THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

THIRD SESSION OF 1966 - 71

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Friday, 9th July, 1971.

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 10.15 a.m. o'clock.

PRESENT

His Honour Sir J. E. T. BRANCKER, Q. C., F.Z.S., *(Speaker);* Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS, J.P., *(Minister of Trade, Tourism, Community Development and Youth Affairs);* Hon. C. E. TALMA, *(Minister of Health and Social Welfare);* Hon. J. C. TUDOR, C.M.G., M.A., *(Leader of the House);* Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON, *(Minister of Communications and Works);* Mr. R. St.C.WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE, J.P.; Hon. N. W. BOXILL, *(Minister of Labour National Insurance and Housing);* Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, *(Minister of Agriculture, Science and Technology);* and Mr. C. A. E. HOPPIN, J.P.

Prayers were read.

Mr. SPEAKER: This is a meeting specially called, by virtue of the appropriate Standing Order, due to the fact that certain representations have been made to me by a Minister. The Agenda is a special one and has, according to my information, been duly circulated.

Mr. HINDS entered the Chamber and took his seat.

MESSAGE NO 3/ 1971 FROM HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR-GENERAL

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the following Message No. 3/1971 from His Excellency the Governor-General:

"HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR-GENERAL
TO
THE HONOURABLE THE HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

His Excellency the Governor-General has the honour to inform the Honourable the House of Assembly that, accompanied by Her Excellency Lady Scott, he will be proceeding to Grenada on a short private visit from 9th to 12th July, 1971.

2. Under the provisions of section 30 of the Constitution, The Honourable Sir William Douglas, Chief Justice, will be appointed to be Governor-General's deputy.

A. WINSTON SCOTT
Governor-General.

GOVERNMENT HOUSE
BARBADOS.
6th July, 1971."

PAPERS LAID

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Prime Minister, I am commanded to lay the following documents:-

1. The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 2) Order, 1971.

2. The Airports (Amendment) Regulations, 1971.

Mr. St. JOHN entered the Chamber and took his seat.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the following document:-

Report on Roadworks and Water Mains programmes of the Ministry of Communications and Works for the period December 1966 to date.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Minister of Finance, I beg to give notice of the following Resolutions:-

Resolution to grant the sum of $327,700 out of the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of Government to supplement the Estimates, 1971-72, Part 1 - Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates, 1971-72, No. 1, which form the schedule to this Resolution.

Also a Resolution to grant the sum of $921,754 out of the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of Government to supplement the Estimates, 1971-72, Part 11 - Capital as shown in the Supplementary Estimates, 1971-72, No. 2, which form the schedule to this Resolution.

Also a Resolution to grant the sum of $134,490 out of the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of Government to supplement the Estimates, 1971-72, Part 11 - Capital, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates, 1971-72, No. 3, which form the schedule to this Resolution and

Also a Resolution to grant the sum of $33,251 out of the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of Government to supplement the Estimates, 1971-72, Part 1 - Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimates, 1971-72, No. 4 which form the schedule to this Resolution.

On behalf of the Prime Minister, I beg to give notice of the following Resolutions:-

1. Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 2) Order, 1971 and also

2. A Resolution to approve the release of the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation from liability to meet interest or capital instalments due on the loan of $2,100,000 previously authorised by Resolution No. 36/1968.

On behalf of the Minister of Finance, I beg to give notice of:-

A Bill to amend the law in force in Barbados relating to notice in respect of transfer or creation of legal estates and charges by way of legal or equitable mortgage and to the priority of mortgages.

On my own behalf, I beg to give notice of the following Bills:-

1. A Bill to amend the Barbados Citizenship Act, 1967.

2. A Bill to amend the Provost Marshal's Act 1904.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Bill to amend the National Assistance Act, 1969.

REPORT OF SELECT COMMITTEE

Mr. SPEAKER: There is a Report of the Select Committee appointed to consider and report on a Bill entitled an act to facilitate the division of properties into parts that are to be owned individually and parts that are to be owned in common and to provide for the use and management of such properties.

I beg to present the Report of that Select Committee.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, if we are to have the luncheon break earlier than we normally do, it will be necessary to suspend the appropriate Standing Orders.

I beg to move that Standing Orders Nos. 5, 14, 16, 18, 19, 40 and 45 be suspended for the remainder of this day's sitting.

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

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

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW entered the Chamber and took his seat.

10.25 a.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: Would the Leader of the House indicate that which he seeks first to proceed with?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Order No. 3.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 3 stands in the name of the Hon. Leader of the House, and it is to move the Second Reading of a Bill to facilitate the division of properties into parts that are to be owned individually and parts that are to be owned in common and to provide for the use and management of such properties.

When this Bill was last discussed, on the motion of the hon. junior member for Bridgetown seconded by the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister, the Bill was referred to a Select Committee. The Report of the Select Committee was handed in this morning.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the adoption of the Report of the Select Committee.

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

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, while I do not object to the motion, I would point out that we have not got a copy to see what was recommended.

I have now seen the Report, and I have no objection to it, but there is one thing I would like to point out and I hope that the Government will see the wisdom of immediately bringing down legislation dealing with the rights which one can hold in land and restricting them of legal rights particularly in respect of tenancies in common. I think the Prime Minister will appreciate the position of this in that if one had rights other than legal rights in tenancies in common, great difficulties could arise in working the condominium legislation in conjunction with our ancient land law particularly in this respect, because one will find the position of having seven, eight or nine people having a tenancy in common in one condominium, whereas as I understand it, the scheme of the condominium legislation is that one must look to one particular person. This condominium legislation operates in those English Law countries which have modified the legal rights in relation to tenancy in common and in relation to freehold, and I hope that that necessary bit of legislation will soon be brought down so that the two will work in harmony.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I can only say that I am not paid to be a legal draftsman. The only Bill that I have drafted since I have been in this House, took me nineteen minutes. The Crown Law

officers with the Commissioners for Law Revision have been working for about six or seven years on a comprehensive revision of the Real Property Act, and I understand that one of the problems is that they frequently cannot get the professional bodies which are the solicitors and barristers in Barbados even to convene a meeting in order to discuss these matters. This has been the major difficulty on bringing forward legislation of this kind, but I believe that they have already discussed the matter and the legislation should be on the way. Another side effect of this is that where land has been devised by will to persons as tenants in common, we gave instructions that they should set up an immediate trust for sale vested in the trustees, administrators or executors of property, and this should fit into the pattern which has been established in this Bill today. The motion has already been moved and seconded.

The question that the Report be now adopted was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

On the separate motions of Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW, seconded by Hon. J. C. TUDOR, the Bill as amended was read a third time and passed and its title read and agreed to.

THE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (TEACHERS) (AMENDMENT) ORDER, 1971

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 7 be the next Order of the Day.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I beg to second that.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 7 stands in the name of the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister, and it is to move the passing of a Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (Teachers) (Amendment) Order, 1971.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, the Order, which we are now seeking formal approval for, was signed by me by the authority of the Civil Establishment Act, 1949, on the 24th June this year. Civil Establishment Orders of this nature have to be approved by Parliament, and this particular Civil Establishment Order provides for an improvement in the staff structure of the Comprehensive Schools, and this is done by an amendment to the Civil Establishment Order, 1969, paragraph 4 by substituting a semicolon for the full stop appearing at the end of subparagraph (f) thereof and adding immediately thereafter the following as sub-paragraph (g) -

"where a member of the teaching staff of a Comprehensive School is assigned and is performing the duties of a head of department of that School, the emoluments payable to him in accordance with the scales of salary set out in the appropriate Schedule may be increased by such amount as the Minister responsible for Establishments may from time to time determine.";

And then in paragraph 6, by inserting the words "or other advanced degree attained by an examination" immediately after the word "doctorate' appearing in the sixth line of sub-paragraph (2).

