
THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1962

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 23rd January, 1962.

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

PRESENT

His Honour Mr. J. E. T. BRANCKER, Q.C., (*Speaker*); Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, (*Minister of Development, Trade and Labour*); Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P., Mr. E. St. A. HOLDER, J.P.; Hon. J. C. TUDOR, M.A., (*Minister of Education*); Mr. S. E. SEALY; Mr. W. A. COWARD; Mr. R. St. C. WEEKES; Mr. W. R. LOWE; Mr. L. A. LYNCH; Mr. G. V. BATSON, (*Chairman of Committees*); Mr. N. W. BOXILL and Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, (*Minister of Social Services*).

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: There are two copies of Minutes of the last meeting which have been circulated. There was an important inaccuracy in the first copy; in consequence, a corrected copy has been circulated amongst hon. members. The correction is in respect of the fifth line from bottom of the second page. "At 4.30 p.m. Mr. SPEAKER declared Private Members' Business to be at an end", is correct. As I have said, there was an inaccuracy in the first set of Minutes: hence this corrected copy has been circulated. Unless there is any objection, these corrected Minutes will be confirmed.

There is no objection; the Minutes are accordingly confirmed.

COMMUNICATION *re* LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received a communication dated 23rd January, 1962, from His Excellency the Governor in reference to the question of the appointment of the Leader of the Opposition which, His Excellency assures me, is under consideration, and that I will receive a communication from him again on this subject in due course.

PAPERS LAID

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

Statement showing the sums advanced to the Postmaster General for the payment of Money Orders, the

amounts repaid to the Accountant General, and the amounts due by the various Post Offices to 30th September, 1961.

Statement showing the sums advanced to the Postmaster General for the payment of Money Orders, the amounts repaid to the Accountant General, and the amounts due by the various Post Offices to 31st October, 1961.

Statement showing the sums advanced to the Postmaster General for the payment of Money Orders, the amounts repaid to the Accountant General, and the amounts due by the various Post Offices to 30th November, 1961.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Government Notices were given as follows:-

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Resolution to place the sum of \$300.00 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1961-62, Part I - Current, as shown in the supplementary estimate 1961-62, No. 38 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Resolution to place the sum of \$120,589 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1961-62, Part I - Current, as shown in the supplementary estimate 1961-62, No. 38 which forms the schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Resolution to approve the lease by the Executive Committee to Messrs. Texaco Antilles Limited of a parcel of land situated at Seawell in the parish of Christ Church, and containing by admeasurement approximately 5,440 square feet, for the purpose of erecting a station thereon for the retail of gasoline and other petroleum products.

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

PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICES

Mr. YEARWOOD: I beg to give notice of the following Resolution:

BE IT RESOLVED that Government undertake in its entirety the insurance of motor vehicles made compulsory under the Motor Vehicles Insurance (Third Party Risks) Act, 1952.

QUESTIONS

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

Will Government in view of the fact that the reaping season is near at hand put the following roads in such a condition that the land owners in the area will have their crops reaped with ease:-

"Cadogan's Tenantry Road and Coward's Tenantry Roads, off Chimborazo?

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

Will Government consider the immediate repairing of the Highway known as Frizers-Vaughn Road?

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

Will Government in view of the drop in the Highway leading over the Frizers River, consider the advisability of building a bridge for the convenience of the travelling public?

Mr. HUSBANDS: To enquire of the Minister of Communications, Works and Housing:-

Is Government aware of the damage caused to agricultural lands and to the property of residents in Speightstown during heavy rainfall periodically flooding the Salt Pond in Speightstown?

2. Is Government aware of the nuisance caused to residents in Speightstown by odours caused by rotting debris and rubbish in the Salt Pond in Speightstown?

3. Is Government aware that the appropriate Minister of the previous Government made an investigation with a view to the preparation of an estimate of the cost of the canalization of the Salt Pond?

4. Will Government facilitate the interests of these residents by implementing a scheme of canalizing the Salt Pond Area?

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

Is the Minister aware of dissatisfaction which exists among the rank and file of the Fire Service in respect of the administration of this Department by the Fire Officer and the Deputy Fire Officer?

2. Is the Minister aware that several non-Commissioned Officers in the said Service have been threatened with dismissal under Section 10 of the Fire Service Act, 1960?

3. Is the Minister aware of the conditions of work imposed upon members of the Fire Service, especially with reference to their duties on the Farm at Seawell and also during the crop season?

4. Will the Minister consider the setting-up of a Commission of Enquiry to investigate the administration of the Service?

3.15 p.m.

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

Will Government take steps to cause electricity to be made available to each and every home in the parish of St. John?

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

RESOLUTION re AWARD OF CONTRACTS OF MEAT, BREAD ETC.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is now time for the consideration of Private Members' Business. The First Order of the Day under this Head is to resume debate on the passing of a Resolution re Award of Contracts of Meat, Bread and Groceries in Local Government areas.

On the last occasion when this Resolution was under consideration, the hon. junior member for St. Joseph was speaking in reply.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I was trying to explain to the House last Tuesday, when the time for consideration of

Private Members' Business expired, the hardship that is being inflicted upon those suppliers of bread and meat. Now, Sir, there are some parishes whose requirements in respect of the supply of bread do not exceed the sum of \$500 at any time of the year; in some cases that is also the position with regard to meat. As the matter stands now, when one has to apply for the provision of these commodities for the area - let us take, for instance, the parish of St. Joseph. You have a small supplier of bread and meat; he sees in the newspaper that tenders are being asked for the supply of commodities for the area, but he does not have the means of transport for the delivery of bread or meat in St. Lucy or St. James. That lack of transportation rules him out; by not being in a position to supply the area, he has to be satisfied when he loses his contract. In my case, I am asking the Government to see to it that rather than have the tender for the area, it should be for each parish. One may tender for the entire area right enough and be lucky enough to get it too; and the small supplier in the parish will be able to tender for his own parish. The small man will be given a chance to tender for the whole area. It will only be a question of the authorities giving the small man the chance of supplying his parish as before.

That is all I am saying. I am not asking for anything impossible. It is that the area rules out the small supplier and then you should not be asking for a contract for the supply of meat or bread, especially when the contract does not exceed \$500.

Last Tuesday some hon. members made some remarks - I think, in fact, it was the hon. junior member for St. Thomas who said that I was in this House for seventeen years and I did not see the injustice which was being meted out to these people until now. Well, the hon. member is a baby politically and therefore I would have to excuse him; the Local Government Act did not come into operation seventeen years ago and therefore I could not have brought forward this Resolution before the Act began to operate. The Local Government Act only began to operate about three years ago, and for the first two years nothing of this sort happened to the small suppliers. This state of affairs only came up with them last year. When the hon. junior member for St. James was Chairman it never happened, and when I was Chairman it never happened; but another Chairman went into office and I do not know if he is responsible for it. You cannot appear in Court to defend anyone who is charged with committing murder when it has not been committed, and the hon. junior member for St. Thomas is accusing me of not bringing forward this matter before it happened. I would not say that the hon. member is foolish politically but.....

Mr. BOXILL: On a point of order. I would like the hon. member to explain what he means by using the words "before it happened".

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

Mr. BOXILL: Well, a point of enquiry.

Mr. SPEAKER: Provision may be made in future for such points.

Mr. BOXILL: On a point of explanation.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member speaking on a point of explanation?

Mr. BOXILL: Yes, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Well, let the hon. member proceed with his point of explanation.

Mr. BOXILL: I would like the hon. member to explain what he means when he says that I talked about something before it happened.

Mr. SPEAKER: A point of explanation means that the hon. member who has risen on such a point, is privileged to explain something in respect of which he has been misquoted. He cannot ask another hon. member to explain anything.

Mr. BOXILL: He said that I started to attack him.

Mr. SMITH: On a point of order. Who is "he"? Does the hon. member think that he is outside?

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the hon. member say whether it is a point of order or a point of explanation which he is seeking to make?

Mr. BOXILL: On a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: Well, let the hon. member proceed with that point of order.

Mr. BOXILL: I did not use the pronoun in any derogatory manner. There is nothing which says that the pronoun should not be used. I was referring to the hon. junior member for St. Joseph when I said "he".
3.25 p.m.

The hon. junior member for St. Joseph was saying just now that when the hon. junior member for St. Joseph started to talk on this particular Resolution, the hon. junior member for St. Thomas got up and started to attack the hon. junior member for St. Joseph, and the hon. junior member for St. Joseph did not know that these things had started; so there is where the muddle comes in with "he" and the hon. member. The point I would like to know is what the hon. junior member is referring to that he did not know took place when I attacked him after being in the House for seventeen years without knowing about these things.

Mr. SPEAKER: What I am trying to point out is that a point of order may not take the form of a query of any hon. member. Let the hon. junior member proceed.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, there you are. You will have to take the hon. junior member for St. Thomas into your Chambers and teach him the Rules of this House, because all of us were circulated with a copy of the Rules, and it does not appear as if the hon. junior member for St. Thomas took time off to read them. When one wants to be an attacker or a fighter, he must gear himself for it; it does not take an idiot to be an attacker or fighter. You have to know your stuff.

Mr. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, is the hon. junior member for St. Joseph calling me an idiot?

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the hon. member bear in mind that a point of order or explanation does not consist of a query; but the hon. junior member for St. Joseph has not called - and I am sure he would not call - any member of this House an idiot.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, the Resolution before us need not have come before this House. This belongs absolutely to the Local Government and not to this House. We as members of the Northern District Council can....

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, that is a speech.

Mr. CORBIN: What are you rising on? Why don't you sit down and rest yourself?

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the hon. junior member for St. Andrew address the Chair!

Mr. CORBIN: I am saying, Mr. Speaker, that this does not belong to the House of Assembly at all and we are only wasting time with this.

Mr. SPEAKER: My ruling is that it is perfectly permissible to discuss this Resolution and it is not out of order; otherwise it would not be on the Order Paper. We discussed it fully last week and the hon. member for St. Andrew made a notable contribution to the discussion. The Resolution is in order whether we agree or disagree with it.

Mr. CORBIN: My point of order, Sir, is that we in the Local Government can handle this situation in the whole.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not a point of order; it is an expression of opinion.

Mr. CORBIN: If it be an expression of opinion, we will deal with it accordingly.

Mr. SPEAKER: An hon. member may not rise on an expression of opinion. The hon. member is now a seasoned Parliamentarian. Let the hon. junior member for St. Joseph proceed. I know that the hon. member will deal with the meat and substance of the Resolution.

Mr. SMITH: Hon. members do not want to deal with it. There is a old saying that "the more the monkey climbs, the more he shows his tail"; but I am saying that the more the monkeys climb, the more they show their tails.

Now, Sir, I was pointing out to the House only last Tuesday what has affected and is affecting the small suppliers in the various parishes - not in St. Joseph alone, but in the six parishes of the Northern area. I am not a supplier; I used to supply bread at one time; I was one of the top bakers, but politics threw me completely out of it; so I cannot run that business anymore. I am not trying to do something for myself; it is for the people who voted for me, and other people too in the various parishes. Hon. members lose sight of the fact even from the last election that the electors are a fraternity unto themselves, and if you interfere with one, you interfere with all. (Mr. CORBIN: You now know that?)

Now, Sir, I thought I would have been able to say that the hon. junior member for St. Andrew knew something about Local Government, but now he has got up and convinced me that I will have to put him in the same boat as the hon. junior member for St. Thomas as far as the Local Government Act is concerned. I feel therefore, that the hon. junior member for St. Thomas feels good now to see that he has a colleague in that boat when it comes to Local Government. I would not blame him, Sir; but what I want to point out to the members on the opposite side of the Table is that most of them do not know that this particular Regulation is causing great harm to these people, and I do not want it to happen anymore. Hon. members, including the hon. junior member for St. Thomas, might have the idea that this thing was existing even during the Vestry system. That is not so; it only began to strike these people from last year although the Local Government was operating now for three years. The hon. junior member for St. Thomas does not know if I had drawn it to my Government's attention; but my Government is not now in power. I dare suppose that if they were in power I would not have to bring it before the House; I would have mentioned it to them and they would have been able to amend it. Now things have changed and I am not a member of the present Government; so this is the place for me to bring it in order to draw to the attention of the present Government what is happening to these people and ask them to have the Regulation amended so that these small suppliers can carry on as before. It is nothing more than that.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, in my right hand is a copy of the Regulations for the contracts under Local Government.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member has already spoken.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member said "on a point of order".

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I am speaking on a point of order, and in these Regulations there is nothing, Mr. Speaker, stating that contracts should be awarded *en bloc* or *en masse* or not *en bloc*. I do not see therefore, Mr. Speaker, the necessity for amending the Regulations when they do not stipulate anything. What the hon. junior member for St. Joseph has brought to the House really concerns the

Committee in charge of awarding the contracts in the District Councils. It is no concern of the House whatsoever.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, this is a contract and I do not know what is happening. The hon. junior member for St. Andrew may be a better lawyer than I am, because I am not a lawyer or a solicitor, but I will read what the Regulation says. I will read it for the benefit of those who do not have one. Although it is really baffling to me, I will agree in part with the hon. member.

3.35 p.m.

I have not seen it is binding that if the Committee concerned were to allow the small traders to carry on, they would be in other words breaking the Regulations. But it is still here in the Regulations. I cannot understand it.

I will read the Regulations. Section 2 (2) reads as follows:-

"For the purposes of these regulations contracts for the supply of goods or materials whether or not entered into with the same person shall, if they relate to goods or materials of the same type or kind to be supplied within the period of a year, be deemed to be contracts forming part of a larger transaction and, unless the Central Tenders Committee established under these regulations directs otherwise, such contracts shall be subject to the provisions of regulation six, or, as the case may be, regulation seven of these regulations notwithstanding that the sum involved in respect of any one of such contracts is two hundred and fifty dollars or less, or, as the case may be, six hundred and twenty-five dollars or less if the total amount to be expended by a Council or a Committee thereof in the course of a year on such contracts is likely to exceed five hundred dollars or, as the case may be, one thousand two hundred and fifty dollars."

Regulation six reads as follows:-

"No contract which is to be made for a period exceeding one year or which in value or amount exceeds five hundred dollars for the supply of goods or materials or the execution of any work, and no contract for the supply of goods or materials which forms part of a larger transaction or series of transactions involving any one type or kind of goods or materials to the value or amount of more than two hundred and fifty dollars in any one month, shall be entered into unless the Clerk of the Council shall have published in one or more newspapers circulating within the area of the Council a notice inviting tenders for such contract and stating the last day, which shall not be less than one week from the first publication of such notice, when such tenders will be received."

This is followed by a proviso, and paragraph (b) (ii) of the proviso says "Provided that -

The notice required by this regulation need not be given if the Central Tenders Committee is of the opinion that -

- (ii) the goods or materials to be purchased are on sale by public auction or at public fairs or markets."

Now, Sir, there is something in this Regulation. You can spend more than \$500 if the goods are on sale at public auction or at public fairs or markets. As it is written, I feel if the Committee or the Council so desire, it can deal with Goddard's Food Fair, because that is a public fair and you will not require to call on the Tenders' Committee to ask for tenders to deal with that firm.

Sir, if this Regulation is wrong, you cannot blame me for the wording or the interpretation. You cannot blame me; but I want the matter put right now because it is causing great harm to these small suppliers. This is the place to put the matter right.

It is a question or something wrong somewhere and you should put it right rather than allow one individual to tender for an entire area and so push out the small trader who has to pay taxes in his particular parish. It is not fair to him.

