hope hon. members saw it. It made a very good sight; when you put gardens and flowers at the front, it looked nice and comfortable. Of course you will have to put it over to the workers themselves. This house can be extended to various sizes; and I am sure that after a little propoganda effort it will sell. The idea will go down with the workers because we are trying to encourage permanent houses.

Faced as we are with the lack of security of tenure of land, we feel that this new type of house is one way of getting around that difficulty. I do not think we can be accused of perpetuating the old system of chattel houses and feeding them to wood ants, termites and the weather, by asking that this provision be made by this House whereby we can erect or repair houses for needy workers. In all countries of the world, a similar thing to this is being done; that is, authorities, so far as housing is concerned, lay down different conditions for different groups of people and the different ages and also make provision for them. This is too rigid under the present Act; it is so rigid that the Housing Authority cannot do that. All we are asking is to extend the scope to include the aged retired worker who cannot pay under the Act the rents ordinarily prescribed for members of the working class. They are precluded from the benefits which the Act gives, and we are asking that they be brought in by this amendment.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, the question I want to ask is in connection with this Act where it says that these things will be prescribed.
10.10 p.m.

Now, the Hon. Minister knows that you cannot have a law passed and give it to somebody to administer, as if you have a kite flying and you let it go and tell somebody to catch it if you can. There must be prescribed conditions. I want to know what are the things you have in mind. What are the circumstances which you will tell the Housing Authority to work on?

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I have already told the House. The other conditions will be laid down directly to the Housing Authority. It can be easily worked out. How often has the hon. member passed the principle as contained in a Bill and leave it to Regulations to work the principle of that Bill? All we are asking him is if he agrees to the principle of this Bill.

Mr. WALCOTT: I do not know if members of this House understand what we are passing. We are passing a Bill which is not like that, where under ordinary circumstances, you will subsequently come and say that these are the regulations; you are today passing a Bill in which we will have no more say. The Executive Committee or the Cabinet can decide that any man who comes out of prison and works in the sugar industry can benefit under it, and we will have no more say.

The reason why I want to know the conditions is that I would be able to tell a man that you cannot get a house to rent unless you comply with certain conditions; and when those conditions are not known, how can I tell him? In all cases which you talk about nowadays, you talk about a means test. What is the basis on which you are going to tell people that they qualify to get one of these houses? That is all I am asking; and do not tell me that this is something which is done in England. As a matter of fact, housing is not controlled by a Minister in England to the extent which the Minister controls housing in Barbados. Housing is controlled in a completely different manner.

Good legislation and good democracy work by consultation; and where people agree on matters of principle, the important details should be worked out by consulation. Therefore, if you are doing something for people who are represented, there is no harm in your having consultation with the people's representatives.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that I was not here when the Hon. Minister was making his main speech on this Bill. One of the questions which I would have asked him if I was here is this: Can the Hon. Minister say whether it is true that two planters - one in St. Thomas and one in St. George - have agreed to sell land to the Housing Authority for this purpose? If so, can he say whether Government has agreed to buy and whether it is to be part of the scheme which he is now outlining?

Mr. STRAUGHN: Before the Hon. Minister replies, I would like to make a comment in connection with what he said as far as how this scheme will be affected. The Hon. Minister said that this is just a small amount of $20,000 a year, and we recognise that it is a small amount; if the fund is to be revolved better than it is, certainly there would be no encumbrances by this.

I think it should be pointed out that the officers of the Housing Authority are themselves concerned that repayments are not coming in as fast as they should; and they seem to believe that the retention of the interest on loans is what is slowing down the repayments. They seem to think that the removal of the interest would probably effect a better repayment of these loans, and by so doing improve the amount of the Revolving Fund.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: As regards the point raised by the hon. senior member for St. Lucy, I know that as far as St. Thomas is concerned, we have bought a piece of land belonging to Farmers Plantation. It is for a resettlement scheme for people who are living in an area which is almost inaccessible; in fact, there are no roads leading to where these people are living and there people have to walk miles to get to a standpipe. We negotiated with the owners of this plantation and got a piece of land to the front at a reasonable price, and we are resettling the people on it. I am not aware of the purchase of land in St. George for any purpose. I will have to make enquiries to see if it so and for what purpose.

In so far as what the hon. junior member for St. Joseph enquired about, that is a matter which the Housing Authority has been investigating. It is still under consideration.

Mr. TUDOR: Would the Hon. Minister say what was the price paid for that land?

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I cannot remember the exact price per square foot. I will get the information for the hon. member.

The question that Clause 3 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

On motion of Hon. R. G. MAPP, seconded by Hon. L. ST.A. THORNE, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Bill in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

10.20 p.m.

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

THE ADJOURNMENT

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, the consideration of that Bill concludes Government Business for the day.

The Order Paper having been fixed.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuedsay next, 14th February, 1961, at 12 o'clock noon.

Hon. . St.A. THORNE: I beg to second that.

The question that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next, 14th February, 1961, at 12 o'clock noon, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

10.25 p.m.