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I beg to second that.
10.35 a.m.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, this Order I think requires some explanation on our part because there is no doubt that it is another step towards witnessing the piece-meal approach by Government in bringing before Parliament a comprehensive Bill with respect to matters of education as a whole. Not so long ago this House was called upon to legislate with respect to our Grammar Schools, and I think it was at this time that I drew it to Government's attention the necessity for doing what an attempt is now being made to do here today, that is, that at that time a Government with any sense of direction in matters of education would have gone through the gamut of things throughout the schools generally, and not set about in the piece-meal manner which we are witnessing here again today.

What we are particularly concerned with here today is to learn from the mover of the Resolution how far, if to any extent at all, has there been any concurrence with the Barbados Union of Teachers on the contents of this Order and the Resolution, because there is no denying the fact that much has been going on for a very long time and it is not the first time that Parliament has been asked to legislate in matters relating to teachers where the teachers themselves or their representative bodies, where the Trade Union representing the teachers, has not been informed or even consulted. This in itself, Mr. Speaker, must be taken in this light because if Parliament were to legislate for teachers and the teachers are represented by a Trade Union body and under the legislation did not have the assistance, knowledge or advice where it could best discharge its functions, it would be seen that the success of any Bill or Order or whatever it might be that is passed by Parliament cannot be expected to appeal as smoothly and as effectively as one would have it.

We do not for one single moment envisage a situation where there is total non-cooperation by the Trade Union body, but there are avenues through which negotiations between Government and the Trade Union on matters relating to teachers can be conducted. I believe that there is not as clear an understanding on the part of the Establishments Division, because I think that is the principal negotiating body on behalf of Government in matters relating to teachers.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, there is a little mix-up here. The Order which I am dealing with is Order No. 8 and not No. 7, and I think it appropriate to withdraw the motion that No. 7 should be the Order to be taken now and substitute No. 8 which is the one

under discussion. This is the one for which I gave the explanation and I think this is the one which the hon. member is now discussing. No. 8 should be the next Order and everything will follow on; I will do No. 7 afterwards.

Mr. SPEAKER: If there is no objection the words "No. 7" will be deleted and the words "No. 8" will be substituted. The hon. member has made his speech on No. 8 and the hon. member may continue to speak on No. 8.

Mr. HINDS: Yes, Mr. Speaker, this Resolution as it stands seeks to perpetuate the class prejudice in our educational system.
10.45 a.m.

Mr. Speaker, this Government cannot deny it. In the face of the shameless boldness, our Minister of Education has time and again made speeches suggesting that Government is, what he calls, democratising our educational system. He is full of brazenness. What we have before us today demonstrates in no uncertain terms that Government admits that in our secondary schools the system that is applicable to these schools makes it look as though some schools are more equal than others. Here you will find that the Resolution defines in some respects the first grade secondary school and the second grade secondary school under our Grammar School system of education.

It is, Mr. Speaker, bordering on a conundrum, if we were to examine what has been put before us today and try to relate it to what is done in actual practice under our secondary school system. You will find that some of our secondary schools have been permitted, in the face of all that has gone on before, to retain their Sixth Forms, but other secondary schools have continued with the Fifth-Form level of education. You will also find that one of the most recent pronouncements from the Ministry of Education with respect to our proposed zoning is something that cannot be entertained by us until we can satisfy ourselves or the populace that Harrison College, Queen's College and Lodge School are providing the same education at Fifth-Form level as can be obtained at all of the other secondary Grammar Schools in this Island. Until we know that, we can get nowhere. But how would we ever be able to convince people about this matter? If we were to look back at our method of intake into these schools - Mr. Speaker, this brings me back to the 11-plus Common Entrance Examination.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the hon. member mention that only *en passant;* let him confine himself to the Resolution.

Mr. HINDS: I will do that, Sir, but I must draw your attention to the fact that the Resolution deals with salaries for teachers in schools, and these teachers teach children. (Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: "In what schools?") Mr. Speaker, I have heard the Prime Minister telling him how many times he has been drunk and so on.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the hon. member keep to the Resolution.

Mr. HINDS: Do not let me be heckled, Sir. The hon. member is sitting on your right and you cannot say that you did not hear him; shut him up! It is just about the ninth or tenth hour of the day, and he is drunk already!

Mr. SPEAKER: No, no.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member must withdraw that.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member, as I understand it, referred to another hon. member as being in a certain state already. I ask the hon. member to withdraw that.

Mr. HINDS: Which hon. member, Sir? Did I mention hon. members *en bloc?*

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us get it straight. Is the hon. member denying that he was referring to any hon. member of this House in respect of that remark?

Mr. HINDS: I do not want to be dishonest, Sir. If I mentioned an hon. member, it is for Your Honour to tell me which hon. member I have mentioned, and then have me withdraw the remark.

Mr. SPEAKER: That cannot be said of any hon. member.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, a drunken member could not be an hon. member.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member, I take it, was not referring to the Chair.

Mr. HINDS: Far be it from me, Sir. If an hon. member is drunk he cannot be an hon. member.

Mr. SPEAKER: So that we may proceed with the Business of the Day, let the hon. member withdraw the imputation that any member of this House is drunk. That is offensive.

Mr. HINDS: I maintain, Sir, that if a member of this House is drunk, he is not an hon. member.

Mr. SPEAKER: Every member of this House is an hon. member.

Mr. HINDS: Even if he is drunk?

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS: Even those with criminal records!

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, I am being heckled by the other side. The hon. member who has made that remark could have had a criminal record longer than any criminal, Barbados has ever seen. Up to now people in St. Lucy are still waiting for their wedding suits. He received money from them to import cloth and they have not yet received their suits.
10.55 a.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: All hon. members not on their feet must preserve silence on both sides of the Chamber; but I would ask the hon. junior member for St. Peter in the interest of getting through the business today to withdraw any accusation or imputation that any hon. member of this House is drunk.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, I never referred to any hon. member of this House. I merely said "he".

Mr. SPEAKER: Did the hon. member not say or intend to imply or implied that any hon. member of this House was drunk?

Mr. HINDS: I did not refer to any hon. member of this House.

Mr. SPEAKER: Not specifically by name, but did not the hon. member imply or seek to imply that any member of this House is drunk? I am speaking only to the hon. member.

Mr. HINDS: The records will prove that I only said "he".

Mr. SPEAKER: That could only refer to somebody in here, and I ask the hon. member to withdraw the word "drunk" and proceed.

Mr. HINDS: I am withdrawing merely the word "drunk".

Mr. SPEAKER: Do not substitute anything else. Will hon. members on both sides not addressing the Chair please be silent?

Mr. HINDS: On the other side of the House, you will find members with criminal minds and criminal records.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member may not say of any hon. member that he has a criminal mind.

Mr. HINDS: Even if I can prove it?

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the hon. member withdraw the words "criminal minds".

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, that they have criminal minds I withdraw.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the hon. member proceed with the debate.

Mr. HINDS: I am withdrawing that they have criminal minds.

Mr. SPEAKER: Do not let the hon. member continue repeating it. The hon. member has withdrawn, and let him not take guidance from anyone other than the Chair.

Mr. HINDS: Without being heckled from the other side?

Mr. SPEAKER: Neither heckled from one side or wrongly advised by another side.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, our whole educational system as it now stands is doomed to failure because it is based on an approach to failure. In other words, if one were to look at the common entrance examination that provides the children for these secondary school teachers to teach, we must see that it is not founded or conducted along lines where the greater number of children passing the examination has any entitlement to entering any of these secondary schools for these teachers to be gainfully employed in teaching. It is a system which must fail and what makes it worse is that we have the Ministry of Education allowing its Publicity or Information Officer to put out not statistics but wilful and corrupt lies about our educational system, and this is exactly what is being fed to the nation. You will find, Mr. Speaker, that there is and must be very difficult circumstances prevailing at all times particularly when it comes to the question of our secondary school teachers.