Give him a fair chance to tender for his parish. Sir, to allow it to stand as it is, the small trader cannot tender for the whole area because he has not the necessary transportation or facility or he may not be financially strong enough to do so. I know that he will be able to supply the commodity in his parish. I only want that amendment put in. If the Council does not do it by contract, the Council would be breaking the regulations. (Mr. MOTTLEY: No.) Well, I do not know.

Mr. Speaker, all that I can say is that it has been operating for all this time and this has never happened at first; but during the past year it has happened. I will not like it to happen again now that they are about to call for tenders. If it is wrong, it is for the Government to say that it is wrong and that they cannot do anything about it. If it is right, it is for them to say that it is right and they should instruct the Council not to give meat and bread out by a large contract. I know in the Northern District Council that the Clerk is very timid about the wording and I drew it to his attention. (Mr. MOTTLEY: He is not obliged to call for tenders.) Why then have a Tenders' Committee?

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The Chairman of the Tenders' Committee is a Barrister and his colleague would tell him this: no matter whether Mr. Straughn has said that it is not so, it is the Chairman who rules when a contract is a contract. The Hon. Minister is correct. As I have said, I am in sympathy with the motion moved by the hon. junior member for St. Joseph, but I cannot vote for it.

Mr. SMITH: Well, suppose it is the Chairman to say whether it is right or wrong.

Mr. MOTTLEY: It is the Chairman of the Tenders' Committee to say when it is a contract.

Mr. SPEAKER: On what has the hon. senior member for Bridgetown risen?

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: You must preface your remarks with those words.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. What I am saying is that the Chairman of the Tenders' Committee is the person to say when it is a contract and it is for the Council or the Committee to say whether they are going to buy by contract. These regulations cannot override the law passed in here which says that you can buy by contract or you need not buy by contract.

Mr. SMITH: Sir, whether the hon. senior member for the City is right or wrong, I am still saying that this thing has caused harm to the small traders. I do not want the law to be so worded that one particular person can say this is so or not. I want it to be so straightforward that everybody can say that it is so. I do not want this matter to operate as it has been operating.

Mr. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of explanation. I have read the law and I have seen absolutely no justification for changing it. All that has happened is that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph and his colleagues have misrepresented the interpretation of the law.

Mr. SMITH: That is no point of order or point of explanation.

Mr. BOXILL: The hon. member will not allow me to finish. As I have said before, I have read the law and I have interpreted it to mean that you can advertise for tenders for the supply of articles: but there is nothing in the law to say that you must advertise for tenders. If you do not advertise for tenders, there is no law binding you to advertise for tenders. That is the law as I interpret it.

Mr. SMITH: Well, Sir, the hon. junior member for St. Thomas said that he read the law. I cannot say that he has not read the law; I can only say that it does not seem to me that he understands it.

3.45 p.m.

For instance, the hon. senior member for St. Thomas said last Tuesday that an ex-Minister took away the contract from a supplier in St. Thomas. If this thing is left in the hands of a particular person for him to be doing these things, that is not good enough. You could not have a Government where an ex-Minister could deliberately take away a contract from a person. The hon. member did not say which ex-Minister because there are two ex-Ministers from St. Thomas, but he said that an ex-Minister took away the contract.

Mr. BOXILL: On a point of explanation. What the hon. senior member for St. Thomas said was that he was told that an ex-Minister took away the contract. I would like the hon. member to understand that that was when there was a dictatorial Government in power. Those things cannot happen now.

Mr. SMITH: I wonder if the hon. member knows that the Government had nothing to do with this matter. He is saying that a dictatorial Government did this thing; but this is something dealing with Local Government and it was done by a Tenders Committee. One particular individual could not take away any contract from anybody. The same thing which struck the hon. senior member for St. Thomas — and he felt it, that the particular supplier had lost the contract — is the same thing which hit the parish of St. Joseph and it will also hit the parish of St. Lucy. Whether it is a mistake or a misinterpretation of the Act or whatever it is, the fact is that it was done. According to the Regulations, as soon as you exceed the value of \$500 you call for tenders. I am trying to help both hon. members for St. Thomas by trying to get the thing back in the right way. I excuse the hon. senior member for St. Thomas because he is a Principal and one of the good ones; but in this case, he will have to go back to school and let the children teach him Local Government politics. No ex-Minister can take away a contract from any person. It was taken away through the Regulations and all I am saying is that the Government should see to it, when the Local Government year is ended and they are about to award the contracts, that this thing does not happen. If they do not attend to this request, they will not be doing me anything.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order. The hon. junior member for St. Joseph has said that the contract was taken away because of the Regulations.

Mr. SMITH: On a point of order. I did not say that.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I am speaking on a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let not hon. members shout across the floor at each other. Let the Hon. Minister complete his point of order.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: The hon. junior member for St. Joseph said that the contract was taken away from these people.

Mr. SMITH: I did not say that.

Mr. SPEAKER: When the hon. member resumes his speech he will point out what he said and what seems to have been misunderstood.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: The hon. member cannot understand what he himself has said.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the Hon. Minister proceed with his point of order.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: The hon. member said that contracts were taken away from these people because of the Regulations. There is nothing in the Regulations which says that the contracts should be awarded *en bloc*. It is for the Tenders Committee to decide to whom a contract should be awarded and it is not a matter of the Regulations. According to the Regulations the Tenders Committee must decide on the person who is to supply these goods. It is not a question of the Regulations which are quite clear.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister has made his point of order and the hon. member for St. Joseph may now resume his speech.

Mr. SMITH: The hon. junior member for St. Andrew said all along that I said that the contract was taken from these people through the Regulations. I did not say that. I was saying that the hon. senior member for St. Thomas said that the contract was taken from a small supplier. I am going along with the Minister of Social Services now. The matter is left to the Tenders Committee. Suppose these small suppliers sent in tenders for the particular parish and one supplier sent in a tender for the area and the Tenders Committee agreed to give the tender to the one person for the area! What will happen then? What will happen with these small suppliers? I am asking the hon. member to answer that question.

Mr. SPEAKER: It will not be for the hon. member to answer because I am in the Chair.

Mr. SMITH: Well, I am asking him through you. Last Tuesday the hon. member said that nothing is wrong with the Act but it is a question of the Regulations; now he is saying that the Regulations are wrong.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: The hon. junior member for St. George said that I said that something was wrong with the Regulations. I said that if there was anything wrong, it would be the Regulations. Nothing is wrong with the Regulations but something is wrong with the brains of the hon. member.

Mr. SPEAKER: The last Clause of the hon. member's remarks does not come within the point of order.

Mr. SMITH: The hon. member is the Minister of Social Services and I will go along with him. He is one of the top notches of the present Government. Now you have a Tenders Committee. I do not want the Regulations to be made in such a way that the Tenders Committee can still do as they feel like doing.

3.55 p.m.

As I have said, the small suppliers apply and one or two large suppliers apply. If the Tenders Committee agree to give it to one and shut out the small ones again, would there be anything wrong? That is what is happening. If they do it, I would not be able to see that these small people get awards. The question cannot be, if I heard the Hon. Minister well, that we would not worry with any contracts at all. I am not going any further; I am leaving it to the members around this Table.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order before the hon. member sits down, the one thing which is worrying the hon. member is that under the Act it need not reach any Tenders Committee, and your colleague who was Chairman a year after you

Mr. SPEAKER: I have no colleague who was Chairman.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The hon. member's colleague made it quite clear that you need not reach a Tenders Committee, because it said you "may" enter into a contract, and if you may enter into a contract and the Regulation says you must follow these Regulations, that is all.

Mr. SPEAKER: Has the hon. junior member for St. Joseph completed his speech?

Mr. SMITH: Yes, Sir.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order, before the hon. member is finished I should like

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. junior member for St. Joseph said he has finished.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to satisfy the hon. junior member for St. Joseph by saying these words: We who represent the Democratic Labour Party will be representing the Northern District Council, and any time tenders from the parish are sent in, we hope to do our best

for them. We do not mind that the last Government has corrupted the whole thing.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not a point of explanation nor a point of order.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, what I wanted to do when I rose just now on a point of order was to get a further explanation from the hon. junior member for St. Joseph with regard to a statement which he had made.

Mr. SPEAKER: There can be no further explanation.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: That is why I tried to speak before he completed.

Mr. SPEAKER: But he had already said he had completed.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: He said he had completed, but if my point had been taken that something he said was not quite clear, and I am trying to explain what he meant.....

Mr. SPEAKER: But it cannot be taken now.

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

AYES: Mr. MILLER; Mr. SMITH; Mr. HOLDER and Mr. COWARD - 4

NOES: Mr. MOTTLEY; Mr. GODDARD; Mr. LYNCH; Mr. SEALY; Mr. BOXILL; Mr. YEARWOOD; Mr. WEEKES; Mr. CORBIN; Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON; Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS; Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD; Hon. E. W. BARROW and Mr. BATSON - 14.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 2 stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Peter, who is absent.

Order No. 3 stands also in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Peter; and Order No. 4 although it is not so numbered on my Order Paper is the one between No. 3 and No. 5, and that stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Joseph. Is the hon. junior member for St. Joseph disposed now to proceed with that Order?

RESOLUTION RE AWARD OF CONTRACTS FOR SUPPLY OF STONES

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, this is another Resolution similar to the last one. It reads as follows:-

WHEREAS contracts for the supply of stones to be used for the repairs or construction of roads throughout the island are awarded by tender by the Department of Highways and Transport in areas consisting of two or more parishes;

BE IT RESOLVED that Government take steps to ensure that such contracts be awarded for each parish and not for such large areas as heretofore.

Mr. Speaker, this Department for years was operating under the system of calling for contracts yearly, and as far as I understand for the whole Island only three contractors are being used. It appears that the Island is divided into areas and it calls for three contractors, and regardless of who they may be - they may not be the same contractors every year - it is being awarded to these three contractors.

Now, Sir, this Island is very small and a lot of people are living in it, there is a lot of unemployment and we should not encourage any more unemployment by allowing this Department to make the contracts in such a way that only three sets of people will be getting work during the time that stones are to be supplied. Now, Sir, if you have a contractor, say, in St. Michael and he has a contract for the whole Island or part of it, his lorries will get work. You would not get an ordinary lorry-hand from St. Andrew or St. Joseph having to pay bus-fare coming down to a contractor in Bridgetown to ask him for a job loading stones. Even if he does that, after busfares and other expenses have been taken out, he would get very little.

4.05 p.m.

But if now the contract is to be awarded per parish, it would mean that each parishioner, or one of the lorry owners, or more than one, could get together and tender in such a way and you would be helping the people of the particular parish. You will also be helping the workers in that parish.

I feel that the time has come when we should consider all these contracts per parish and so help the parishioners to get work during the hard times. In the crop season, every lorry owner gets something to do; but in the hard times most of the lorries in the country districts are put down because there is nothing for them to do. The only little help that could be given is by allowing them to draw a few loads of stones in the parish in which work is carried on. That is not to say that they will be able to get a whole year's work, but they will get some work to do and as the saying is: "half loaf is better than no loaf at all". We should concern ourselves and see to it that these contracts are awarded per parish. Put it in the way that the small parishioner, the lorry owner in the particular parish, would be able to get something to do too.

I think the hon. senior member for St. Thomas will bear me out when I say that during the election campaign he may have heard the grievance stated by people in St. Thomas that they suffered the loss of drawing stone owing to one particular contractor receiving the work. I do not know if the hon. junior member for that parish will say that the only way he will vote for this Resolution is if his Party votes for it. However, I am sure that he has heard the complaints which were made during the election campaign and perhaps that may be responsible for his getting into this House.

Sir, I do not think I have to go any further in speaking on this Resolution because it hinges around the Resolution on which I spoke on just now and which hon. members voted against.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. HOLDER: I beg to second that.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. junior member for St. James seconding the motion with the view of seeking the right to speak on the Resolution later on?

Mr. HOLDER: Yes, Sir.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution which we have before us is for the purpose that small contracts for the supply of stones to be used for the repairs or construction of roads throughout the Island be awarded for each parish and not for such large areas as heretofore. Sir, I remember, when the Conservative Government was in power, that I was a contractor for the supply of stones for the parish of St. Andrew. We had about four contractors supplying stones in that parish. As a matter of fact, anyone who could supply the quality of stones which Government was in need of would get a part of the contract. We went along for sometime supplying stones in that way: but as soon as the Barbados Labour Government got into power, they awarded the supplying of stones to one contractor whose name was Mr. Farnum. He supplied the stones required for the whole Island of Barbados. He had the contract. I was aggrieved over the matter. I appealed to the Colonial Secretary at that time and then called on Mr. Scott-Bushe who was in charge of the Road Board and asked them to distribute the work among various contractors. When the time came for Mr. Farnum to be awarded the contract again, he was asked to hold on and as a result of my appeal, the whole Island was divided into four districts and the contract for supplying stones was given to Mr. Hinkson, Mr. Boyce, Mr. Farnum and Mr. Norris. I caused that to happen, because the awarding of the contract to one person was proving itself to be a burden on the other people.

Sir, the very hon. member who has brought this Resolution was a member of the present Government and was allowing such evil to be carried on.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member saying that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph was a member of the present Government?

Mr. CORBIN: I mean that he was a member of the Barbados Labour Party. It was that Party which awarded the contract to one person. They could not see that the poor people were in need of help. Mr. Farnum when he had the contract solely in hand lived sumptuously while the others were perishing. Some evenings I saw men crying. This is what Mr. Farnum told his rock blasters: "You are my rock blasters; you are like a chub fish." He meant that they could not do better and if they could not abide with what he did to them, they would die because he alone had the contract.

Sir, that continued until John Wesley Corbin asked the Government to change the practice and the Island was divided into four sections for the supplying of stones.

Sir, I cannot say it is right to give one man the contract. I will agree in part that every parish which can supply the stones according to the quality required by the Department, should really have the privilege of being able to supply that stone. But, Mr. Speaker, there were some of us who could not continue with the contract which was given us because we did not have transportation. Another thing is this. There were certain contracts which called for fine metal — that is to say, chips — which we could not supply; therefore, those people who had the necessary machinery to provide that material were able to accept the contract. In St. Joseph and in St. Andrew we had the contract and in St. Peter and in St. Lucy somebody else had the contract.

Sir, what I am saying now is that if people in the parish are able to supply the stones necessary, they should be given the contract; but if they are given the contract and they will be only able to carry out the contract for a day and can not supply the stones according to the contract tomorrow, they will be just embarrassing the Government. What I want to say is that anybody who wants a contract should have the necessary equipment to enable him to supply the materials required, and if he can do that, we will accept his tender; but if he does not have the necessary equipment then we cannot accept his tender. There are various types of material which are supplied to the Highways Department.

What I will say is that we should, wherever we can, employ in the particular parish men who are rockblasters so that the stones required should not be brought in from another parish. We should do so wherever we have the required material in the parish. I say that where a parish is able to supply the quality of stones which are needed, we should accept a tender from that parish. I know that that is what is causing so much grievance because the poor rockblasters are idling. The stones used are taken from certain parishes.

4.15 p.m.

That is the only possible means of helping the poor man; if you do not do that, you will have too many people crying out. The Government today is wholeheartedly willing to support the masses of this island in whatever we can do for them; whatever lies in our power to do we intend to do because we are wholeheartedly with the people of this island since they are wholeheartedly with us. We do not mind who may bring suggestions to this House; we will accept them if they are good. We will not do as the last Government who laughed at suggestions we made and believed that they are the only ones who could do things. Good suggestions should be respected; we will select the material and we can keep it and use it in time. We are not going to criticise members who are not members of the Democratic Labour Party; we are willing to hear the suggestions of hon. members. But the thing which shocks my modesty is that since the Democratic Labour Party came into power the scales have fallen off the eyes of some hon. members. They can now see.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the hon. member revert from scales to stones. *(Laughter)*.