Now when a teacher of either Boys' Foundation, St. Michael's Girls', Coleridge-Parry or else finds himself or herself presented with children who are supposed to have gained admission to that school by passing an examination, but that those children can hardly spell words which they ought to be able to spell having gained entrance to one of those schools, what do we expect from those teachers? It is all right for us to have before us a Resolution such as this seeking to give a new definition to post special responsibility and to make provision for the addition of $40 in some cases to the salary of the teacher, but this is only part of it. There is much more bound up in this matter where education is concerned than giving teachers a few extra dollars.

You would be surprised to know, Sir, that there are some children whom these teachers are expected to teach who still cannot present themselves in school. In some of our grammar schools, and I am referring to Boys' Foundation, St. Michael's Girls' Coleridge-Parry, Girls' Foundation, Alleyne School and Alexandra School, there are some children whose parents today cannot pay the $3 or $4 games fees.
11.05 a.m.

That is a fact, it is something that Government should investigate. As a result, some of these children lose two or three weeks, sometimes nearly half a term having to stay away from school because they cannot pay the games fees.

Mr. Speaker, we have a system in this country which finds that we have a teaching body of well over 1,700, but you will find that just about 703 or thereabout of the teachers are on the Establishment, all of the others are acting in some form or other, and all of this is a matter, however unrelated it might appear to an hon. member, is all bound up in the Resolution that is before us here today, because education is something that goes in stages and we move from one

stage to another, so you will find that at our secondary schools as we have here, that is where you find the Government boasting to an unsuspecting public of how many Grammar School places and of how many children get free secondary education. You will find, Sir, I think coming out from the Ministry of Education that there is something like 7,112 the Government is claiming to have given free secondary education during their ten year term of office, but the amusing thing about this which must annoy any teacher in any of these schools is that in this Resolution, here is a Government that boasts of providing 7,112 children with this free secondary education in a ten year period, but at the same time the Government is not concerning itself in any respect with the number of children who had been seeking admission to these same Grammar Schools. In other words, when we come here today to make provision for allowances and fix salaries in respect of teachers at the Boys' Foundation, St. Michael's Girls', Coleridge-Parry, Girls' Foundation, Alleyne and Alexandra schools, what we are saying is that if the Government had been alive to its responsibility the Government would have increased the number of secondary schools, they would have built more secondary schools during their ten year period to have accommodated by their own figures no less than 93,000 school children that the same Government has left to go astray.

By their own figures these are children that these same teachers would have been teaching now; they would have been arranging the curriculum as Heads of Departments or whatever you call them for these children, because when you find over 100,000 children seeking to get into these Grammar Schools and the Government is bare-faced enough to be boasting of accommodating a mere 7,112 leaving 93,000, what we are maintaining is that the Government should have added to this list of schools three or four, maybe five other names of schools at which posts such as these ought to be created, but it is here that the Government has fallen down. They are prepared to bluff even in our educational system, that is what we are maintaining, and if we are to find this in our system of education, where will we eventually end up?

Mr. Speaker, we believe that the Secondary School Teachers Association has agreed in principle to what is before us here in this resolution, but there has been a struggle to have achieved this. We will recall that from the time of the Gardiner Brown report a lot of water has gone under the bridge where the teachers in secondary schools are concerned. Some of it is almost too grievous and too bitter to recall, but there still lingers with us the memory of the part played by none other than the Prime Minister who cannot deny having short changed these secondary school teachers. He certainly would harldy ever attempt to deny that his negotiating arm was faced with a critical exercise after threats had been heaped upon the heads of the teachers consequent upon certain action they had taken.

11.15 a.m.

Mr. Speaker, all of what we have in this Resolution before us is the result of the arduous exercise carried out by the now becoming militant body: the trade union arm of the secondary school teachers. We must note that this Resolution seeks retroactively to go back to the 1st September, 1970. There is good reason for all of this, and we hope that somebody from the Government's side will be good enough to give an explanation for this. Why from the 1st September, 1970?

We know, Sir, that the post of special responsibility has to be designated by the Governing Body. In other words, a teacher who is designated to such a teaching post must be so designated with the approval of the Minister. We believe that in former years it would have read "with the approval of the Governor-in-Executive Committee" or words to that effect; hence, we now see the substitution of the Minister. But, Sir, we have seen enough to convince us that it is becoming much more necessary, day in and day out, to remove political sanctioning in matters of education. We feel that there should still be a Board to take care of the administration of educational matters. There has been, time and again, too much political interference, and it has shown itself in many forms all to the detriment of the children who have to be taught by these teachers.

For instance, there is no guarantee that creating these various posts will make for any easier administration of our educational system in our Grammar Schools. What we are doing for the most part is admitting in some form that our secondary school teachers, like many of their fellow brothers in the primary school system and even in the independent school system, have not been given a true valuation in terms of salary for what they are really worth, and Government is seeking, perhaps, in some way to make up for this in the Resolution that is now before us.

Mr. Speaker, the Government came here at an earlier date with the creation of these posts of special responsibility for the first grade schools. We are now having it for the second grade schools under our secondary education system, but we still have a Government that is approving of the education that is given in our private secondary schools. What is the position with regard to these schools? In other words, if Government has seen the necessity for having in its own first grade and second grade schools in our secondary school system the creation of these posts of special responsibility which Government would have us believe is to make for better supervision, catering and execution of Government's policy through the Governing Bodies, through the Heads and Deputy Heads of Departments, then if it is so necessary in the Government schools, our view is that it must become increasingly so and much more necessary in our independent secondary schools.

Mr. Speaker, however one may look at it, there is much that needs be done in these independent secondary schools to bring them on an equal footing

with the Government Grammar Schools. As we know it, Sir, the greater part of these teachers is untrained. This now brings me to the point where the Ministry of Education, in attempting to aid and improve the quality of teaching at some of these independent secondary schools, offered courses at Erdiston for a number of teachers from the independent secondary schools. A number of them took the course; sat the examination and, as far as we know, have passed. 11.25 a.m.

What we are making out is that the reason why Government has had to stretch its hand out to assist these independent secondary schools to this extent is because Government has not provided enough secondary schools to meet the demand.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think that point has been very clearly made by the hon. member, and I would ask him not to proceed simply because the names of certain schools have been mentioned in this Resolution to deal with each and every aspect of the life of that school. This is a very restricted Resolution.

Mr. HINDS: I quite agree with Your Honour.

Mr. SPEAKER: Other opportunities, I am sure, may arise for the hon. member to deal comprehensively with it.

Mr. HINDS: I quite agree with Your Honour because you will find that we are today merely making provision for deputy headships in six Government grammar schools, but we are making out the point that if Government had been discharging its full function to the over 100,000 children that have been seeking admission to these schools, we would have been providing today not for six but may be sixteen schools, and this would perhaps eliminate the title of independent secondary schools because they might not then exist. I quite agree with Your Honour that the Resolution seeks to restrict us in some measure, but when we find that Government is today considering the appointment of deputy heads in six grammar schools and making provision for posts of special responsibility, it must be seen that in the year 1971 the Government is merely educating 151 children more than they educated in 1962. Had Government set about to survey the requirements over a ten year period, we could not now be so restricted to considering posts of special responsibility in just half a dozen schools.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has made that point.

Mr. HINDS: Where has Government built a single secondary school during its ten year period to add to these names?

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid the hon. member is going outside the scope of this particular Resolution to which I must ask him to keep. This is not a general Resolution.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, the Government is asking us to make provision for fixed salaries to pay head teachers or posts of special responsibility in secondary schools in this Island.

Mr. SPEAKER: For certain schools.

Mr. HINDS: Our contention is that if Government had built more schools to meet the requirements of the 93,000 children that the same Government has turned its back on, we would have had a much longer list and would not be so restricted. I must express my regrets at having a Government offer itself again to the electorate on so bad a performance.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order, in so far as the building of secondary schools is concerned, the hon. member does not seem to fully appreciate that the comprehensive schools carry a secondary stream. In so far as the actual building of secondary schools is concerned, one is at present being built in St. George, and in the Estimates which were passed quite recently, provision had been made for building one at the Garrison and another one in St. Lucy; so to say merely because it is election and everything is coming up, to misrepresent the case is not really playing the game.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member made a point of order in respect of a matter on which this House is being addressed, which matter I said did not come within the scope of this particular Resolution which is very restricted and confined.

Mr. HINDS: The Hon. Minister who has just sat down could well be appointed Minister of Education. He does not understand in our educational system what is meant by a comprehensive school, nor does the Ministry of Education itself understand and appreciate what is meant by a secondary grammar school in this Island. That is where we run into conflict. The Minister of Education tells you he is going to build a secondary school in St. Lucy, and now the Minister gets up and tells you it is not a secondary school as such, it is a comprehensive school, and in our comprehensive system, there is a secondary education stream and what not. We are maintaining Mr. Speaker, that since 1949 the children of this Island had the benefits of free secondary education, and it cannot be denied. The Ministry of Education has made feeble attempts in its published reports from time to time to belittle that effort, but it is on record that free secondary education was available to our children, but the system is corrupt at present. It does not only take education to corrupt education. It is the various other activities and avenues of Government that reflect on our educational system. In the same secondary education system which the Minister who has just sat down is telling us goes through the comprehensive schools, we are maintaining that the same secondary education to G.C.E. "O" Level could have been obtained at our primary schools since 1949.
11.35 a.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us now return, after that alleged point of order, to the specific subject matter of the resolution.

Mr. HINDS: These posts are created because children are to benefit by the responsibility exercised by the Heads of Departments. In other words if there were no children to be taught at these schools there would be no creation of these posts.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us not indulge in anything to deal with the children and everything else to deal with secondary schools.

Mr. HINDS: I have got to respect Your Honour's ruling, but my view is that since these are posts of special responsibility and they relate to children - and I am sure Your Honour will agree with me - we will be entitled to deal with the children from their entry into the schools.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not agree with the hon. member as to that, and I will ask him to confine himself to the particular point of issue in this resolution.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker - you will understand that this Resolution and I am referring to paragraph 3 of the resolution, the last three lines - you teach these subjects to children from 1st form back up to the 6th form.

Mr. SPEAKER: But this does not entitle one to deal specifically with children from the 1st form to the 6th form.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, we are only trying to relate what these teachers will have to do for the money we are going to pay them.

Mr. SPEAKER: The purpose of this Resolution is to propose a definition of a post of special responsibility.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, we have to restrict ourselves as Your Honour has ruled and maintained but children still have to enter these schools before these posts can be created or a definition given to the posts of special responsibility. There is so much on which we have to look when this question of organising groups of subjects arises because you have got to be very careful about all of this. We have had the experience in this very island of teachers coming back here with phony degrees and drawing Government's money and then having to pay it back into the Treasury.

Mr. SPEAKER: We are merely dealing with a definition and I must again point out to the hon. member that the opportunity will become available to deal comprehensively with this; we are only confined now to a definition and I will ask the hon. member if he has anything more to say on the definition he is entitled to say it but not to attempt a general discussion on the educational system or what happens to pupils from the beginning to the end of their careers at Secondary Schools. The hon. member, in any event, has made his points along those lines.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, the approval of the Minister has got to be sought by the Governing Body after a teacher has been designated a Head of Department. Who is going to carry out the investigation into the claims and qualifications of these people that the Governing Bodies are to designate Heads of Departments? Will it be at the Ministry level? Will the Minister carry out investigations for the guidance of the Governing Bodies or will the Governing Bodies themselves be charged with this responsibility? These are points we would like to have cleared up and we would still like to make a final point, because you still find that our system must be doomed to failure when you find the child that may get the most marks in the examination, that leads you to enter one of these schools mentioned in this list, not getting in.

Mr. SPEAKER: I regard that as irrelevant.

Mr. HINDS: If Your Honour rules, I will have to obey, but it is just that a child may not get a place although he gets the most marks in an examination.

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

11.45 a.m.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 7 be the next Order of the Day.

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

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I am asking leave to take charge of this Item, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member may so do. Now, Order No. 7 is to move the passing of a Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (Teachers) (Amendment) Order, 1971.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (TEACHERS) (AMENDMENT) ORDER, 1971

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, this one amends the 1969 Order in two or three respects but, perhaps, the most important one is the one dealing with the assignment of teachers to perform duties of a Head of department. The amendment would read

> "where a member of the teaching staff of a Comprehensive School is assigned and is performing the duties of a head of department of that School, the emoluments payable to him in accordance with the scales of salary set out in in the appropriate Schedule may be increased by..." the amount to which he would be entitled as an acting head of the department - such amount as the Minister responsible for Establishments may from time to time determine,;

This merely means in effect that, if a man who is not normally a head of a department but is assigned to perform those duties for any specified period, he would be entitled to the increased emoluments.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, I think that if there is any debate on this Resolution, the Leader of the House in his opening remarks has invited it. The Minister says that the amendment is at " (g) ;; and it states:

> "where a member of the teaching staff of a Comprehensive School is assigned and is performing the duties of a head of department of that School, the emoluments payable to him in accordance with the scales of salary set out in the appropriate Schedule may be increased by such amount....."

When the Minister got there, he said "to which he would be entitled."

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I was not quoting the amendment then.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, he says that he was not quoting the amendment. I am sorry that I found myself hearing the Hon. Minister's own interpretation exactly down to the point where I read " by such amount." His own interpretation is exactly what has been written here and circulated to hon. members. Did he draft this Order?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, it was a question of interpolation. The amendment is: in paragraph 4, by substituting a semicolon for the full stop appearing at the end of sub-paragraph (f) thereof and adding immediately thereafter the following as sub-paragraph (g) -

> "where a member of the teaching staff of a Comprehensive School is assigned and is performing the duties of a head of department of that School, the emoluments payable to him in accordance with the scales of salary set out in the appropriate Schedule may be increased by such amount as the Minister responsible for Establishments may from time to time determine."

I was reading it, and when I got to "such amount" I said: "to which he is entitled", but that is not part of the amendment.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, if this Order really means what the Minister is inviting us to accept, why do we find these words "as the Minister responsible for Establishments may from time to time determine?" The Minister has interjected "the amount to which he would be entitled" and ended there. When this Order is passed and it becomes law, you would not have the Minister or the Leader of the House tagged on to the law books, so that when the Judges have to interpret the law, the Minister would, in some diminutive form, get up and announce "to which he would be entitled." Mr. Speaker, we are saying that the words "as the Minister responsible for Establishments may from time to time determine" lend themselves to abuse by a Minister. Even this might mean, or could be deemed to mean, to what he would be entitled for his services to the Minister.

In other words, as this Order stands, if you find that the Minister has a good boy, or a good teacher at a Comprehensive School who is going into Bay Land and campaigning strenuously - the Bay Land is the constituency in which the Minister of Education is contesting a seat - that Minister can have him put on a salary scale to which he is not entitled, but to what he may be entitled on consideration of the services rendered to the Minister. That is what we have to guard against. If that is the position, then it should have been put in the appropriate Schedule to be increased by such amount to which the teacher would be entitled, and there would be no necessity for us to have the words "be increased by such amount as the Minister responsible for Establishments may from time to time determine." because it would already have been fixed and laid down by law.

Mr. Speaker, this Order tells us that if the Minister has a good boy, who is doing well, the Minister may from time to time determine how his school teacher-canvasser should be paid. That is what we are now guarding against. Can the Leader of the House tell us how much the Barbados Union of Teachers has done about this matter? Have they been consulted about this? (Hon. J. C. TUDOR: "Yes.")

11.55 a.m.