Mr. CORBIN: I am still dealing with stones; stones are what we need. Anyhow, Sir, we are going, as the Democratic Labour Government, to see after the welfare of this island as a whole; we are going to help every man and woman. We intend to do the best which it lies in our power to do. We have men with ability and men with qualifications and

therefore we will do our best. We are now setting up the workbench and I am certain that when that workbench has been set up and when suggestions are made to us, we will do the best we can for our people in every parish of Barbados. We will choose the best stones and we will listen to reason and deal with every man according to his qualifications.

As to the hon. junior member for St. Joseph, I am glad that the broom did not sweep him out *(Laughter)* because the things which he has brought to us are an indication of what the other people were doing to the people of Barbados. I can assure you that whatever the hon. junior member for St. Joseph brings to us we already have under consideration. As I have said, we only want to set up the workbench and we will do everything and we will do it at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. COWARD: Mr. Speaker, as far as I can see, these Resolutions are very close to each other. I do not know the reason why the past Directors and the present Director have called for supplies. I will ask that we consider the postponement of this Resolution in order to get the observations of the present Director.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member moving the postponement of the Resolution?

Mr. COWARD: I am putting that by way of motion.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I am speaking on the original motion. I cannot see the reason for the postponement.

Mr. COWARD: On a point of order. I said that I do not know the reason why the past Directors and the present Director have called for supplies. That is why I say that we should postpone this matter in order to get the observations of the present Director.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am asking for enlightenment. I see that this Order reads as follows:— To move the passing of a Resolution re award of contracts for the supply of stones for use for the repairs and/or construction of roads by the Department of Highways and Transport. Am I to understand that the Local Government in the North and South still have a Highways Board which repairs the roads? The hon. member who has just sat down has taken a different line; he takes the line from the Department of Highways and Transport. I take it that the hon. mover of the original motion wants to deal with the idea of the awarding of contracts up to the value of \$500 and over, relative to the supply of stones for repairing roads from taxes collected from the North and the South. The hon. member who has just sat down seeks to get the idea of the Director of Highways and Transport. I do not like to vote until I give my reasons for voting, but I will have to vote against the Resolution. I cannot understand how it is that the Northern District Council which is composed of laymen except for the present Chairman — I would say that when you pass legislation, the interpretation of such legislation should be a matter for the Judiciary. While the Crown Law Officers can give their opinion, you should take your opinion and vote on it.

I do not understand on what grounds the hon. senior member for St. Joseph is asking for a postponement of this Resolution. He is dealing with something quite different from that with which the hon. junior member for St. Joseph is dealing. The hon. junior member for St. Joseph is dealing with Local Government practice.

Mr. SMITH: On a point of order. This is nothing to do with Local Government; this is something to do with the Department of Highways and Transport. If the hon. member would read the Resolution he would see that.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I must apologise to the hon. member, but when he started his speech he said that this matter hinged on what had gone on before. If this matter deals with the Central Government, then I will agree with the hon. senior member for St. Joseph for the postponement of this Resolution.

4.25 p.m.

The hon. member was right when he said that you could not talk about buying stones from here, there and everywhere. The engineers for the road must be satisfied with the quality of the stones, whether they be from St. Joseph, St. Lucy or St. Andrew. You are not an engineer, and I agree with the last member that this should be postponed in order to get the engineers' views on this. A Deep Water Harbour was built in the City of Bridgetown and the stones were taken from St. Thomas because the engineers decided that this was the quality of stones they needed. St. Philip made a bid, whether right or wrong; but the engineers had to advise whether they could supply the quality of stones required.

I think under the circumstances, rather than cast my vote against this Resolution, I would be prepared to vote with the hon. senior member for St. Joseph in postponing the matter, and I hope the hon. junior member for St. Joseph will accept it because there is a tremendous lot in what he has said. We must know of the quality and the reasons why the several engineers have taken stones from the several places and whether the rock blasters used in these areas are rock blasters from St. Lucy or other parishes where they get the type of stone. As a matter of fact, I do not talk of stones in St. Joseph which people use in Christ Church.

I have much pleasure in seconding the motion for the postponement, and I hope the hon. member will accept his colleague's suggestion.

Mr. SPEAKER: Does any other hon. member want to speak on this motion before the hon. Mover exercises his right of a final reply? It does not appear so and I shall let the hon. junior member for St. Joseph proceed.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I do not see the necessity for postponing this Resolution. I am not questioning the quality of stones or anything at all; I am only asking that, instead of the contracts being awarded to three contractors for the whole island, it should be possible for them to be awarded per parish. I have also said that it does not prevent one from getting the contract all over again, but it would be possible for a particular person or persons in a parish to have a chance or the right to apply for work in the parish or words to the effect.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is now after 4.30 p.m. o'clock when Private Members' Business automatically is concluded. The House shall now proceed.....

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Speaker, under Private Members' Business....

Mr. SPEAKER: Private Members' Business is concluded for this meeting. The House will now proceed with Government Business.

The first Order of the Day under Government Business stands in the name of the Hon. Leader of the House, the hon. senior member for St. Philip, to move the House into Committee of Supply to consider the grant of sums of money for the service of the Island.

Is it the intention of the hon. senior member for St. Philip to proceed with this motion standing in his name?

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The silence is oppressing.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I beg to second that.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1961-62 No. 37

HEAD VI - CUSTOMS

Head VI - Customs was called.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head VI - Customs - do now pass.

Before I sit down, I would like to explain the amounts under this Head. You will see Items 22, 24, 13, 27 and 30. They are nearly all of them self-explanatory. The largest amount under this Head VI is the sum of \$85,000. Now, this is not an amount coming out of the Treasury which is a charge upon the taxpayers of this Island. As you are aware, Sir, there are certain items on which importers pay customs duty, but by law they are entitled to refunds on these commodities if the goods are taken back out of the Island. That, roughly, summarises the position. The amount voted in the previous Estimates was \$360,000 for customs drawbacks. Everyone who is in commerce in Bridgetown would be aware of the practice of claiming drawbacks from customs on matters on which you should never really have paid duty in the first place.

Mr. Chairman, some of the items on which drawbacks will have to be paid under this Head would be the increases in the sale of goods to tourists - we have a free Port both at the Airport and at the Harbour - fuel used for aircraft and a general increase in the amount of goods on which the importers are entitled to claim drawbacks.

I would like to say as a matter of explanation to members that when the current Estimates for 1962-63 come before the Legislature - they have not been printed yet, but at least I can indicate to members the improvements which I intend to make in the drawing up of the Estimates. I do not consider that this is a matter which should come before the House at all, because it is purely a matter of internal accounting. It only involves the House of Assembly in an unnecessary waste of time, because the law is that customs duty should not be paid on these articles, and I was quite scandalized to discover that the former Government padded out the Estimates of Revenue in this respect by over \$400,000, and in respect of income tax by another \$500,000 or \$600,000, thereby inflating the Estimates by \$1 million to give the impression that the revenue of Barbados was \$1 million more than it actually was, and then over on the expenditure side they came in from time to time with Supplementary Estimates, so presenting in my opinion an entirely false picture of the true state of the economy of this Island.

Now the law is that the taxpayers or importers, as the case may be, are entitled to these things as of right. We are not giving a dispensation or a waiver of customs duties or exemption to people when we give them drawbacks. This is the state of the law and as a matter of practice and procedure in the Customs Department, the Comptroller for very obvious reasons insists that you pay duty on every gallon of petrol coming in and every commodity which is dutiable, and then if it is re-exported, then you get your drawback.

4.35 p.m.

But it is the money of the importer or the consumer, as the case may be, or the income taxpayer in relation to the Customs Department. If hon. members notice in the Current Estimates that there is a drop of \$1 million, it is not that we are collecting less revenue but it is because we consider that this is the responsibility of the Comptroller of Customs in one instance and the responsibility of the Income Tax Commissioner in the other instance. It is purely a matter of internal accounting. We have been wasting Government paper and the time of Civil Servants, the time of this House and the stationery which we have to provide by putting in matters such as this to show that you collected \$1 million more than what you collected. It is completely dishonest and it is completely irrelevant from the point of view of good accounting. You will find it nowhere else and it is only the Government of Barbados hitherto which will do accounting in this manner.

Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that I have to make this statement at this time but it is a matter which I want to

make clear. This is not giving exemption from Customs Duty but merely repaying what they deposited. That is putting the situation in a nutshell.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: I can appreciate the point which the Hon. Premier made, but I am somewhat worried as to his change now that he has announced it. I think that this is a method which was carried on for many years and it applied merely to what you import with a view of bringing in certain goods free of duty.

I am wondering whether the Hon. Premier has given every possible thought to this matter. As he mentioned, I agree that it is confusing in a way. But let us take oils for the use of aeroplanes. By what method are we waiving and protecting these people if you are allowed to pay less actually before?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: If the hon. member would give way, I would like to clear up a wrong impression which he seems to have gathered. I was not suggesting that when goods are imported into the country, the money would not have to be paid in. I said that this was a matter of internal accounting. In other words, let us take the example of aviation fuel. The Customs and Excise statistics will show us exactly how much of that fuel was sold at the Seawell Airport. It does not matter how much is stored in the installation tank. The people who import this fuel, whether it is Messrs DaCosta and Company Limited or Messrs. R. M. Jones and Company, paid duty on that fuel when it came into the Island. If they want their money back, they do not come to the House and ask for a Resolution; they go to the Customs Department and certify by a document that that is correct and they collect the money. In another way, the Financial Secretary will call this a Revolving Fund.

The position is this. I came to this conclusion. I consulted the Commissioner of Inland Revenue and although I did not directly speak with the present Comptroller but another officer, from them I understood that for years all these departments were agitating and asking the ex-Government to take these things out of the Estimates; but the Government for reasons best known to themselves kept them in. I was therefore gratified that these three responsible officials had also come to that conclusion. I cannot find the way in which they were doing it in any financial statement of the Governments in the Caribbean area. Again, it is purely a matter of internal accounting.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I thank the Hon. Premier for his explanation. I can now see his point.

Mr. GODDARD: Sir, in the last session I remember asking the Government then if it was not possible that they could show to members of the House the different types of drawbacks so that they could see the business dealing in the Tourist Industry and what they were getting as drawbacks. The amount should be broken down; but everything is put under one Head. Now that you have bulk installation, you are going to have something more under that too and all of these things will be mixed up. I say that it should be broken down so that we would have a picture of where the amount is going. That is another form of accounting which we would be glad to have.

I agree with the Hon. Premier that the present method of which he has spoken only goes to swell the expenses of the Customs Department and every year it is rising and it would look as if the cost has risen. This is a drawback on goods which we know beforehand and it could be taken off. However, I am saying that the item "Drawbacks" should not be presented to us in a lump sum; you should have it broken down to show what amount there is under tourists' items, under oils and gasoline at Seawell and then, may be, to deal with that which is under bulk fuelling at the Deep Water Harbour and the other things. It is a question which I have put before the former Government. I am glad the Hon. Premier is interested in that form of accountancy.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I will take note of what the hon. junior member for Christ Church has said and make a careful search of the revenue relevant to this matter. Apparently his suggestion was not noted by the person in charge of this Head when it was under discussion. For obvious reasons when we are dealing with our Budget, we would like to see not only what concessions we are granting but also how they are affecting our revenue. It may also be useful to demonstrate to the outside world the extent to which we are going to help industrialists coming here. I am sure the Tourist Board will also be interested in this information as well. 4.45 p.m.

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

HEAD VIII — LEGAL

Head VIII — Legal was called.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head VIII stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Hon. Premier could tell me at this stage what has been the decision taken by the present Government in relation to the printing of the new Laws of Barbados. Has the Government decided to have these Laws printed abroad or locally? I am speaking in connection with Item 12 — Law Books.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, that question is really not proper to this item, but I am not afraid to answer questions. I will give the hon. member the information now. Hon. members will remember that the hon. senior member for St. Peter introduced a Resolution in this House — a Resolution which was prompted by a similar Resolution of the Barbados Workers' Union — expressing fears that there would be a dropping off in the level of employment, that the journeymen printers and book-binders would suffer as a result of the decision taken by the past Government to print the Laws in England. This is a matter which I took up with the learned Attorney General about two weeks ago. As far as I can remember, the Resolution of the hon. senior member for St. Peter was defeated on the floor of this House. I cannot remember the Government supporting the Resolution which was brought forward by the General Secretary of the Barbados Workers' Union. However, I went into the matter because I was very anxious to discover what are the chances of getting the Laws of Barbados printed in Barbados as soon as possible. I was informed — I do not have the information before me now — that the Advocate Company had been asked how long it would take them to print the Laws of this Island and they said that it would take them about two and a half years.

This matter was started in 1959. A former Chief Justice of British Honduras was given a commission to revise the Laws and get them ready for the printers. He was paid the sum of £1,000 on account and the Government allowed him to keep that, but the Laws have not been finished. *(Laughter)* Mr. Chairman, I am trying to give the facts; I am not making any suggestions either in one way or in the other, and anyone who wants to challenge the accuracy of my information can do so. The first person who was to revise the Laws collected £1,000 for the work which he was supposed to have done up to date and then the gentleman's eyes gave out and he could not go any further with the work. There the matter rested. It was suggested that two Judges of the Supreme Court along with the Attorney General should be established as a commission and be paid for completing the work which has been started by the former Law Reviser, if I may so call him. The position is that I do not agree that anybody who is sitting on the Bench should have anything to do with the revision of the Laws, because you cannot make Laws and interpret them too. I know that the person who revises the Laws makes the Laws sometimes. I can quote instances of persons who are still alive, and it is not for me to quote Laws which have been done by persons who sit in authority and who made the Law. The history of members of the Bench revising the Laws has been a very unfortunate history in the Caribbean from the extreme North to the

extreme South, that is, from British Honduras to British Guiana. We have had the unfortunate history of members of the Bench being invited to take on, in addition to their arduous duties, the strenuous work of revising the Laws of a country.

I have asked the Learned Attorney General, without giving him my opinion, whether it would be possible for the present Government to break the contract with the firm of Messrs Eyre and Spottiswoode even if it meant our compensating them by way of a moderate amount without incurring the enmity of the outside world. I undertook to ask if the House could break the contract with this firm and pay them damages, provided that those damages were of a nominal sum, something like £100, and give this work to Barbadian workmen. The Learned Attorney General said that it was quite clear to him that there was a contract and it would not look well if we did that; but he is considering whether we could break the contract with these people. In any event, the last volumes of the Laws could not be delivered to the Island of Barbados in less than two and a half years from the date on which we first gave them the proofs. They would supply one volume of the Laws every six months. There is absolutely no chance, under the present arrangement, of getting a complete volume of the Laws of Barbados before 1964. That is the position. The previous Government has been dragging its feet on this matter, and it is unfortunate that the person who was revising the Laws was not in a position to complete them. The whole matter is now being suspended between Heaven and Hell.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that what I have said covers the point made by the hon. senior member for the City. I have not got the information on the matter here, but as far as I can remember, that is the position in which we are at the present moment. I am discussing the matter next week with the Chief Justice and I believe that he may be — I use the word "may" advisedly — of the same opinion as I am myself. In Barbados we have had a Law revision; if hon. members would look at Volume 1 of the Laws of Barbados on the very first page they will find this:—

"Legislative provision for this Edition of the Statute Laws of the Island was made by Act No. 22 of 1935. The Commissioners appointed for the purpose of the revision were the Hon. E. A. Collymore, K.C., then Attorney General, and the Hon. H. Walter Reece, K.C. Before the work got under way, the Hon. Walter Reece, K.C., passed away; in the meantime the Hon. E. A. Collymore, K.C., was appointed Chief Justice of the Island; and by Act No. 63 of 1936 the Hon. E. K. Walcott, K.C., who succeeded him as Attorney General, was nominated Commissioner in the place of the Hon. H. Walter Reece, K.C.

4.55 p.m.

The actual work of revising and preparing the New Edition was entrusted to Mr. C. V. H. Archer and Mr. W. K. Fergusson, Barristers-at-Law, each of whom has in turn performed the duties of Legal Draughtsman in the Attorney General's Department.

Considerable time has elapsed since the work was commenced. It is therefore relevant to point out that Mr. Archer and Mr. Fergusson have had, throughout the whole period, to perform their substantive duties as whole-time Government officers while undertaking the task of revision, and were able to devote to the preparation of the New Edition only such spare time as was common to them both. Wartime difficulties further delayed the completion of the work.

Originally, it was contemplated that the revision would be taken to the end of the year 1940."

Then they go on to say that it was taken right down to 1943. This Edition came out in March, 1944, and hon. members would therefore see that it took nine years from 1935. By the time War broke out, four years had gone already; but it is entirely unsatisfactory in my opinion, to take whole-time Government officers and give them a monumental task to perform such as this. We have in this Island and outside of this Island, if members would like an indication of the way I am thinking, lots of young, energetic, West Indian

lawyers, well-qualified and well trained academically, who could be paid to do this matter whole-time and get them ready in three months, at least to get the proofs ready in three months for the printers, and there is no reason from what I can see why a Commission of three Barristers, say, under the Chairmanship or guidance of the Attorney General or some other high-ranking legal officer should not be able to get the proofs for these laws ready in three months. I intend to do everything I can and I will be coming to the House when we do formulate definite proposals and when I have had my consultation with the Chief Justice in order to expedite the printing of these laws.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, in connection with the matter now being discussed, the Premier did say, speaking more or less from memory, that £1,000 was paid to this Chief Justice. Again it is a matter of memory, but I remember the House voted the money, and if I am correct I think it was £2,000 for the complete revision of the laws and I think it was this retired Chief Justice from British Honduras who was appointed to do this job. During that period which I think, was over a year, I remember only too well that he broke down in the first place with his eyes which forced him to have a rest with special treatment. However, he did return working at night on this particular job on which he collected an advance of £1,000, and three or four months later the doctor demanded that he must give this job up. The question then arose as to whether he should refund half the money for the work that was done or whether he should be allowed to keep the £1,000 for more than a year's work. As I said, he has not actually lost his sight, but maybe 90% of it.

On the question of the printing of the Law Books, so much has been said, I remember too well that the period fixed by the *Advocate* was 2 1/2 years. There was no prejudice, as far as the Government was concerned, about giving the work to the *Advocate* or any other place, and we were satisfied that they would take 2 1/2 years. Over and above that there was the question of material, and we were thinking then of the loose-leaf system. The Hon. Premier might have something more to say on this because I am not familiar with it, but I think he has seen this question of whether we should use the loose-leaf system or whether we would have to abandon the books printed in 1944 which were brought up-to-date, and for that reason on grounds of (a) efficiency and (b) because it was cheaper then.....

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, if I remember, the contractors, Messrs. Eyre & Spottiswoode, undertook to supply one volume every six months, that is two volumes a year, and that would be a period of two years, but somehow or other we lost six months on the way. I think they undertook to supply two volumes at one time or something, but I know that there was some talk about 2 1/2 years.

Mr. MILLER: Whatever happened, we got these volumes and completed the text which the retired Chief Justice was doing on the revision and the *Advocate* said it would take 2 1/2 years at any cost. Everybody advised that we should get after this and not be concerned with whether it would cost more or whether as a matter of efficiency we could have buckle-backed books and put in loose leaves and bring the amendments up to date every year or two years rather than like in 1944, and for that reason it was not a question that we wanted to deny the *Advocate* of any local work. You might decide to follow the principle we agreed on of going back and taking in the last fifteen or twenty years, or you might want to do over the whole job and spend almost nine years in the revision, to say nothing about the 2 1/2 years; but you should want to spend additional funds and improve the efficiency of the book which is for the service of the community. A loose leaf arrangement whether over a year or two years might bring them up to date against the cost of efficiency and in less time than what the *Advocate* would produce. These are things with which we are concerned; but going back to the first question on whether or not the Government should decide that this retired Chief Justice should continue to keep this £1,000, we were advised by the Council and by people connected to the Judiciary that for the service and the volume of work, measured in time, and probably expressed to some extent in suffering through the loss of his sight, it was not fair to ask him to refund the money, but

to continue with someone else who would probably be willing to do the balance of work and complete it even if it cost a little more.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the Hon. Premier first of all for his courtesy in answering, because as he rightly said, it really was not quite in order for me to pose the question under this Head. I would like to say to him now that as far as my Party is concerned in dealing with the printing of these laws, the little difference in time which it makes and the relief which it can give to the number of displaced printers does not matter to the Advocate or any Printery. I remember definitely the hon. senior member for St. Peter saying that quite a number of persons were laid off at the leading Printery in the Island for the simple reason that with the establishment of the Government Printery and having modern machinery and so on, there was no work for them; and they were told that a job like this could keep a tremendous lot of people employed.
5.05 p.m.

I want to say here and now, as far as we are concerned, that we are definitely prepared to support the idea, even though it costs more money. I appreciate the statesmanlike manner of the Hon. Premier in not offering any criticism to the former Government for allowing the money to be kept by the gentleman who started this work and then got ill. Even if somebody takes somebody to read for him, he must be able to see for himself. There can be no criticism of the last Government for allowing the gentleman-lawyer to keep that money.

The Hon. Premier gave his reasons and said that from Sir Allan Collymore down to Mr. W. K. Fergusson had taken part in the last revision of the laws, and from the figures the printers would be able to supply two volumes every year; therefore it would be a question of three years to complete these laws. I say that if the English Company which has contracted for the printing of these volumes can give us six months earlier or even a year earlier than a local printing office, I am still of the opinion, having regard to the number of printers whom I see idling as a result of modern machinery, that my Party would be prepared to back the Government in trying to give the work to a local firm of printers even if it meant your breaking the contract. What is breaking a contract? I hope nobody would believe that in breaking this contract, you have broken anything. This is an agreement on which you have not started any work, and the firm has not gone out of its way to get any machinery to do the work. This firm of Eyre & Spottiswoode is a big established firm. If you have to pay £150 or £200 as a result of charges because you have entered the contract I see no reason why you could not break it because it would relieve the situation which you have here.

Now, Sir, inside Barbados and outside of it, you have many young, well-trained lawyers who would be more suitable for revising and bringing up-to-date these laws. Speaking for myself, I know that it is a very strenuous task. I would like to see any three men sitting down doing this work without getting rest. It is a strenuous task; it cannot be hurried and it takes time.

I agree that you should not commission members of the Judiciary to do this work but that you should get this work done outside by a member of the Bar even if you have to get some person from Trinidad to do it. I am sure that you can find many who are not established enough either in Barbados or outside to accept this offer.

I suggest strongly to the Government, and with the greatest respect, that they should try and get the contract broken so as to get the printing done in Barbados. As a matter of fact, I would not call it breaking the contract; I would call it relieving themselves from the agreement. I am sure that the people of this country will be very gratified to know that you kept this work in Barbados. As long as work can be done in Barbados, it should be given to people in Barbados to do.

I heard the hon. junior member for St. George refer to loose-leaf binders. There was some talk about that; but I

remember when that matter came up, it was not so much favoured by the legal luminaries in the House. It was a question as to whether you should have these loose-leaf binders, and the Government said that while it would be more expensive it would be a means of making it easier when you have to amend the laws by making it possible to put in the amendment then. However, Sir, I commend the Hon. Premier for his very able explanation on the matter.

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

HEAD XIV - JUDICIARY

Head XIV - Judiciary - was called.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head XIV stand part.

Apparently, there is a rise in the homicide cases during the past year. I do not know whether it has anything to do with the elections, but we have to increase this amount of fees to Counsel assigned in capital cases because Sessions are going on and I think that they are some capital cases before Sessions at the present moment. The amount of \$515 is needed.

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I must ask the Hon. Premier this. I do not know if he is aware or it, but I am aware that there is some dissatisfaction among young practitioners at the Bar as to the fees paid in this respect. I am wondering if the Hon. Premier can tell us what has been decided about it. As I understand it, it is almost impossible to ask a young practitioner to undertake the defence of a person on a capital charge for the fee which is offered.

I am going to take the opportunity, if Your Honour does not rule me out of order, to say, while on this subject, that it has been brought to my notice quite recently that the last Government has been pursuing a policy which has been contrary to what happened in this country years ago. It is with respect to the question of payment of jurors. I do not know if members of the Government have heard anything about it, but within recent months, people who have been asked to serve as jurors, if they were working, were told that they were not going to be paid for their services. In many cases those jurors who have been working were not paid.

I want the Hon. Minister in charge to take note of this. I took the matter up with the Registrar and he said that that was the instruction given him. He was told that those jurors who were working, as long as they were being paid from their place of business, were not to receive any money for their services. A lot of us feel that that is unfair because quite a lot of these people, although they are employed, come from the country; and when they come to town to do this work, sometimes they have to get additional boarding. I counsel the Hon. Premier to take this matter up with the Registrar and to cancel these instructions which were given to him.

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

HEAD XX - EDUCATION (1) HEADQUARTERS

Head XX - Education (1) Headquarters was called.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head XX stand part.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I rise to second the motion which has been made by my colleague, the Hon. Premier and Minister of Finance. In doing so, I realise that it falls to me as Minister of Education to give this Committee some extensive knowledge of our proposals in respect of free secondary education and our attitude to secondary education in general.

5.15 p.m.
I should like to say, first of all, that if things had gone a certain way and we had not so prematurely lost the com-

panionship in this House of the former hon. junior member for the City, the late Mr. A. E. S. Lewis, it might well have been his privilege to be making the main speech on this Resolution, since it was he who first drew to the attention of the House and the public at large that it was possible within the limited financial resources of this island, to provide free secondary education at the Government-aided Schools. I do not think it is possible to say one word on this Resolution without paying tribute to the memory of that hon. member and the valiant fight he put up in this House for that privilege. I am happy as one of his colleagues to be able now, too late it may be, to pay him the tribute which he deserves in making the main speech on this matter.

I should like to say at the outset that this is nothing spectacular which is being done; therefore the Resolution which the Committee is asked to consider for the sum of \$41,000 is a Resolution to enable the Governor-in-Executive Committee, so to speak, to pay the Governing Bodies of the ten Government-Aided Grammar Schools, the fees which would normally have been paid by the parents of the pupils who are attending these schools. Here again, before I go further, I ought, perhaps, to clear one of the hurdles which people say we have not yet cleared and about which there is still some doubt, with respect to the preparatory departments in Government-Aided Secondary Schools.

Let me remind the Committee that what we are offering in this island is free secondary education and not free education in Secondary Schools. There is a difference between them. Some people still believe that preparatory departments are an integral part of the system of Secondary Schools. I have been at great pains to point out that that is not so, and I take the opportunity to say again that it is not so. I do not have to go further than to quote at random from the Scheme of Government of the Coleridge-Parry School and this information would be duplicated in reference to the Scheme of Government of any of the other Secondary Schools. Quoting from this Scheme, "the term 'preparatory department' means all classes in the school junior to the classes in which pupils between the ages of 11 and 12 proceeding from elementary schools would normally be admitted." Any person below the age at which you would normally start a secondary course is a preparatory pupil, and those most nearly connected with education in this island have admitted that children in preparatory classes at Secondary Schools do primary work. Here was the decision which the Government had to take; we said that we were providing free secondary education. There is also in existence, and has been in existence for some time, the system of free primary education. If, therefore, you have established or you are about to establish a two-tiered system of free education, you cannot have from a two-tiered system of free education something which belongs to the primary part of it which finds itself in a secondary school system. Therefore when we reflect that preparatory classes are really primary school classes in secondary schools under conditions of privilege, we have had to decide that we had better stick to the commitment which we made to the electorate, that is, to offer free secondary education and not free education in Secondary Schools.

Mr. Chairman, because of that consideration, I have advised the Cabinet that pupils who are now in the preparatory forms in the Government-Aided Secondary Schools must pay fees. Allied with that anxiety about fee-paying was the much greater anxiety on the part of the parents — the anxiety as to whether pupils in preparatory forms would or would not have to leave these schools immediately. Before Christmas in a broadcast address specifically to parents and guardians, I made reference to some aspects of our Secondary School policy; I said in the course of that broadcast that after July this year I will not permit admission into the preparatory departments of the Government-Aided Secondary Schools. In other words, there would not be any admission to preparatory classes in these secondary schools from September this year; but pupils who are now in preparatory classes will, of course, remain there and in the normal fashion they will move from the preparatory classes to the main departments of the secondary schools. Any child who is going to be put out of a preparatory class now, if he follows the normal procedure, will move in the

normal way out of the preparatory form of the Secondary School into the main school.

Before I explain why I have advised the Cabinet to do away with the preparatory classes, I must say this in order to reassure certain parents; you would enter a Secondary School when you have been through a common entrance. When the new Schemes of Government are ready to be submitted to the House, I shall explain that in greater detail. Sometimes it happens that you come across a pupil, who, perhaps, at the age of 10 years, can pass an entrance examination in Parts I and II and that pupil deserves to be admitted into a Secondary School.
5.25 p.m.

Now hitherto what Government Bodies had permitted in the case of the under 11's was this: they would put them into the preparatory departments — I am referring to those under 11 who passed entrance examinations — in the cases of the leading schools, the Upper Prep as it is called, and let them spend a year there until they could move into the main Departments of the School. That was not entirely unsatisfactory, but it was not entirely satisfactory, because in some cases you got a very bright pupil who could profit immediately from the introduction to a secondary course being kept back, and in other cases, of course, you got people who had passed the entrance examination to a school with the understanding that they could start the secondary course being made to do primary work for another year.

What I have decided to do is this: in consultation with the Heads of the ten Government-aided Secondary Schools, I am permitting admission into all the Government-aided Secondary Schools at the age of ten. But I am not permitting it at an age earlier than ten; so that all schools from next September will be able to admit pupils a year earlier than the normal 11+ range, but such pupils must be pupils who have passed the entrance examination. I am not permitting admission of pupils who cannot pass and who have not satisfied the general entrance examinations, who would as has obtained in the past been admitted into a preparatory form.

Now since there must be a certain amount of flexibility in the arrangement of each school, I have not and would not dictate to the schools as to how they should arrange these ten year olds; but since such pupils would be people who would pass the entrance examination, in my view that would entitle them to start their secondary course, and perhaps a six year course would be required for studying for the General Certificate of Education, whereas in the case of the 11 year old a five year course of study would be prescribed; but that is a matter of flexibility for the schools themselves. Preparatory pupils must pay for these two terms, this one and the summer term. When the pupils are admitted into the main school they will cease to pay. I hope I have made that quite clear.