Mr. Speaker, if the Leader of the House wants to tell us that the Barbados Union of Teachers has been consulted, I am to say that he is doing everything he knows is not right. He is saying what he knows, which could be otherwise. The Barbados Union of Teachers has not been consulted on this bit of legislation at all, and it is false and misleading to this House for any Minister of this House from the Prime Minister back down to get up and say so. This legislation seeks to go to the very hearts of school teachers because the Trade Union is striving hard and Government has already accepted in principle the I.L.O. convention with respect to these matters, but the Government is only prepared to apply them when it suits the Government. How dare any hon. member come to this House and introduce a measure such as this to give the Minister the right to pay somebody whatever he likes whenever he likes from time to time and not increase his salary for the efficient work he does inside the school? The Resolution does not say this, but his pay will be increased on the strength of his political affiliation and activities in the political arena on behalf of the Minister or the Government. This is what we have to stand up against in this House.

Mr. Speaker, this seeks to tie teachers down to the boot-strings of the Minister, and that is a shackle, the Trade Union is striving to throw off.

In the same paragraph which says that where a member of the teaching staff of a Comprehensive School is assigned and is performing the duties of a head of department of that school, it goes on to tell us what would happen, but Mr. Speaker, suppose an occasion arises where a member of the teaching staff of a Comprehensive School is assigned and is performing the duties of a head of department in another school, what is the position then? These are points which may appear small, but nevertheless I would like to hear some sort of explanation from the Hon. Mover of the Resolution. It is all well and good for us to have these interpolations and interjections, but we prefer to see what is really intended conveyed to those who have got to make the law that is enacted here so that it can work for the good of the nation.

Mr. Speaker, what we have got to face up to is that in these comprehensive schools the Government did not negotiate with the Barbados Union of Teachers about the number of posts. Government simply and without any regard for the rights of the Trade Union just dictated to the Barbados Union of Teachers the number of posts for these comprehensive schools. You will find, Mr. Speaker, that Government has laid the foundation for the Barbados Union of Teachers, the Association of Assistant Teachers in Secondary Schools and the Association of Independent Secondary School teachers to come together as a body to fight Government on a matter such as this. We sincerely hope that these three bodies will act speedily in this matter, because undoubtedly Government is seeking to make inroads into a system which could otherwise be made near perfect if we could avoid this unnecessary interference by a political Minister. We would like, Mr. Speaker, to hear the views of the Leader of the House on this matter; but we are maintaining that this paragraph which is now being amended did not have the approval of the Barbados Union of Teachers, and we should be more than grateful for an explanation on this.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, first of all if the hon. member is familiar at all with the way in which Civil Establishment Orders are drafted, especially this, which deals with salary scales, he will see on several other Civil Establishment Orders the same words "such amount as the Minister responsible for Establishments may from time to time determine". This is common form in this kind of draft. The second point is that it is not the Minister of Education who determine these things, but it is the Minister responsible for Establishments. When the hon. member was addressing the House he asked whether we thought the teachers had been consulted on this point, and I said sitting in my seat "yes." I see here that as recently as the 24th of last month somebody in the Chief Establishments Office pointed out that the original Civil Establishment Order which was to have been brought to the House some time last year was not proceeded with in Parliament because the Ministry of Education and the Teachers' Union sought further discussion on various aspects of the matter. It would seem to me that if you are seeking further discussion on anything, you have already had some discussion on it, and it was on that basis that I said to the hon. member that they had been discussing it. It goes on to say that the Order can now be introduced in Parliament. The inference there then is that these further discussions have taken place and that the Civil Establishment Order is now properly before the House. It is on that basis that I said to the hon. member that discussions had taken place between the Teachers' Union and the Ministry on this matter. 12.05 p.m.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, can the Minister tell us when these discussions took place?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I am informed between the middle of April and the end of June this year.

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

THE FINAL APPROPRIATION (1970-71) BILL, 1971

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, it is provided both in the Constitution and in the Financial Administration and Audit Act, 1964 that from time to time resolutions for supplementary appropriation maybe introduced into the legislature and as soon as possible after the end of the financial year that a final appropriation Bill should be introduced into the House embodying all the Resolutions which have been passed during the course of that financial year. I had instituted a new system of money resolutions as supplementary appropriations for the period instead of coming in here every Tuesday with Resolutions for small amtunts, and as far as I can remember this was instituted for the first time last year, so in pursuance of the established law of this Island, this Bill is now being introduced to embody all the previous resolutions granted by the House during the course of the financial year. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

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

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

APPOINTMENT OF TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I think we will need a Temporary Chairman, I do not see the Chairman of Committees in his place and I beg to move that the hon. junior member for St. George be appointed to act as Chairman for today's sitting during the absence of the Chairman.

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

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

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

The Preamble was postponed.

Clauses 1 to 4 inclusive were called and passed.

The Schedule was called and passed.

The Preamble was called and passed.

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

On the separate motions of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, the Bill was read a third time and passed and its title read and agreed to.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 4 be the next Order of the Day and I am asking leave for the hon. senior member for St. John to take charge of it.

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

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

12.15 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 4 is the instant Order of the Day and it is to move the passing of a Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Country Road, St. Michael, for the provision of educational, cultural and welfare facilities.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT COUNTRY ROAD, ST. MICHAEL

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, this is a Resolution for the compulsory acquisition by the Crown of a parcel of land described in the Schedule situate at Country Road, the property known as "Bradfield". Now, this property was originally offered to the Government some time ago, but it did not come to the attention of the appropriate Ministry. I have already issued directives on that, because no Ministry other than the Minister of Home Affairs and the Minister charged with the purchase, care and disposal of lands has any authority to deal directly or indirectly with land. If land is needed for a particular Ministry, it still has to be done through the Ministry of Home Affairs. Unfortunately, the offer of this property to Government was not known, and the Ministry to whom it was offered said that it had no immediate need for it and the matter rested there. A private person then signed a contract for the acquisition of the property. Government considered that this property is highly desirable for Government purposes; the purposes have been set out, and we are merely seeking approval under the authority of the Lands Acquisition Act for the compulsory acquisition of the property.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, the Resolution states that the land described in the Schedule thereto is for the following purpose, namely, for the provision of accommodation for educational, cultural and welfare organisations. I think the Government ought to be more specific. It should tell us exactly what it is proposed to do with the parcel of land. The Resolution does not state very much, except for a general outline by the Government of what the land will be used for. I should like to find out from the Government whether it has been decided to do something specific with this parcel of land. I should also like to find out what is the price paid for the land, and if an agreement has been reached. I notice that this matter is dealt with by way of compulsory acquisition, and I want to know whether this is merely to get a good title, or whether it is due to the fact that the Government has not reached final agreement as regards to the purchase price. I should also like to see a copy of the plan.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, the Schedule to the Resolution sets out the purpose for which the property is being brought. We are not giving it or selling it to any one, but immediately we have need for the old Combermere School building and the headmasters' house, which the YWCA currently occupies, for the Police Club. They are going to use Weymouth, and they are going to use a Club and not a pavilion in the place where the YWCA is housed. We have given the YWCA notice a long time ago, and the YWCA was supposed to move to *Verona*. We have been using *Verona* for voters' registration, and we cannot give that up now. Immediately we intend to offer this property on the same rental basis and not necessarily for the same rent to the YWCA, and then there will be a complete re-deployment of Government property later on. This is the immediate use to which it will be put, but it was not bought specifically for that purpose. We feel that it is a desirable property; it has a large area of land, and Government has property in the vicinity such as the School Meals Centre, the Housing Authority, and also the new Moravian School in the immediate vicinity. The immediate purpose to which it will be put, which is not the final destination of the property, is that it will be rented to the YWCA.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: What is the price?

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: We cannot tell you the price of the land yet. The original price was about £15,000. We may have to pay £1,000 or £2,000 more, but obviously we cannot discuss that here because it is a subject of arbitration and discussion. I, person-

ally, do not see why we should pay more than £1,000, or £2,000 more than what the original offer was a year ago. *(Asides)* It is a property and not pasture land.

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Item No. 9 be the next Order of the Day.

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

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

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE MOTOR VEHICLES AND ROAD TRAFFIC (AMENDMENT) REGULATIONS, 1971

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 9 stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Communications, Works and Housing, and it is to move the passing of a Resolution to approve the Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic (Amendment) Regulations, 1971.
12.25 p.m.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 4 be recommitted for a verbal correction.