I should say something at this stage about the holders of Exhibitions and other scholarships awarded by Local Government Authorities, private benefactors, Trusts and the like. Now this matter had perforce to be separated from the matter under discussion now. It would never have been possible within the short time at our disposal since taking office and now to be able to settle in detail these matters which arise out of scholarships and bequests. For instance, we should have to look from the legal point of view at each of these Trusts, bequests or endowments to see the terms upon which the scholarships were given and to ascertain legally what the wish of the testator in each case was or could be deemed to be. The Attorney General and the Legal Department are examining all of these scholarship awarding bodies one by one, as each has to be treated on its merits; and as soon as the report comes back to my Ministry from the Crown Law Officers, the Cabinet will then be in a position to make up its mind. Meanwhile the position goes on as before. Those who awarded scholarships to the various schools will continue to do so; but they will perhaps want to consult with us as we should want to consult with them as to whether or not they would like the money applied to other purposes within the educational field.

It is possible, for instance, Mr. Chairman, that a scholarship awarding body, now that fee paying has been

abolished, might decide that it would like to give lunch to the pupils who hold scholarships; it might wish to spread the money out over a larger number of pupils, or it may wish that the money be spent in defraying the transportation expenses of the pupils of the various schools or that some should be used in one school and some in another. All these are matters which will have to be gone into very carefully.

I believe, with respect to Local Government authorities, that their scholarships are awarded under legal sanction, and I believe they will wish to discuss what they would like to do in this respect. I just mentioned that to let the House see that we have not forgotten that most important aspect; but because of the nature of that side of it, I am not in a position to say with finality what the Cabinet's mind is with respect to the scholarships given by bequests, endowments, Local Government authorities and other bodies.

There is another point, Mr. Chairman, which I know has been agitating the minds of people in this Island. After all, what is being done when the House passes this Resolution is that the Barbadian community is meeting to a certain extent, not entirely, the cost of secondary education. At once the question arises as to who are to benefit from it. Is it to be all and sundry, is there to be some discrimination practised, and if so, what discrimination will be practised? Well, Sir, I can refer hon. members to the Addendum, and to draw their attention to the fact that we have set out, as carefully as we know how, the categories of pupils who will be entitled to, for want of other words, what we call, "free secondary education". "It is necessary to provide the sum of \$41,000 to defray in full or in part, as the case may be, the tuition fees payable at Government grant-aided schools by children who - (a) are not holders of exhibitions or other awards;" I have dealt with that; "(b) are holders of exhibitions or other awards which carry only part payment of tuition fees;" I have also dealt with that; and "(c) are not members of preparatory departments." I have dealt with that.

Now I draw this particularly to the attention of the Committee. "To be eligible for the payment or part payment of tuition by the Government, such children must be (i) natives of Barbados or children of a native; or (ii) the children of persons qualified by residence or service in Barbados."

We have made these two provisos because in one of the Government Secondary Schools, there is a sizeable contingent of pupils who are not the children of natives of Barbados. I refer, of course, to the Lodge School where the number involved in this category, I think, is between 37 and 40; some of them are Venezuelans and some of them are children of persons, not Barbadians, but not necessarily foreigners in the sense in which Venezuelans are foreigners.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say this: The Government of Barbados, at least this Government, would never have expected to ask Barbadians to defray the education expenses of a foreigner; therefore we took that into account. What we have done is this: I have given instructions to the Governing Body of that School that fees will be collected from the foreign pupils as usual pending some further arrangement which I am taking up with one of the Governments concerned.

5.35 p.m.

I do not wish to say very much on that now, but at least the interests of people in Barbados are safeguarded to this extent, that those pupils at the Lodge School who are not children of Barbadians and whose parents are not resident here - therefore, they would not be qualified by residence or otherwise - would still pay the \$24 per term which they have been paying up to the end of the last term. More detailed arrangements would have to be worked out with the nationals of those countries, and when the Cabinet is in a position to review the whole matter in that respect I will, of course, then tell the House what we have done.

Now, before I go farther, something has just occurred to me. The House will recall that towards the end of the last session my predecessor sought approval of the House in Committee of Supply for the expenditure of a sum - I believe it was \$7,000 - which the Governor-in-Executive Committee used to grant 210 free places to pupils in Government-aided Secondary Schools. That was done; and in consequence of that pupils who paid scholarships fees have found themselves this time being given back money and some of them are praising this Government quite undeservedly. They are saying that the present Government is giving them not only free education, but money as well.

I must take this opportunity of waking them up from their dreams. The remittances which Governing Bodies have made to pupils were in respect of those pupils for whom the parents were required to pay part-fees and those pupils whose scholarships were completely covered and from whom therefore payment was accepted. Since the outgoing Government has given 210 free places, some of these scholarship holders came within that category and therefore, the part fees which their parents were paying, the Governing Bodies saw fit to refund that money to the parents. Now that some parents find themselves getting back money, it has nothing to do with what is before the House now; it has happened in consequence of a measure which was brought down by my former colleague and which was granted approval by the House.

Obviously, hon. members would wish to question me more closely on our policy. There is a lot which I would like to say but I would prefer to answer questions. I have not said anything about Private Secondary Schools, but would be willing to do so by way of answering questions.

There is also the question as to what is likely to happen from next September after the demand for free secondary education and there is a clamour for extra places.

That part I will answer now. First of all, by not taking in more pupils into preparatory classes I am likely to have 200 extra places available for 11 plus pupils. Secondly, as regards the proposal which my predecessor had of building a new secondary grammar school in the St. George area, I am not going to build the school entirely in one job. To do it like that might involve me in not getting the school ready at all for the September term. What I propose to do is to build the administrative block and sufficient classrooms to permit me to take in pupils in the First Form; and then at leisure, though as speedily as I can, to complete the rest of the school. In short, what I intend to do is to get by September enough of the school ready to enable me to admit pupils of 11+ into the First Form, as I am advised that I can do that if I have my administrative offices and enough classrooms. Therefore, if I can manage to get that part of the secondary grammar school building ready and can also admit an extra 200 in view of the fact of not admitting any more into preparatory classes, that would be 320 which we can look forward to admit extra to those who would be sitting and passing the entrance examination.

I want to draw the attention of the Committee to this. Some people take the view that my Ministry is proceeding too rapidly with our plans. It is a view which I cannot share. I, myself, wish that we would be able to move at a swifter pace. Here it is: we have scarcely settled down to implement our own plans for the developing of our island when like a bolt from the blue, comes the challenge to be once again the educational centre to our West Indian nation. When the Federal Interim Organisation is set up here and the officials and servants come here, my Ministry would be hard pressed, if we do not plan ahead, to provide school accommodation for the children of the Federal Civil Servants. I estimate that it may well be set up by next year and I am going to be asked immediately for 250 secondary school places for those Civil Servants. That means, of course, that I must proceed as swiftly as possible with our school building programme. That must have first priority in our scheme of things. Matters like that must engage our attention because we do not have a lot of time to

spare. Therefore the criticism which I am going to find hurled at us is not that we are going too fast but that we are not going fast enough because the events are crowding in upon us.

I do not know what else at this stage I can be expected to say but I am willing of course — the House need not doubt that — to give any explanation which is required of me. Meanwhile, I commend the passing of this Resolution to this House.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, before you put the question, I want to say this. As a matter of fact, there is much to be said. The Hon. Minister of Education did mention on a number of occasions that he would give explanation to whatever is asked of him on this matter but he was speaking so fast and rapidly that perhaps I was in trouble to understand a lot of what he said; therefore, I hope he would explain to me these questions which I am going to ask him. I am somewhat surprised to hear him say that the refund of school fees to 210 children had caused some surprise to the parents of these children. He was present in the House when the last Government voted money to give 210 free places and I think he would remember that he declined to vote on this decision of the Government.

Mr. Chairman, with your permission, I will read what we said in our last Five Year Plan. We said that "in the current financial year Government is contributing \$914,547 or approximately 85% of the cost of grammar schools. The remaining 15% or \$166,588 is accounted for by fees. The Government is, therefore, in effect providing 85% free places in the grammar schools. By contributing a further \$166,588 the transition to free grammar school education could be accomplished. It is planned to achieve this end by progressively increasing the number of scholarships to these schools." What the Hon. Minister is seeking to do is as old as the ages. That is what is set out in the last Five Year Plan.

The Hon. Minister took part in the debate on the Resolution of \$7,000 which we brought down to be spent to cover that period to give 210 free places in these secondary schools. Why does he say that it is his Government's policy?

5.45 p.m.

Over the period of the Five Year Session a plan for a complete system of free Secondary Education was brought about which would incur an expenditure of \$66,000. There is nothing new and obviously we have been waiting for a long time for some definite statement on the policy for education. We have seen so many changes; you will remember that the first thing we were told was that instructions were given to the Governing Bodies of the various schools not to take school fees any longer. So many things have happened. In my own case I was told that I should not pay any fees. In the month before that a man borrowed money to pay the fees for his child. The Minister did say that he was concerned about the institution of free secondary education and it was the Government's responsibility to provide free education in Secondary Schools. That was more or less mentioned on a number of platforms and it is still the belief of the majority of people who are seeking secondary education for their children.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member is under some misapprehension. The point I made as regards free secondary education and free education in Secondary Schools, is this: by free secondary education we mean the payment by the Government from the Treasury of fees for pupils in Government-Aided Schools pursuing a secondary course of study. That would exclude pupils in the preparatory forms. If we were to consider paying fees for pupils in preparatory forms we would be giving free education in Secondary Schools, which we are not doing. We are paying fees for persons in Secondary Schools pursuing a secondary course of study and you can only do that from the First Form up, no matter the nature of the school.

Mr. MILLER: I remember a statement by the Minister to the effect that all preparatory departments would be removed or would come to an end by September next. Probably he has had reasons to modify that.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I do not want to be impolite to the hon. member, but to question me on a matter like this requires some previous study of the matter under discussion. The decision to abolish the preparatory forms could only have come into operation from September, 1962. Meanwhile, there are pupils in preparatory classes; these pupils are not getting secondary education now; they are getting primary education in secondary schools and therefore we said that they should pay for it. When these pupils move from the preparatory departments to the First Forms, then, of course, fee-paying for them will be abolished.

Mr. MILLER: Of course, the Minister need not be impolite because I can take care of myself. We have been told something today and we have been anxiously awaiting a decision on policy with regard to education. As people who are interested in education, we were awaiting the policy of the Minister and we were told that we will have a policy. The number of 612 places would represent 15% of the grammar school education. We are now being told that pupils in Secondary schools, not primary schools, are not regarded as enjoying free secondary education. It is all right to have something in mind but you are apt to be confused. I had always felt that on gaining entry to a Secondary School you were going to a Secondary School. If you decide to have a preparatory department in a Secondary School, it is secondary education which the children should get from the schools and they would be expected to pay for it. I can extend my point; you can even break tradition and destroy custom and where you are prepared to toy with the approach to the principle which is accepted in the minds of the community generally — I can say to the Minister that, in the minds of all and sundry of this island, as long as your child gets through the entrance examination he is thought to be going to a secondary school. I am wondering if out of all of this

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member would give way, I would like to say this: I can appreciate the fact that it might be difficult for him to get in all that there is involved at one time. Perhaps I may say what the position will be.

5.55 p.m.

May I just say this now to the hon. member? As from September 1962 no more Primary school work will be done in the Government Secondary Schools.

Mr. MILLER: I must interrupt the hon. member. You have said that already. What I just wanted to know from you if you give way on a point of order — because that is not a point of order and you are attempting to explain something you have said three or four times already this afternoon — is this, and I am anxious to be told: I am saying that in the minds of the people in this country after 100 years — which is regarded as custom, tradition or what have you — as long as they get their children through the entrance examination, their children will benefit from secondary education in a secondary school. This is to some extent a departure since you are separating the preparatory departments, and you are asking the kids in the preparatory departments to pay up to the end of September when there will be no more preparatory departments. I was only thinking of how do you expect the country to take this. It is true that by plurality of vote and decision all this can be done, but you have a section of the community who would like to be told whether or not and how it is going to evolve in another six or seven months. The Minister talked earlier about constructing certain blocks of a new school to accommodate 120 pupils before the September term, but you know that is physically impossible. You cannot continue with all this rush and speed with which you are doing all these things. There is nothing wrong if you can put in two eight-hour shifts with artificial light, ventilation and what not. We are anxious to support you, but it is a question also which is still open not only in my mind, but in the minds of the people that hitherto less than two months ago we were told that no fees would be taken in preparatory departments and now we are told that there will be no more preparatory departments in schools.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Again I must intervene. The hon. member is confusing himself and not me.

Mr. MILLER: I did not hear that. Will you repeat?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I said the hon. member is confusing himself and not me. The position is this, Mr. Chairman: as from September, 1962, no primary work will be done in a secondary school; in other words there will be no preparatory classes. Entrance as from this year for First Forms, or whatever you like to call them, will be made a year earlier; that is, not at 11 but at 10, so that there should be no complaint on the part of people that because their children are not 11 they cannot get them in since we have abolished the Preps. Meanwhile there are pupils, 467 of them to be exact, in the ten grant-aided secondary schools in preparatory departments. These 467 will not be put out in July; they will sit their internal examination as Preps have always been doing and will move into the main School, but because there will not be an intake of pupils of 8 or 8+ or 9 or 9+, I shall have class-room space available in all these schools for a further intake of 11+ or 10+. Is that clear?

Mr. MILLER: The hon. member said the figure is 467 and I am thinking of the examination at the end of June. Are you telling me or is it reasonable to believe that the 467 pupils will all pass or will some be superannuated and what are left would be sent on to the main school? That is what I am in trouble to understand because if you are going to destroy preparatory departments in your schools, I want to be assured that the Minister can tell us that the 467 pupils in the preparatory departments at the moment will all pass into the First Form of the Schools. What would happen to the children who fail? Or do you expect none to fail? Will the Minister explain that?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: That is the fairest question the hon. member has asked in the whole debate. Last Saturday morning I discussed this whole matter with the Heads of the Secondary Schools, and I told them my mind on it. I told them I did not think any pupil now in a preparatory department in any school should suffer the result of a changeover in policy over which the pupil has no control, and therefore I personally suggested to them that they should lean over backward in July to admit or to promote — I gave them my own authority for it — every pupil now in a preparatory form to the main school, because I realise that although the pupil may not have passed the entrance examination or the promotional examination from Prep to the First Form, in these new circumstances nobody would believe that he was put out of school merely because he could not pass the examination. They would feel he was put of school for reasons other than that; so I have instructed the Heads to exercise whatever latitude they need do for this particular year to see that all inmates of preparatory classes are put into the main school.

Mr. MILLER: I rather prefer the manner in which the Minister has decided to reply to the matter rather than accumulate, because there is so much to be said on this point. If it is a question of superannuation, I am somewhat unhappy to think that a section of the community will feel that you are discriminating in some way. You are trying to save the class room because you are thinking later on of Sixth Forms; yet you are saying that in July there will be no examination to take people into the preparatory departments. Is it that automatically they will go to the First Form?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: As a matter of fact, the hon. member is....

Mr. MILLER: What do you mean by leaning over backward to see that the children would be absorbed? Would it matter if they fail or would they go on whether or not they fail?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: The position is this, Mr. Chairman: there have been cases where children previously admitted to the preparatory departments have not satisfied requirements of the internal examination for the main Departments of the school and have therefore been asked to leave after they have been in the preparatory form. That was under the last Government, of course. Now if that system were allowed to continue, there would be some children who probably in all the schools — or some of them — this year would

be asked to leave the school because they did not pass the internal examination for the main school. Now if that were to happen, some parent would be justified in saying "Why is it that as soon as you are going to have free secondary education my child gets pushed out?" He would not believe that it was due to the fact that the child did not satisfy the internal examination; he might possibly believe there was some spite or discrimination on the part of the staff against his particular child, and therefore I said to the Heads of the schools, in a case like this where a change of policy is being effected, that no child should suffer any disadvantage from a change in policy; therefore those children who would normally perhaps not have satisfied the internal examination, I have asked that they be promoted as if they had satisfied the requirements, so that nobody should be pushed out this year.

6.15 p.m.

Mr. MILLER: Am I to understand that their policy is no superannuation in no secondary schools as was done in the previous Government? If that is so, I would like the Hon. Minister to explain. A number of persons would be anxious to have some explanation of this. I can appreciate his anxiety for the utilization of places now taken up by pupils in the preparatory forms. I just want to say that that was the policy laid down by the former Government. If the hon. member would look at page 39 of the last Development Plan he will see that in reference to this matter we said that there are 612 places or just over 15% of grammar school places now occupied by preparatory forms. This means in effect that the grammar schools are providing primary education. If you are satisfied that the grammar schools are providing primary education to the tune of 15% of the grammar school places — and that is the argument I have heard and it was argued in the Petter Report — if you are satisfied that you will probably be able to take up that load in the senior section of the secondary schools and if you say that the number in these preparatory forms is 467 and the primary concern of the Government is the impact of what falls out of that school, are you not probably denying the opportunity to a child which can use this sort of education to a better advantage and if that is so, is it fair to the community?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Sir, again one has to pick one or two points from the whole mass of confusion which comes from the hon. member's mouth, and say that that is a point worthy to answer. I wish to tell him that the 467 preparatory students are not all of one level. Some schools have Prep. A and Prep. B, some have Prep. A and two Prep. B's, and so forth, so that the 467 preparatory pupils will be preparatory pupils in various places. Obviously, the pupils of the age of eight years and a few months would not be in your higher preparatory forms; the pupils of the age of ten years plus would be in your upper preparatory forms. To answer the hon. member sensibly, those preparatory pupils going into the main department of the secondary schools would probably not number more than half of the total now in the preparatory forms. In other words, only those in Prep. A of the various schools would be those involved in entering the main department of the secondary schools.

You cannot have it both ways. The hon. member cannot accuse me of keeping out some deserving person by my policy of allowing everybody to go up this year and, on the other hand, if I do not do that, you say that I am discriminating. You can only attack me at one point. I, therefore, prefer to face public criticisms in being lenient and generous because I am prepared to make it possible that all those in Prep. A should enter the main school.

Mr. MILLER: Why is it that the Hon. Minister should think of attacking me? He said that he was at pains to do the ABC and to separate my points from the mass of confusion. I think the hon. member understands that I know the meaning of words. The hon. member would not have to go over the details when he is replying to me. I happen to be on the Governing Body of the Combermere School; therefore, we need not go over this. I do not know why the hon. member regards this as confusion. I was present at the meeting which decided that these fees were to be refunded; therefore, it is not a question of confusion. It appears to me that

the Hon. Minister is so worried and conscious of being attacked that probably that is the reason why he is always on Rediffusion. Is the hon. member worried by something deep within him, by something which we call conscience, that he is destroying a section of our community by what he is doing and which is going to cause pupils between eleven years and twelve years to suffer? Why is the hon. member so conscious and afraid of this question of attack? I am simply asking him to answer the question as regards where he is asking people to bend over backwards, where he is saying that these pupils will be taking no examination but will enter the main school in order that he would secure that section of the school to carry out his policy. To do that, you by way of discrimination are going to deny a boy or girl who has the ability. The hon. member is asking the Governing Bodies of these schools to bend over backwards and to promote children who would be superannuated by the last Government.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: That is ignorance.

Mr. MILLER: The hon. member said that that is ignorance, Mr. Chairman. What is he speaking on?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I believe if you give way you will find out.

Mr. MILLER: Why should I give way to find out?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I assume that he is speaking on a point of order.

Mr. MILLER: You cannot assume.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: He has indicated that to me.

Mr. MILLER: He must tell me that. Ask the hon. member what he is speaking on and until he says that, he must sit down.

Mr. BOXILL: Why is the hon. member raising his voice so loudly?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Is the hon. member speaking on a point of order?

Mr. J. C. TUDOR: I am on a point of order. I know the hon. junior member for St. George fancies himself as being capable of explaining all sorts of difficult problems.

Mr. MILLER: Is that a point of order?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I will listen to the Hon. Minister.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Sir, if the hon. member has the slightest acquaintance with the matter under discussion, he would never have mentioned the word "superannuation" with a preparatory department.

Mr. MILLER: That is not a point of order. I said: "If later on you expect to superannuate a child". Does he not understand what I am talking about and is hoping by clever means to suffer a section of our community which is between the ages of ten and twelve? Is it because the hon. member wants to be different? Why tell me that I do not understand? Does it take a genius to tell us that what you are doing is to eliminate the preparatory department to get more places in the senior classes? What the hon. member is doing is confusing the whole issue. He says that I am the one confused.

I am sure that some member in the Ministry of Education or in his Department has some idea as regards the management of secondary schools. I simply want to be told, and it is my right to be told this. I want to know what is going to be the position in the hon. member's attempt to eliminate and clear the preparatory departments. The hon. member has asked the Governing Bodies of these schools to bend over backwards. What does that mean? Are you not denying somebody's child because you want to utilise that child's place by children who ordinarily would not pass on to those forms?

6.15 p.m.

I have a perfect right to ask it; you cannot get away from it by twisting anything. You cannot do it better than I and do not worry to go down because I will reach you at your level. I may be in trouble to cope with you there but I will make an attempt to do so at least. I have asked an honest-to-goodness, straightforward question in the interest of a father of six children, and when you have the opportunity of sending a child to a secondary school then you will see through my eyes. (ASIDES). What is happening here? The election is over.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am listening to the hon. member.

Mr. MILLER: I thank you. I am a father of six children and all of them are at school. Every time I ask the hon. member a question, he is suggesting that it will be an attack and the Government will be accused of putting children out of school. Is this another way whereby you will deny children the opportunity of attending the schools? In view of what has been going on for more than 200 years, you will probably be stifling the opportunity of children. I had thought that the hon. member would have an answer to the question rather than be confusing me. He has there some member of his organization who would have, at least, some knowledge of management of schools. It is true that we need more schools but that is not what we are discussing at the present moment.

Let us assume that you have 467 places in the preparatory department; you want to eliminate them because you are thinking in terms of free secondary education. I quite agree that this is the policy of the Government; but suddenly you are crashing or splashing a decision that by September a change will take place. What is the position of these 467 children? If the hon. member will give me an undertaking that all the children will pass on to the other part of the school.....

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, on a point of explanation, I take it that these 467 children who are presently in the preparatory forms, have all written a common entrance examination to the Secondary Schools. All we are doing is undertaking by next September to give them education at Secondary level. They have passed the entrance examination and therefore I do not see the point of kicking them out of school, as it would appear that the hon. junior member for St. George would like us to do.

Mr. MILLER: I have never given that impression.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Sit down man; I am addressing the Chair.

Mr. MILLER: The hon. member cannot tell me to sit down; he is distorting what I am saying. And to whom does he think he is talking? Sit down, boy. I am not asking the Minister to withdraw anything because I expect he will talk these things and the same thing is taking place with the Chair; but let us get accustomed to it. However, I did not insinuate anything like what the hon. member has said; I am simply asking the Minister what is the policy to take care of the 467 children who may not have got through their examination. It is not a question of a common examination because there would not be any need for an examination.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I said that it appeared that the hon. junior member for St. George wants us to kick those children out of school. That is what I said. Those children have all passed a common entrance examination to Secondary Schools. All we are doing - and I want the hon. member to listen to me carefully - is to give these children Secondary education for which they have passed the entrance examination and have not had the opportunity of getting a secondary education. We are beginning to give Secondary education to those who have not got it yet and we will begin to give it to them by next September. That is all.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Chairman, I have been listening to some of this debate. I think that there is some difference of opinion between the Minister and the hon. junior member for St. George. I hope I understand the position rightly. The Minister has said that in bringing about this proposed change, those children who are already in Secondary

Schools, those who would be at least in the higher forms of the junior school - I prefer to use the word "junior" to the word "preparatory" because the junior would include the preparatory. There are preparatory forms in some of the grant-aided schools and therefore I prefer to use the word "junior". The Minister has said, and I hope he is listening to me and he is not engaged otherwise.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Chair is listening to the hon. member; you address the Chair.

Mr. HUSBANDS: I need not be reminded of that at this stage. I would like the Minister to listen to me. I can appreciate that in the bringing about of this change, he will not make any hard and fast rules where children who are already in Secondary Schools will be asked to sit another test and possibly fall down and then have to leave the schools. On the other hand, the hon. junior member for St. George seems to think that while the Minister is bringing about this change in this way, he may be depriving, if not neglecting, children who may have passed the entrance examination; he may thereby be excluding those children who would have qualified for entrance and at this time deny them the opportunity of entering the schools.

6.25 p.m.

By the Minister's present actions, he, as it were, is sweeping in - I hate to use that word at this stage - a number of children whom perhaps should be asked to stand down. Well, between the two things, whenever a change of this nature - and this is a big departure - or when a departure of this size takes place, results can never be exactly perfect. There has to be give and take. If you put the hon. junior member for St. George in the shoes of the Minister, he would produce something that somebody would pick holes in too; it cannot be fool proof. You are dealing with education and with human beings. (A VOICE: You do not have any children.)

I do not listen to the hon. member's chat about having children, because the having of children is an endowment that mankind has had. Mr. Chairman, there are some of those asides you get accustomed to. I hope you do not hear them and just let them pass; but I do hope that in the manner in which I have spoken both members on opposite sides who are contending can realise that something practical has got to be decided upon. Every Barbadian is an educational theorist. If you have a memorandum in your hand, you can read what somebody wrote and say "what nonsense" or probably you call it a document of Heaven.

All I am saying is that I appreciate the Minister in his anxiety to initiate this change. The change is going to come with a pain for somebody; it is bound to happen. In this world we never do anything perfectly. I think it is a bit of a quibble at this stage to blame the Minister, because in his anxiety to bring about this change, there is that possibility that some children who may have passed the entrance examination will be denied entrance. Now it may be and in a *sotto voce* voice I said "what a disaster"! In fact, you cannot bring people into secondary schools who cannot use to the best advantage the education therein provided in a secondary grammar school, and after this system is going, you will have to have entrance tests in the very same way. Do not let anybody deceive himself that every boy or girl is going to get free secondary education in grant-aided or what used to be grant-aided schools. It is not going to happen; we just cannot do it. The election is over and if people want to deceive themselves they can continue, but I am not going to deceive anybody. After this is implemented, and I understand it is going to begin next September, you have to screen those who are going to enter; otherwise you will give the schoolmasters 50% dotards to teach and 50% possibles. We have schoolmasters in here now - I used to be one - and they know what I am saying is true; so all this hullabaloo can stop at this stage. Something is being done.

As the Minister said, it was the late Mr. Lewis who first told us that it is possible to have free secondary education; he was laughed at, he was booed and scoffed at and all that sort of thing. I stood in a focal position in this Chamber and listened to him, and I was one man who was convinced that it was more than an ordinary possibility.

Just figures will show you that. There are no fees in any school that will pay the ground staff. Schools have been endowed in Barbados more than we imagine, and this is only one more thing being done - taking off fees. It is practical, but in one fell swoop you cannot implement something that is going to be perfect at once; you will have these snags. We imperfect human beings cannot initiate anything overnight and have it work perfectly overnight; it just does not happen.

Mr. Chairman, I would not blame the Minister if in his anxiety he is making this thing a reality; he has just started one process of it and is telling this Committee that at this stage and for the present we are not sending anybody home. That is all it is and nothing more than that.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I should merely like at this stage to assure the hon. junior member for St. Peter that the intention of this Government is to provide free secondary education for every single child in this country who should have it.

Mr. HUSBANDS: On a point of order, I take it that the Minister who is speaking means, when he uses the words "free secondary education", education from 11+. If he means that, I understand it.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I said that because what the member said just now was this: that at this stage you can only expect to provide free secondary education for the children now in secondary schools. We appreciate that, but we intend to go further and provide more secondary places for those who at present cannot find places in secondary schools. We realise quite well, Mr. Chairman, that even to provide free secondary education under existing conditions will not provide secondary education for every child in the community who should have it because there are not enough secondary school places, and after adopting the principle of free secondary education we have to go on and provide more secondary places. To go on from there, I was rather mystified to hear the hon. junior member for St. George accuse this Government of trying to sacrifice an entire generation of school children of a certain age.

Mr. MILLER: On a point of order, I am sorry that the Hon. Minister did say that, because in no part of my speech did I even insinuate that. I simply asked him to explain how he planned to use the number of places when he was thinking of these 467, but he went on to say that he had instructed the Governing Bodies of the various Government schools to go over backwards to make sure that these children were taken into the schools rather than sent home whether or not they failed. I then further asked if he would explain how he hoped to cushion all of this against the children who would be preparing for entrance to the schools and who would be denied the opportunity since there were these 467 from the preparatory departments. I am asking if they should fail what about the question of transition, as the Ministers wants to have this done by the September term. There was no insinuation at all that such could happen, and I am sorry you probably missed my point.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: The hon. member said "sacrificing a generation".

Mr. MILLER: I said it is possible you could sacrifice a generation. Would the Minister explain how he hopes to handle this?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: The Minister explained it and, to begin with, he did not say he is moving up the 467 in one fell swoop from the Preparatory forms to the First Forms, because there are existing now different stages of Preparatory Forms.

6.35 p.m.

In other words, a child in Prep B would have to go to Prep A before he goes on to the 1st Form; therefore, you are not really taking 467 pupils from all the different forms in the preparatory, and putting them in the 1st Form at one time. All that you are doing is that after you remove the preparatory forms, eventually, the children who wish

an entrance into these schools would have to sit the examination at 1st Form level and not an examination to get into a preparatory form.

However, Sir, I want to impress on the hon. junior member for St. George that it comes with ill grace from him to get in here and insinuate or imply that this Government wants to sacrifice or hinder the prospects of any age group in this community either in the primary schools or in secondary schools or to introduce age grouping and superannuation as this Government had done, to condemn an entire generation of children. By what his Government has done, we cannot get men to be recruited for jobs to go to England. If certain of our youths had the qualifications, we could get more of them into the London Transport. In their introducing age grouping without compulsory education and then going on to introduce superannuation, that Government condemned large numbers of children of a certain age group to be thrown out into the wilderness without any education at all. A large number of children between the ages of 14 years and 18 years are now walking around who are neither fish, fowl or red herring and their education is far inferior to what it would be a quarter of a century ago. Now, the hon. member talks of sacrificing somebody else. I say that sounds of ill grace coming from him.

Mr. Chairman, I say that because this Government is now concerning itself on a large scale with undertaking some semi-educational facilities to take charge of that large number of youths floating around the country who are completely unequipped to make a living. That is an additional headache which we have to take on and we are doing so purely to eradicate the evil introduced by them and to try to raise the level of education to what it was a certain time before.