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

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, it is really typographical rather than verbal. In line 5 of the Schedule the word "Emptage" is spelt with a "p" and it should not be.

I beg to move that the letter "p" be deleted from the word "Emptage."

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

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

THE MOTOR VEHICLES AND ROAD TRAFFIC (AMENDMENT) REGULATIONS, 1971

Mr. SPEAKER: We now revert to Order No. 9 standing in the name of the Hon. Minister of Communications, Works and Housing to move the passing of a Resolution to approve the Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic (Amendment) Regulations, 1971.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution seeks to amend the Motor Vehicles Regulations and to give the Minister of Communications and Works certain powers limiting the number of taxis that can operate in this country. It is clearly set out in the Addendum that the Regulations entitled the "Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic (Amendment) Regulations, 1971," have been laid in Parliament. The Regulations will make it compulsory for operators of taxis and self-driven cars, including motor cycles, motor scooters and autocycles, to obtain a permit in respect of each vehicle from the Ministry of Communications and Works.

Mr. Speaker, one can see every day the number of vehicles on the street due to tourism, and we will have to give a certain amount of protection to those presently operating. I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that there is anything in this Resolution that hon. members on the other side can object to, because it is to keep a certain amount of control over these vehicles. Lately, there have been companies set up to hire motor cycles and other vehicles to tourists, and the Ministry has absolutely no idea of the number of vehicles involved in this business. This is one of the reasons why this Resolution is here where we can have a fair check and keep control so that the present cars and taxis operating on hire can be protected and too many other vehicles cannot come in and rival and destroy the industry that certain persons have been making a living from for many years.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, I have been trying to obtain a copy of the Regulations, but I have not been able to get a copy. Now, we must admit that....

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order, I thought the hon. member was going to make the point that he did not have a copy of the Regulations, but nobody on this side seems to have got one. We have a copy of the Resolution but not the Regulations themselves. I have asked the hon. junior member for St. Joseph, the hon. junior member for Bridgetown and the hon. junior member for St. Peter and I have searched very carefully among my own papers and I have had a search made among the dead papers so to speak, and none of us can discover that we have been circulated with a copy of the Regulations. I would like to speak on this, but I cannot speak on it until I see the Regulations. The principle we support. If the hon. member would give way, I would move that further consideration of this be postponed until this matter can be cleared up.

Mr. SPEAKER: Actually the hon. member may not do that because he rose on a point of order.

Mr. ADAMS: I said if the hon. member would give way.

Mr. SPEAKER: I understand that attempts are being made to obtain copies of the Regulations.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, in view of the remarks of the hon. senior member for St. Thomas to the effect that he has not seen the Regulations which have been laid, I beg to move....

Mr. SPEAKER: Perhaps the hon. junior member for St. Peter who is on his feet could move that further consideration be postponed.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that further consideration be postponed in view of the fact that hon. members on this side have not received copies of the Regulations as laid. (Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Until later in the sitting.) I cannot commit myself to saying until later in the sitting. I have to see the Regulations, and I would suggest postponement until Tuesday next.

Mr. SPEAKER: It will still be on the Order Paper.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, I cannot agree with this. How do you know they have not got the copies? Have you ascertained from the Clerk if they have been sent out? You cannot let the Opposition run the Government.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to second the motion.

The question that further consideration be postponed was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.
12.35 p.m.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT RIVER BAY, ST. LUCY

Mr. SPEAKER, When this matter was last discussed in this House the Hon. Minister for Health moved, seconded by the Hon. Minister of Communications, that the Resolution do now pass. The hon. junior member for St. Peter was speaking when he moved, seconded by the hon. senior member for St. John, that further consideration be postponed. The hon. junior member for St. Peter may now resume his address.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, I think that the motion for postponement of further consideration arose from a point which we have reached with respect to the vast difference in price where I think the Standing Valuation Committee had offered something like $1,000 per acre and then went back and offered something like $9,000 per acre for the same land. If the Hon. Minister is now in possession of the relevant facts to enlighten us I will give way so that he can make the point and expedite the passing of this Resolution.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, since the adjournment on this matter, we have had a check made and the price has been settled at $25,000 for this parcel of land which is almost three acres. The parties have all agreed to this price and that is the position as it stands.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, this information raises quite a number of points in my mind. It is approximately three acres of land and the sum of $25,000 has been agreed upon, but what were the guiding principles which enabled the Committee to value the land at $1,000 per acre in the first instance and to have now come up with just over $8,000 for the three acres? This is a very serious matter; what we think the taxpayers ought to be told in this particular matter is that the Valuation Committee took into consideration at a later stage the owners of the land.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order, this land was regarded as rab land in the first instance by the Standing Valuation Committee but it is not rab land as such, because as we know land which was regarded as rab land has the highest value today. A good example of this is Regency Park where you have to pay at least $5,000 to get a spot up there, so that what was rab land is no longer rab land but is very valuable building land. The Crown Solicitor in negotiating on behalf of Government wrote this: "Mr. St. Hill came in and discussed the matter with me and informed me that the owners are willing to accept $25,000 for the parcel of land which is approximately three acres and which is shown on the plan attached at cover." I will pass the plan to satisfy hon. members again.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, one very important point comes to mind, when did this land cease to be rab land in the eyes of the Valuation Committee? Is It not a case where the Valuation Committee took into consideration at a late stage the owners of the land? We believe that the Standing Committee has left itself open that no valuation it gives in the future can be accepted by any party.
12.45 p.m.

After all, it is not a case where land was valued at a particular figure and then the Valuation Committee found that it had slipped into an error and increased or reduced the valuation amount by a few dollars. This is a terrible situation; this Committee ought to be dismissed for life never to be seen any where around anybody's property for valuation purposes. Sir, $1,000 today and $8,000 the next day for the same plot of land! We are satisfied that the ownership of the land is what guided the Valuation Committee to jump from $1,000 to $8,000 per acre. We intend to walk the length and breadth of this Island and let the taxpayers know what is taking place in a matter of this sort.

Mr. Speaker, we would like to see River Bay bought for something more than a Beach facility; we would like to see River Bay developed for the benefit of people who go there for excursion purposes and so on. Anything that can be done to make those people happy in spending a day away from their offices or their labours is appreciated by us, but, Mr. Speaker, there must be some explanation offered when we see who are the owners of this land. In other words, would the Valuation Committee act in such a manner if the owners were different from whom they happen to be in this case?

After all, Sir, the Valuation Committee is not to go about to deprive people of their lands or to rob them. People must be given the proper value for their land, but we have the case here where it is the property of John Hynam. Everybody knows who are the

Hynams. This is going to look bad and smell bad. It is going to smell bad, Mr. Speaker, to know that the Valuation Committee offered $1,000 per acre and then gave over $8,000 per acre for the same land. We cannot get away from the fact that the property is owned by the Hynams.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know if the Valuation Committee wanted to rob them or what. If it were a Committee that was set up and it felt that its first function was to rob people, then the Committee should be dismissed for life. I am not prepared to say that the price offered is too much or too little, but I feel that we should not be asked today to pass this Resolution when you have a Valuation Committee saying $1,000 per acre today and $8,000 per acre tomorrow for the same land. This matter should be submitted to a new Valuation Committee before an agreement is arrived at.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I rise to explain that the Standing Valuation Committee is not comprised of politicians, but of senior Heads of Departments in the Government Service such as the Chief Technical Director of the Ministry of Communications and Works, the Town and Country Planning Officer, the Crown Solicitor, the Chief Agricultural Officer and so on. Those Officers comprise the Standing Valuation Committee, and I want to make it abundantly clear that no politician sits on the Valuation Committee.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker,....