Mr. MILLER: Education is very important all over the world and it is so in Barbados particularly. On the question of policy, there is a slight difference between what the three members of the Government have said particularly so far as the preparatory forms. The Hon. Minister of Education may be a good debater but he is so worried about this matter that he says that it cannot occur in the evening schools. One would imagine that you would look away from your secondary education in which priority is to be given to those between the ages of ten and eighteen and even those of the ages of ten to twenty and you would probably go back. One would imagine that you would abolish that and bring in compulsory education. There is nothing new or novel in the idea because free secondary education started last year in September. I am wondering why we are worrying about the preparatory departments.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. The hon. member said that this House of Assembly accepted his Government's policy for free secondary education last September. That is an absolute untruth. They came in here with a Resolution to give a number of scholarships. I saw nothing of free secondary education from the period of last September.

Mr. MILLER: I do not know why the hon. member should have risen to say so because it was discussed at length and I think he heard it being said by the then Minister of Education that there would be completely free grammar school education because it would cost only \$166,588 more. We came for \$7,000 after we decided over that policy.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order.

Mr. MILLER: You cannot rise on a point of order now.

Mr. MOTTLEY: We have passed the time when you thought that we were brought in here on a wheelbarrow. I am saying that we did not agree to any policy of free secondary education commencing from September last. What I am saying is that you came in here with a Resolution to provide for a number of scholarships to be given free.

Mr. MILLER: We discussed it in here and you also agreed to it. The proposition was that it would take place

probably in three years for free secondary education. That is in a document which was agreed to by this House.

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Chairman, I would like to enquire from the Hon. Minister of Education what happens to the children who are now in Prep B. As he knows, those who are in the preparatory forms at these various schools are not yet members of the main school. If even we accept the political pass from Prep A, what happens to those children who are members of the Lower Prep, who ordinarily would be promoted from Prep. B to Prep. A?

I do not know if the hon. member intends to introduce a policy of subter-annuation instead of superannuation. What worries my mind is that I have heard no mention whatsoever of what is to be done to assist those children in private secondary schools. There are roughly 4,000 children in Government-aided secondary schools and more than twice that number in the private secondary schools in this Island. I would not like it to be thought that I have an axe to grind, but I am thinking of the responsibility of this Government as regards the children who attend those private secondary schools, and the parents of them, in particular. The Hon. Minister has said nothing of the children in those schools and what aid is to be given them. There is a plan in British Guiana whereby a percentage of the salary of teachers in private secondary schools is paid. I think it is something to the extent of 70%. If that plan were adopted in Barbados it would enable us who run private schools to lower our fees and parents would realise that it is not that a small number of children is helped and a large number discriminated against.

If it is argued that the private secondary schools are not doing their jobs, there should be some Government agency whereby the owners of those can be eliminated and others made to conform to some standard. I would like to hear the Minister answer the questions on these points.
6.45 p.m.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I must thank the hon. member for raising the first question about the children in preparatory "B". The answer to that question is a simple one. Those children who are in preparatory "B" will, after passing their examination, go into preparatory "A". That is what has always gone on and what will continue to go on. What hon. members must understand is this:

Mr. LYNCH: On a point of order. How is it possible for children in Preparatory "B" to go to Preparatory "A" when the "Prep" forms will be eliminated after this year?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: No more pupils will be admitted into the Preparatory forms. If you have Preparatory "A" and Preparatory "B" now, after July, Preparatory "A" will go into the first Form and Preparatory "B" will go into Preparatory "A", and there will be no admissions into Preparatory "B". That is all it means. Preparatory "B" will be there for a year. The point which has to be grasped is that there will be no more new admissions into the preparatory forms.

As to the question of the private secondary schools, that cannot be answered now. I would like to say that last week I had the first of what will probably be several conversations with a delegation from the Council of the Barbados Independent Secondary Schools with whom I believe the hon. member is associated, and when he is next summoned to a meeting of that body he will be informed as to what is going on. We have not been able to make any pronouncement as to aid to the Private Secondary Schools; hon. members can have the assurance that that is something which will have to be considered.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, whether you agree with the Minister of Education or not, you are a believer in democracy. You have to admit that the policy which has been adumbrated today is the policy which brought a majority of members of a Party in this House and we have to agree that they have their way of doing it. I feel that in any transitional period such as this, you must find that there are those who will suffer as a result of change. I think that the public

generally appreciates the fact that the Minister of Education has certainly been giving us a lot of information in the Press in respect of the changes which the Government will bring about. Nevertheless, I am still to say that while I offer my support to this venture, I believe myself that I would rather see the matter tackled from a different angle. I repeat that I offer my support to the Government, because that is the method by which the majority of the people of this country sent the Government here; it was because of the policy which they have enunciated and which they said they will put into operation.

I understand the Minister to say that they are offering free secondary education and not free education in Secondary Schools. You have to begin somewhere. What I am worried about is this and I think I shall preface my remarks by saying that the hon. junior member for St. George referred to the Combermere School Board whereas I served for over ten years on the Harrison College Board. The Minister is by experience a University Graduate. I have no book or record but I have commonsense; (*tapping his head*) this is my University (*Laughter*.)

As far as I am concerned, I would prefer to see free education in Secondary Schools. I mince no matters about that, but to approach the matter from that angle would be a tremendous thing. Sitting as a member of the Governing Body of Harrison College I would say that the School is divided into preparatory, lower and upper classes. I think that the third form divides the lower and upper School. Relative to the question of the preparatory schools, I may say that human beings are not all alike and indeed children are not all alike. When we come in here, we are not a congress of ambassadors fighting for our respective parishes, but we are here as representatives of the people of Barbados. Mr. Chairman, I represent the children of St. Lucy as you represent the children of St. Thomas, the Minister represents the children of St. Lucy and we all represent the children of Barbados. This system of education which you have inherited, which was brought about or accepted by the last Government, is a system which I have damned. I have never minced any bones about that; I have never contended to be able to speak as an educationalist, but sitting on the Harrison College Board I will say this; I spoke as a parent to Mr. Petter. The others would speak as University Graduate and the like, but I spoke as a parent and I know the difficulties and hardships of parents. I know the difficulties with which people are faced in trying to get their children into these schools at the age of ten years. Your system of free secondary education and not free education in Secondary schools will be based on a mental test. Of your 4,000 children in these schools, with the abandonment of Preparatory "A" and Preparatory "B", at the end of two years you will have more room to take children into the Grant-Aided Secondary schools. I have not got the figures before me, but when you have done that, your free secondary education will move into free education into Secondary schools in a process. However, are you, in the interim period, prepared to offer the children these 460 odd places, and are you, after taking them in the middle school, because some in the upper school will be leaving - making preparation for the number of 10 plus children who will then be ready to enter into the lower school in the absence of the preparatory forms?

6.55 p.m.

As I have said, this is not my own idea of secondary education. My own approach would have been to consolidate the primary departments first in this country; but democracy demands that you do it this way because you went to the people and you told them this is the way you were going to do it and you have got to do it this way. We believe in democracy and we have to offer you that support. As I said, my own approach would have been to consolidate the primary or what is known as the elementary schools and see that rather than give free secondary education only by way of a screening test, education with the three R's be given to every soul who sees the light in this country as soon as they reach the age of going to school.

However, the question which I would like the Minister to answer is this. I have listened very carefully to your agreeing to carry out the plan to build another secondary school

in the parish of St. George, but I should like to draw this to the Minister's attention: even at the risk of incurring the wrath of the hon. junior member for St. George, with that I do not agree. Our net work of transportation and the way this country is laid out makes it easier for children to come into the metropolitan area to a school rather than to get cross-country buses to go to school, remembering that all children, 10+, are not the children of parents with automobiles.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The hour is now 7 o'clock p.m.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDER NO. 5

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Before you suspend the Sitting of the House, Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Standing Order No. 5 be suspended.

Mr. SPEAKER: I can explain to the House that the purpose for which we normally suspend the Sitting, because our Rules say '7 o'clock', cannot be effective this evening until 7.30 p.m. due to certain circumstances beyond our control.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I beg to second the motion for the Suspension of Standing Order No. 5.

I would just like to explain that there has been some previous doubt as to whether the Rule under Standing Order No. 5 could be suspended unless it was done at the beginning of Government Business each day. I do not think you will be called upon to exercise yourself in this matter at this stage, because as far as we are concerned on this side, and I think members on the other side will agree, the Rules were made for the House by the House, and there are no such provisions as entrenchment clauses. The experience has been that when you entrench certain clauses the organisation breaks up anyhow; so our Rules have remained very flexible and as Your Honour has adverted, the purpose for which we normally suspend the Sitting cannot be fulfilled in any sense of the term at least until 7.30 p.m. In other words, dinner is late; so I beg to second the motion.

Mr. MILLER: I do not agree with the latitude about the flexibility of the Rules of the House. Do not tell me that you throw any elastic in this and stretch it. The hon. member could ask for special permission and we would agree because we want to get through this, but do not tell us that you can come at any meeting of the House and change the Rules *ad lib*. We were waiting ten years for this.

The question that Standing Order No. 5 be suspended was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HOUSE RESUMES COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House resume Committee of Supply.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House resumed Committee of Supply, Mr. BATSON in the Chair.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Question!

Mr. MILLER: Before you put the question, I just wanted.....

Mr. MOTTLEY: I was speaking. How do you mean "question"? I was saying, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister of Education has certainly given the public his views and has acquainted them with all his Government intends to do; but as my colleague, the hon. junior member for the City has said, we want to have some more information. We take it that nobody should suffer as a result of this transitional period, but you will still have some suffering. I take it that the Minister is acquainted with the fact that there is still an examination to get out of Prep A into the main school,

and there is an examination from Prep B to Prep A. Anyway, be that as it may, there are 467 pupils who at the end of two years when you have closed your preparatory department would automatically go into the main school. I want to know what arrangements are being made to carry on from what you call free secondary education to free education in secondary schools. I believe, as the Minister of Trade has said, that that is your ultimate aim. You will give free secondary education, but your ultimate aim is free education in secondary schools similar to what I consider free secondary education, that is, from your primary school to Junior High and then on to High School, like the usual English and American system.

As I was saying before the motion for the Suspension, I understood you to have said in the Press and on the air that you have accepted the policy of the last Government of erecting a school in the parish of St. George, and I said that even at the risk of engendering the wrath of the hon. member for St. George, due to our network of transportation and having within the municipality over 100,000 people whose children must attend these schools, it is difficult to understand your erecting a school in this parish because of this talk about people representing a constituency and wanting a secondary school in their constituency. It is not altogether in the interest of parents and in the interest of the entire economy of the Island that you should have it there. You should have a school where it is easily accessible to people.

7.05 p.m.

Now, Sir, as I was saying, what we are worried about most of all is what will happen to the number of children in our secondary schools now. I have listened to nearly every broadcast which the Hon. Minister of Education made and I have read all of what he said in the Press. I do agree with my colleague that the time has come to do something to weed out those private secondary schools which are not taking any interest in education and to have some process of elimination and control over those other schools; but to exert control you must give monetary aid to the deserving schools so as to train teachers or pay teachers in those schools.

I am also worried about your free secondary education. You are going to have an island-wide test of every child of 10+ for the entrance. You must take it that it is going to be an island-wide test, because, as I see it, the test will be set for my son as well as your son, my cook's son, your cook's son and the doctor's son. They all must take the entrance examination so as to be able to enter your secondary schools and if your system is going to be one of a mental test, I am somewhat worried. I am worried after ten years' experience as a member of the Harrison College Board, because I know that there is no living human being good enough to tell at what age should a boy or girl have a mental test.

I wonder if the Hon. Minister of Education would give me some idea of what he proposes.

I suppose he can, if not now, later on, tell me something about this. How many children do you expect to sit the entrance examination? Right now, there are still thousands of children who do not take that entrance examination. It is a fact that there is that great desire for education, but there are still thousands of children who do not take the test. There are those children who have no shoes, no suitable clothes, who do not take the test but whose schoolmasters or schoolmistresses will tell you that they are bright and they possess a great deal of general knowledge; therefore, if the test is made according to the curriculum taught, it is a fact that many of those children would do far better than some who take the test now.

From my ten years' experience on the Harrison College Board, I have come to the conclusion, and I believe that you, Mr. Chairman, will share my view as you are a schoolmaster, that it is rather difficult, if it is at all possible, for a teacher to decide at what age a child will be at its best for entering into a secondary school.

I have seen it, Mr. Chairman, and you have had the experience, that some children at eight plus can romp through

the work set them and after they have got into a secondary school for a year or two, they can hardly pass out of the preparatory forms to get into the main school. They were only able to romp through with the work set them for entrance because of the affluence of their parents to pay privately to teach them so as to get them into the school. I have also seen some children take the examination test at the leading Government-aided secondary schools in this country when they were at the age of 10+ and 11+ and they failed to get entrance because they were not competent enough. I have seen some of those same children taken into my colleague's school, that is the Modern High School, and some of them have come out with such success that they were eventually taken into the higher forms of Harrison College. In short, when they sat the examination at 11+ for Harrison College the examiners said of them that this is no material for Harrison College or for Combermere or for the Alleyne or for the Parry School; so these children went and sat another examination which gave them entry into private secondary schools. As I have said, I know pupils of the Modern High School after they sat their G.C.E. examinations have got scholarships into Harrison College and one or two of them have even done so well as to gain themselves exhibitions at the U.C.W.I. That is why, speaking for myself, if I had to start any system of education, I would have started it from the bottom rung. However, you all have got the mandate from the people and we say that we will offer you our support. However, I must confess, Mr. Chairman, that I am somewhat worried about this matter. It is not free secondary education now, it is free education in a secondary school. If it were free secondary education, there should be a mental test.

Sir, I have spoken to an ex-schoolmaster on an occasion and he told me that he has had the privilege of teaching a boy whom he thought was a dunce, and now, that boy is a Professor at Cambridge University. I, Sir, have had the privilege of a boy coming to me one morning in tears when I was a member of the Governing Body of Harrison College asking me to do him the favour of helping him to go back to school at Harrison College. He told me that he has been superannuated because the faculty said that he was no material to sit the Barbados Scholarship and on account of that he was absent from school for three days. With that burning desire which I have always had for education I thought I should make a plea for him. In passing, let me say that now that I have very little education, I am in here; therefore if I had some, I do not know where I would be. However, in my usual persuasive manner, I did succeed in getting that boy back into school. The Barbados Scholarship examination came up in six months and that boy sat and became a Barbados Scholar and is now doing medicine at a University abroad.

7.15 p.m.

This is not a criticism of what you are trying to do. I hope the observations I am making will not be taken to heart and that the Government will work on them. The hon. senior member for St. George has tried to convince this Committee that his Government started this thing in September, but I am saying that nobody tried to put any hindrances in their way. I am pointing out to the Minister the difficulties with which he will be faced; for instance, there are over 10,000 children in Private Secondary Schools, some of which should be shut down, and you have 41,000 in the Elementary Schools. You can see, therefore, that your system of free education for children would be for those who are around 10+, and at least half of them, and perhaps more, will take the examination because it is free education. You have 41,000 children in the Elementary Schools and about 12,000 in the Private Secondary Schools.

Mr. Chairman, I am here to tell the Government that all is not well; I am here to wish good luck to the Government but at the same time I am not one of those people who go about with their heads in the air. If you have 12,000 children in the Private Secondary Schools who are 10+ and you have another 10,000 in the Elementary Schools who are 10+, then you have over 20,000 who are 10+. I have always condemned the last Government for this; when I see the Secondary Modern Schools I express the view that these schools should be used for your Grammar Schools. You have the material, you have the teachers and the schools are there. What I say is my considered opinion. These Second-

ary Modern Schools are the schools which can be successfully used as Grammar Schools. I want to say that your experimental system of Secondary Modern Schools has not been taken all over the United Kingdom; the experimental system which was adopted lock, stock and barrel by the last Government, is not taken all over the United Kingdom.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order. May I suggest to the hon. member that he will have ample opportunity within the next few weeks to expatiate on the proposals for the educational policy of the Government and that he need not take up the time of the Committee tonight in dealing with this minor Resolution and propounding educational theories and setting the Government aright on its educational policy? We should like to get through these other Resolutions which are on the Order Paper tonight.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, there is nobody in this House who could tell me to stop talking. The Hon. Minister knows that as soon as the Chairman tells me that the time is up I will bring my speech to an end; but when something is on my conscience I will have to bring it out. I must draw to the attention of the Government the difficulties which I see and I will suggest where you will get my support. What I want to say is this: you will have your 467 new places in two years.

I will come to the last point now. I am wondering whether the Minister will not reconsider the question of the preparatory schools. The position is this: if you offer people free Secondary Education I am wondering whether you will reconsider the question of having fee-paying preparatory schools. School fees in Barbados at Secondary Schools are frightfully cheap. (ASIDES)

Mr. CHAIRMAN knocked the gavel.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, the Labour Party members are keeping a meeting over there, and when they keep quiet I will go on. On the question of the preparatory schools I am suggesting to the Minister that he should give further consideration to the matter, because there are still hundreds of people who are willing to pay fees: in view of the fact that they are getting from the First Form to the Sixth Form free, they will pay the preparatory school fees. There is no reason why, in any community, we should not adhere to the injunction which is in Holy Writ, that those who are strong should bear, at least, some of the infirmities of the weak. There are people who have children who will get into the schools only by their brains; such people have not got the money to pay the preparatory teachers to teach those children and, on the other hand, there are others who can pay the preparatory school fees. In that case, there is no reason why you should not take the money from those who can pay these fees.

In passing, let me say this: I hope that the Minister will look into the matter and see that if he has trained teachers for the preparatory schools he will not put them to work in the Public Library or in the Government Service and then tell us that he is in need of teachers. I hope that the Government will not fall into the same error as the last Government did. You send people from the schools for training and after they have been trained you put them to work in other departments and then you say that there is a dearth of teachers.

Mr. Chairman, those are my views on this matter. I will express one thing and that is that I do hope that in two years' time rather than follow up the St. George School, the Government will establish another Secondary School in order to help what I consider another 4,000 children who will take the test.

7.25 p.m.
I enquired and discovered that less than half the 10+ took the test, and then could not enter because they knew they had to pay. Now you have come along and said they have not got to pay and you will take the 10+; so you will have to face it. It is a tremendous task. I do not envy you the burden because I think it is a most tremendous task which your Government has to carry, having made your promise to the people. Taking the exam is going to be a tremendous task,

and I want to warn you that they are going to take it. One of the Ministers used to run a school with 1,500 pupils, and I will bet you that 1,000 of them will take the examination to enter; some will get in but a tremendous lot will not get in.

Mr. Chairman, I think I have made my contribution, and having made it I want to assure the Hon. Minister that we offer him our support though we must make criticisms where necessary. We appreciate all your going to the public in every move on this matter and letting them know what is happening in these circumstances.

The question that Head XX - Education (1) Headquarters - Stand part, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

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

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head XXIII-Medical (3) Mental Hospital - stand part.

Head XXIII - Sir, calls for \$4,761 for the purposes set out in the Addendum to the Resolution.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I beg to second that.

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

Head XXIII - Medical (7) Maternity Hospital - was called.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head XXIII-Medical (7) Maternity Hospital - stand part.

Mr. HUSBANDS: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I understand that this House was suspended for half an hour. The time has expired. (Mr. MOTTLEY: The time has not expired, I have a watch.) Your watch is not the official time piece of this House and the Chairman will have to tell me that the time has not expired. I was saying, Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, that I understand that this House was suspended on a motion until 7.30 o'clock.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I should like to inform the hon. member that Standing Order No. 5 was suspended, not for any definite time.

Mr. HUSBANDS: The House has not been suspended for any definite time?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the Clerk read back the motion on which this House was suspended?

Mr. CLERK: The Minutes read that the Hon. W. A. Crawford moved seconded by Hon. E. W. Barrow that Standing Order No. 5 be now suspended.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Is that all? Indefinite suspension?

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I am sure I heard a member on the opposite side say 'until 7.30'.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That was an aside.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Chairman, if this Standing Order has been suspended indefinitely, that means the House is suspended indefinitely. When is the Committee going to resume? Just on its own motion? I am not callous when it comes to procedure in Parliament. Mr. Chairman, you cannot sit there and allow hon. members to make those asides.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I was really listening to the hon. junior member for St. Peter.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Chairman, when you are listening to the junior member for St. Peter, you must remember that asides not only reach my ears but the ears of strangers in the House.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, is the hon. member drawing your attention to strangers in the House?

Mr. HUSBANDS: It is obvious, Mr. Chairman, that if this House has been suspended indefinitely, the House will remain in Committee indefinitely unless another motion is made. If I am to understand that a motion is going to be made.....(Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: It will be made in due course.) I do not like the words "in due course" because that again is quite indefinite.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: May I on a point of order set the mind of the hon. member at rest? The Rule was suspended in order that the Minister could carry on after 7 o'clock because of the circumstances explained by the Chair. These conditions still exist and there is no point in suspending the Sitting yet, and as we have made no specific hour for the suspension, we are going ahead until the position is materially altered and then move the appropriate motion for the suspension at that time.

Mr. HUSBANDS: The longer the Hon. Minister talks, the more I begin to be convinced how indefinite matters still stand. He said just now it is not their fault. I was not here when the motion was made, but, Sir, I will ask you to be very careful in receiving such motions in future. Remember, Sir, when you are in that Chair you have no friends on either side of the House.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, Head XXIII (7) calls for \$700 for fuel and light for the Maternity Hospital. The Note is as follows:-

"The number of deliveries at the Maternity Hospital has increased considerably during the past two years, with the result that there has been a corresponding increase in the consumption of electricity (for sterilisation, etc.) and fuel at the Institution."

This amount, Mr. Chairman, will meet the payment of these items up to the 31st March, this year.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I beg to second the motion.

The question that Head XXIII - Medical (7) Maternity Hospital - stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head XXIV - Barbados Regiment - was called.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Under Head XXIV - Barbados Regiment the sum of \$1,951 is required.

I beg to move that Head XXIV - Barbados Regiment - stand part.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I beg to second that.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Chairman, Head XXIV - Item 30 - Grant to Cadet Corps. Sir, I do not intend to oppose this Head at all, but whenever the opportunity arises I am going to let the Committee know that these three privileged schools, Harrison College, Lodge and Combermere, which have Cadet Corps are enjoying something that is denied the other secondary grant-aided boys' schools such as Boys' Foundation, Alleyne School and Coleridge-Parry.

7.35 p.m.

I have on more than one occasion drawn to the attention of the appropriate Minister - whom I do not see in his place but who undoubtedly will read this debate - that in the northern and south-eastern part of the island there are taxpayers whose taxes pay for the up-keep of these Cadet Corps. These taxpayers have children who go to some of the Government grant-aided schools at which there is no Cadet Corps and they should not be denied something which children of other people enjoy. The time has come when the Boys' Foundation School, the Alleyne School and the Coleridge-Parry School should have Cadet Corps or you should stop all of them from having a Cadet Corps.

Sir, I am a citizen of the north and I am proud of that. I want it to be made crystal clear that the Governing Body of the Coleridge-Parry School has approached the Government on this matter and we have had our proposals post-

poned. We are going to be rebellious some day. Today, the army can be made a career to many of our youths who go abroad. They can pick up at least a college education in the army. Time is running out. I hope that my school - the Coleridge-Parry - which I have listed last along with the Boys' Foundation and the Alleyne will also be allowed to get the benefits from a Cadet Corps. There are many benefits which you can get from it, I believe the Deputy Premier was a Cadet, and he is one of the hon. members in here, not to mention the others, who has received some benefit from being a member of a Cadet Corps. Whatever advantages there are, and there are many, that can accrue to a school by having a Cadet Corps, I wish that such advantage should also be given to the schools which I have mentioned. The Hon. Minister of Education has now resumed his place and I wish to tell him that those Government-aided Secondary Schools for boys in the south, the north and north-east should not be any longer denied the privilege of having a Cadet Corps.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, we have no Cadet Corps yet in the north and already we are threatened with rebellion. If they had any military training, it would be worse than a rebellion.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. The sort of training you get also brings out that good in you and when you are denied that training, you can be very rebellious.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Is the hon. member implying that boys from the north do not go to Harrison College and the Lodge School and join the Cadet Corps of those Schools? In those two schools there are boys from all over the island; therefore, it does not necessarily follow that because there is no Cadet Corps at the Coleridge-Parry School, there are no boys of the north who are not in the Cadet Corps. According to the hon. member's argument, none of the boys who live in Christ Church are in the Cadet Corps because there is no Cadet Corps in that parish. Surely, there are many boys who live in Christ Church who go to school at Harrison College or the Lodge School and are in the Cadet Corps of the respective Schools. However, Sir, it is not my duty to dictate the educational policy of this country but I do want to impress upon the hon. member that boys of all the parishes of the island are in the Cadet Corps of the three schools which have them.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I do not want to be facetious in my reply to the hon. junior member for St. Peter. As a matter of fact, I will join him to a greater extent than he may expect in the remarks which he has made. He is singing no solo in saying that a Cadet Corps should be established at the Coleridge-Parry, the Boys' Foundation, the Lodge School, Combermere and wherever it is at present. I go further and say, that along with those schools, how with the Modern High School? Why can't a Corps be established at that school too? How with the establishment of one at the Arlington School and another at the Federal High School? As the hon. junior member for St. Peter has said, the parents of those children who go to those schools are taxpayers too. If the parents of those children are taxpayers and as such are contributing to the upkeep of Cadet Corps at Harrison College, Combermere and the Lodge School, surely, I agree that there should be established at the Modern High School, the Arlington and the Federal High School such a Corps. Sir, I am not making any sport. I am serious about this. Let me tell the Hon. Minister that the Modern High School has applied already for such a Corps and they have been told "no".

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. All that I am asking the hon. member is whether he means that the Government must establish these Corps at the private secondary schools?

Mr. MOTTLEY: Why not? What I am saying is that you should assist those schools which want them. I know that there are several headmasters who do not like Cadet Corps at their schools. As I have said, the Modern High School has applied for assistance in the establishment of a Cadet Corps. The parents of those children pay to have these

these Corps established. I am serious. Are you going to argue that the parents of children at the Modern High School, at the Arlington High School, the Federal High School and the Community High School do not contribute to the running of the Cadet Corps at those three privileged schools?

Sir, as you walk along the road now, you hear people saying, "we Government". You have to say "we children" too. I have no doubt that the Hon. Minister of Education would come to the conclusion and say that you should assist those schools which desire to have a Cadet Corps.

Sir, the desire for education is such that the only reason why children go into private secondary schools is because the Government does not provide enough places for them. There is no subsidisation by Government of private secondary schools, and it is a fact that some of the children whom these private secondary schools turn out are better equipped than some who have gone to the Government-aided schools. Do you not think that parents will prefer to send their children at a grant-aided secondary school at which they will only pay, sometimes as low as \$8.00 a term, rather than to send them at a private secondary school?

Sir, I agree with the hon. junior member for St. Peter. If after an application is made for the establishment of a Cadet Corps at either of these private secondary schools you are satisfied that you can get a proper Cadet Corps organised there, you should give them assistance.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say this. When I was in the Opposition, I believe on possibly two occasions that I myself have raised the question of a Cadet Corps for the Coleridge-Parry School and in theory, I am still in favour of it.
7.45 p.m.

I would not mislead this Committee by pronouncing either for or against that at the moment. There is one aspect of the matter about which I would like to speak. If having or not having a Cadet Corps characterises a school as a First Grade or a Second Grade School within the Secondary system, I think myself that we have got to reevaluate our attitude towards these schools. There may be reasons, financial or administrative, why some of these schools do not have a Cadet Corps, but one such reason there cannot be is that only First Grade Schools must have Cadet Corps. At the same time there is a Secondary School which has a Cadet Corps and it may well be that Combermere was allowed to have one because of its nearness to the Regiment or the Armoury at the Garrison at the time. I would like to get further information from the Governing Bodies of the various schools as to their desires. It is only upon their desires that some consideration should be given.

With respect to the Private Secondary Schools, I should imagine that there should be help of a more important order which the private Secondary Schools would desire before the question of a Cadet Corps, and I should not imagine that they would press for that as immediately as they would press for something of more importance.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Chairman, if the Minister does any research he will discover from the records of his Ministry that the ground has been cleared already with respect to getting a Cadet Corps for the Coleridge-Parry School. Things have gone so far that we have contacted the Regiment and something has been done in that direction. The Governing Body of the School has forwarded a Resolution, the Army has been contacted, I have had a talk with Major Rose and the Adjutant and figures have been given from the Army to the Education Department. If the Hon. Minister would make some investigation, he would discover that more than just airy talk has been done. I hope that the Minister will find enough that will give him the desire to assist at least the Coleridge-Parry School in the establishment of a Cadet Corps.

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

HEAD XXXII — HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORT

Head XXXII — Highways and Transport — was called.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to move, Mr. Chairman, that Head XXXII stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD XXXIX — STATISTICAL SERVICE

Head XXXIX — Statistical Service — was called.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head XXXIX stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I now beg to move that a Resolution for the sum of \$144,853 do now pass.

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

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

On the motion of Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Resolution in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On motions of Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSON in each case, the Resolution passed in Committee was read a first and second time and agreed to.

THE ORDER PAPER

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, in fixing the Order Paper, Committee of Supply will be the first Order of the Day and the other Orders will remain as they are.

Mr. SPEAKER: Under the Head "Private Members' Business" does any hon. member want to make any change?

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Speaker, I am asking that Order No. 11 standing in my name be made Order No. 2 for the next meeting.
7.55 p.m.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, if the Hon. Leader of the House would give way, I want to make a very serious request before he makes his motion for the Adjournment until next Tuesday. I do not know if I am asking too much, but I would like him certainly to indicate to the House — and I wish he could make it as early as next Tuesday — whether the House will have a full dress debate on the Hospital Report.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Do not give any such undertaking; that is bluff.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I am in trouble and with unswerving respect to the Chair I am making a simple request and I want it to be heard. I am requesting, Sir, that the Government be kind enough to initiate a debate on the Hospital Report as soon as possible.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order, I would like to know why the hon. member is now asking us to initiate a debate on the Hospital Report, and he came here and told us that it was the hon. member's private Report. You are making fun, man. We will do that when we are ready; you are not forcing us into anything.

Mr. MILLER: Us?

Mr. MOTTLEY: Yes, "us".

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I must say that I am slightly astounded by the request of the hon. junior member for St. George for a debate on the Hospital Report. As a matter of fact, left to him, this Report would never have been made public or never have seen the light of day so far as the public is concerned, and therefore there could have been no public debate. Since we occupy the seat of Government, Sir, and he was so anxious to have it remain a secret document available only to himself and his Ministerial colleagues, for what undisclosed reason can he now demand as a matter of some urgency after we have published the Report that there be some public debate on it?

Anyhow, Sir, all the hon. member needs to do is to bring in a Resolution under Private Members' Business and at the appropriate time discuss the Report. That is the step he can take.

I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next, 30th January, 1962, at 12 noon.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I beg to second that.

The question that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 30th January at 12 noon, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.
8.00 p.m.