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

Mr. HINDS: Yes.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, in my opinion this is something similar to what happened to Mr. Douglas Haynes' property. You have a Director of Agriculture, a Permanent Secretary and a few others who get together; they know nothing, absolutely nothing about valuing property, and they do all sorts of nonsense. When they first valued the land at $1,000 an acre, how could anybody think that you could offer $1,000 an acre for land at River Bay? You should dismiss those people; they do not know what they are doing. I would prefer to err with Mr. Carl Fields, and I am sure Mr. Carl Fields could not have gone there and said that the land was worth $1,000 an acre. As a matter of fact, I would have asked for $10,000 an acre for land at River Bay. You are buying land at the seaside and you cannot get a spot of land anywhere nowadays.

Mr. Speaker, I have asked the Government to look into the question of these valuations. It is not a question of having yard fowls or politicians on the Valuation Committee, but it is a question of having people who know what they are doing on the Committee. When the members of that Committee told the Government to offer $1,000 an acre and then agreed to pay over $8,000 an acre, it shows that they did not know what they were doing. I do not believe that the Government in this case is trying to do anything underhand. (Hon. N. W. BOXILL: "What do you mean by saying "in this case?") Shut up, you idiot.

Mr. SPEAKER: Only one member must be heard in here.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, I am on a point of order. The hon. member told me to shut up because I am an idiot. I am asking him to withdraw that. There are no idiots in here besides himself.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: I withdraw that, and I would like to say that he is a convulsed idiot.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us deal with River Bay land. I ask the hon. member to withdraw that remark.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: I withdraw that you are an idiot and a convulsed one.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Accepted.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, the Ministers in particular on the Government bench must realise that any member of the Opposition must view with suspicion what has taken place. I speak *ex cathedra*. on a matter of this sort. I know River Bay backwards, and I would know any part of this Island where land could be sold. Who would sell land at $1,000 an acre at River Bay? When this matter came before the Minister of Health at a valuation of $1,000 an acre, what did he say? This is not 1932. This is absolutely ridiculous, and you should never have those people doing a valuation again. It would look suspicious for them to value the land at $1,000 an acre and then accept roughly $8,000 an acre. In my opinion the valuation was absolutely wrong, and it was similar to what was done with Mr. Douglas Haynes' property.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The valuation of $1,000 never came to me. I am not the Minister of Lands, and I am merely handling this matter in here. I know about valuation almost as well as the hon. member who has just sat down, and I know that beach land in almost any part of the Island is worth between $6,000 and $10,000 an acre at least - in some cases $10 (US) a square foot.

12.55 p.m.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: Therefore, Mr. Speaker, that brings me to this point; what did the Minister think when they sent in the valuation of $1,000 an acre?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: No recommendation came to me as such. I am not Minister of lands. I saw it here for the first time and I tried to give full information without withholding any facts. The Minister of Home Affairs and Lands deals with this matter, not me.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: At least the Minister of Home Affairs is from St. Lucy and he would not like anybody to go there and value any part of his land like that.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: On a point of order, the Minister of Home Affairs shares the same feeling as the hon. member. The hon. member would notice how long this has been on the Order Paper, because we ourselves did not accept that $1,000 per acre was either a right or fair price to pay.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: The Leader of the House having admitted that the Minister of Home Affairs did not agree, nor did the Minister of Social Services agree because he knows something about valuation at least in the Cabinet, would you now still expect that Valuation Committee to go around valuing people's property? Several times I have said that they just try to rob people out of their property. (Hon. J. C. TUDOR: That is a different matter.) How is it a different matter?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: The hon. member is now recommending that we do not necessarily have to have public officers and he may find a lot of agreement on this side on that.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY: Since we will find agreement on that side to the effect that public officers do not necessarily know about the value of land, we hope that what we are saying today will not fall on deaf ears and that you will be able to select people who know about valuing. Not one of you would like this thing to happen to you, and people would have to view this with suspicion. If an hon. member who did not know this went out and said that the Valuation Committee told the Government only to pay $1,000 an acre and the Government is paying $8,000 an acre, this would be wrong, because the Valuation Committee is a bunch of convulsed idiots.

Mr. Speaker, I am supporting the Resolution because I believe the land on which you are going to build these facilities is worth at least $8,000 or $9,000 an acre.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, I support the hon. senior member for Bridgetown in all that he has said, but what worries me particularly about this Resolution is that here you have a Valuation Committee, and I know that Government spent quite a lot of money, withdrew a number of Civil Servants from their normal posts and had them run a valuation course and set up a Department of Valuation. This very Committee has by its actions created the greatest non-confidence in itself as one could ever want, and as from today everybody who has got land that the Government needs should refuse to accept any valuation placed on it by this Valuation Committee. This has to be a typical example of incompetence, because to value land in this day and age at $1,000 an acre and then come back and value it at $9,000 an acre means that the Committee does not have any yardstick by which it does its work.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: On a point of order, the hon. member is representing the facts wrongly. The Valuation Committee that has been set up recently by Government is for rates and taxes, but the Valuation Committee that was set up for valuing land is a completely different thing. It comprises the Crown Solicitor, the Chief Technical Director, somebody from the Ministry of Agriculture and so on. It has absolutely nothing to do with the valuers at the Rates and Taxes Department. I would not like the hon. member to go ahead with this idea because he is giving the wrong impression, and when people get their houses valued they would say it is wrong.

Mr. BOLDEN: It is the same Government with the same valuers, and if they do not know it in one way, they cannot do it any other way.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: On a point of order, the point which I am making is that they are two different things. (Mr. BOLDEN: I will repeat the same thing when you are finished.) You can afford to repeat the same thing because you are a lawyer and I do not expect lawyers to have much sense or character.

Mr. BOLDEN: I would not even object to his saying I have no character, because character is judged not in here but outside.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: I did not say he did not have any character. I was dealing with lawyers.

Mr. BOLDEN: The hon. member does not like lawyers and he knows why. I have asked him outside why when he wanted to go in the High Court a few weeks ago he did not go by himself. A lot of people think they are lawyers, but the only problem is that some of them cannot get to the law school door and will never get there as long as they live, and that includes the Minister. (Hon. N. W. BOXILL: But I will make a living.) A dishonest one too. If you want to get nasty, let us get nasty.

Mr. SPEAKER: No, no.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Let the hon. member tell anybody when I took money from any client and did not appear.

Mr. BOLDEN: You cannot appear.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: There are a lot like you who take people's money and do not appear. *(Asides)*

Mr. SPEAKER rose.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid the disorder is grave.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, as I was saying, I am sorry the hon. senior member for St. Philip is about to leave because I remember they went to St. Philip where a man had a small piece of land and they cut off piece to set up a bath. Carrington & Sealy were acting on the man's behalf and he was dissatis-

fied with the valuation Government had put on the land, and the man went both to the hon. senior member for St. Philip and to me. This is the same Valuation Committee which has proved beyond reasonable doubt that it does not know what it is doing when it comes to the valuing of property. This is the very Valuation Committee that has now proved that when people have been dissatisfied about the values which have been placed on the lands, particularly the people with a quarter of an acre of land, they did not know and will never know what they are doing; and I am going to challenge the Government now to go back and make a revision of all those sites which have been acquired where people have challenged the valuation and see if new valuations would be placed on these lands as at the date they were acquired under this very system and under these very people. I say, Mr. Speaker, that the Government as of now should refuse to take any valuation from any of the members who compose this Standing Valuation Committee until some person who is trained in valuation gives proper values to people's land, because what has happened now is that these people have now agreed with the vendor's selling price, which means they did not know one iota when it comes to valuing people's property. (Hon. J. C. TUDOR: This is only one instance.) One is as good as one hundred. It has proved beyond reasonable doubt that they are not *au fait* with the current values of land in Barbados, and I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the Government should refuse to accept any more valuations, and people outside who have land to sell to Government should not accept any valuation placed on it by this Standing valuation Committee.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I agree that it is quite clear and obvious from what has taken place in these transactions that the Central Valuation Committee is incompetent and should not be allowed to continue as presently constituted.
1.05 p.m.

One thing that bothers me is whether the Standing Valuation Committee has now accepted and advised the Government to accept the price of $9,000, because if they do this, I have no quarrel with the fact that the land is valued at $9,000, I have no quarrel with the owners of the land, but I say this that it would have been far better for the Standing Valuation Committee having once advised the Government that the land was worth $1,000 an acre to have kept at that price. You cannot have a Valuation Committee at one stage advising the Government that land is worth $1,000 an acre and then coming back and advising the same Government that the same land is valued at $9,000 an acre. It makes the public wonder what has gone wrong; upon what has the Valuation Committee based its valuation? What are the factors upon which the Valuation Committee based its valuation of $1,000 per acre? What are the subsequent factors upon which the Valuation Committee based the valuation of $9,000 per acre? What is very disturbing in this case is the fact that the Government has not given any explanation or any reason to the Chamber for the change in the valuation. I do not want to speculate that it is because of the ownership of the land that the Valuation Committee has now agreed to increase the value of the land to $9,000; I do not want to speculate, but the public of this country would like to know how is it that two weeks ago when this matter was being discussed in this House the valuation was $1,000 and then two weeks later the Valuation Committee can accept a valuation of $9,000. It means that there must be some explanation given by the Government why the Standing Valuation Committee first valued the land at $1,000 and now comes backwith a valuation at $9,000. I would say that in the absence of such explanation I would caution the public in this country never under any circumstances to accept any valuation done by the Standing Valuation Committee unless the Government changes the present composition of the Standing Valuation Committee.

That is only one aspect of this question, but on the question of beach facilities I am not very concerned that it takes four Government Ministers to open one beach facility, but what I am somewhat concerned about is the fact that when this Government allowed Sandy Lane Estate to be sold and the Sandy Lane Hotel to be erected right on the sea, I believe the then Opposition queried the wisdom and attacked very severely the then administration of the Barbados Labour Party for allowing the right to the beach to be sold and for allowing the Sandy Lane Hotel to be built right on the sea, and I believe that in 1951 when application was made to the Government to divert the road so that a hotel could have been built near to Heywoods Beach which would provide a private beach there Government resisted the application. It seems strange that for ten years the Government has resisted the application but now one finds that the road at Heywoods is going to be diverted.

Mr. SPEAKER: Anyhow, let us get back to the confines of the resolution before us.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: I am questioning the wisdom of allowing the road at Heywoods to be diverted so that the public would no longer have proper or easy access to the beach, because it is at this stage that enough of our beach land has been sold to ex-patriates who then deny Barbadians access to the sea, and I am very concerned with the fact that the Government is going to allow the road to be diverted, and in those circumstances I would like to find out something about whether access to the beach at Heywoods would be prevented.

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

REPORT OF SELECT COMMITTEE ON A BILL TO PROVIDE FOR THE MAKING BY EMPLOYERS OF SEVERANCE PAYMENTS TO EMPLOYEES WHO CEASE TO BE EMPLOYED IN CIRCUMSTANCES AMOUNTING TO REDUNDANCY ADOPTED

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, I beg to report that the Select Committee that was appointed by this House to go into this Bill has reported that the Bill should be accepted in its present form. There were no amendments to the Bill, and I beg to move that the Report be adopted.

Hon. K.N.R. HUSBANDS: I beg to second that.

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

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Bill be now read a third time.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that. 1.15 p.m.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I was not present in the House when this Bill was read the second time and, therefore, I was deprived of the opportunity of lending my support to it at that time. Some years ago the hon. Leader of the Opposition, the senior member for Christ Church, and I were in London and we had already discussed what even at that stage - I think it was in 1965 or 1966 and neither of us was a member of the House - what had become obvious to us as a problem, namely, the fact that persons could be dismissed from the services of their employers without anymore than a week's notice after 30 or 40 years, and that there was no general provision of law in Barbados that provided for severance pay.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am quite sure the hon. member is not now making a second reading speech.

Mr. ADAMS: I am not suggesting that anything should be in the Bill which is not in it, and that is the difference which the Rules say should lie between a second and a third reading speech. I can tell you what is the Rule, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is entitled to his own opinion.

Mr. ADAMS: One of the things that I do regret sometimes, Sir, is - anyway, I would not worry to suggest it. I will let the Chair spend its last few weeks in authority in peace, Sir. The senior member for Christ Church and I .....

Mr. SPEAKER: Both hon. members seem very confident of the future.

Mr. ADAMS: The hon. senior member for Christ Church and I, when we were in London, spoke to somebody who was connected with the then Labour Government in Britain. I remember that we went to Her Majesty's Stationery and obtained the then English Contract of Employment Act which we thought did not go far enough to cover the Barbados situation. Eventually, the result of our discussions is to be found in the Manifesto of the Barbados Labour Party for the 1966 General Election that is the last General Election, in which at page 10 you will see that we said that if the Barbados Labour Party were elected to power, a general redundancy payments Act would be enacted which would put an end to the piecemeal negotiation on a one industry basis whenever a redundancy programme arises. This Act would provide a redundancy payment for every worker who loses his job through no fault of his own when a business or a factory closes down or reorganises its internal structure. This is a part of what we had included.

We also said that the B.L.P feels that a week's notice is too short a period for a long service worker, and this Act would provide a period of years based upon the number of years service which the worker has had with his employer. We and we alone, Sir, included this in our Manifesto for the last election. I remember the Hon. Minister, the senior member for St. Peter, supporting our platform on this point during the successful campaign at that time; therefore, Sir, the Barbados Labour Party could not possibly say that, in any way, we are opposed to the principle of this Bill.

The Report of the Select Committee has been accepted. I will say that I have one or two reservations about aspects of the way the Bill will work. I do not altogether understand whether since a large number of persons in Barbados, especially the employers of domestic service, are now going to be liable when that service comes to an end to pay these persons who have worked for them for a long time substantial sums of money. I do not altogether understand whether the severance fund is going to be made available to help those persons who literally cannot raise $1,000 or $2,000 at short notice to pay to somebody who has been working with them for a number of years. Some people are not going to have the money to do that.

I do not understand if the severance fund is going to be available for assisting employers who by reason of this Act have to make these payments in respect of past service. I think the Minister will appreciate this problem. There are many people who have employed maids for 15 years; they cannot give them 104 weeks' pay because they do not have the money; they pay the maids out of income and they have no capital. That is one point I should be glad if the Minister would deal with. This Act should have been passed long ago. If one political party was prepared to make a pledge in its manifesto, then the other political pary, if it were going to copy it, did not have to wait until the last part of the election year to do it.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, I am not going to allow the hon. member to get away with this. The hon. member knows full well that the Committee that was set up took three years before it reported to the House on this Bill. As I said during the introduction of this Bill, Mr. Speaker, it was the first bit of legislation I have ever had to deal with that I was not *au fait* with. There is no lawyer, no matter who he is, who can tell me that he is fully *au fait* with this. It is a very complicated matter.

In reply to what the hon. member said about having this in his party's manifesto, I know that a lot of things are put in manifestoes but sometimes they are only put there to brain-wash others. This might be what the Labour Party was trying to do, because strangely enough the Labour Party was in power for 17 years and never saw it fit to do these things. They are now criticising us.....

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, there has never been such a misrepresentation of an hon. member's views as to say that we were in power for 17 years and

we are now criticising the Government for doing this. The point is that it was in our manifesto, and we are now congratulating the Government on doing it at this late stage.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: I am saying that they had the opportunity to do it.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. It is just that the Labour Party was concerned in making it possible for people like the hon. junior member for St. Thomas to be in the House of Assembly.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, I object to that most strenuously, because if it were left to his father people like me could never get in the House of Assembly. I am not going to let him get away with this foolishness. It is people like me who paved the way for people like you to get scholarships. I never had a father in any position to have things arranged for me.
1.25 p.m.

The hon. member has raised a very pertinent point which I want to explain to him, but I must give him what belongs to him first, and that is some lashes. He knows fully well that what I am saying is perfectly true, or as the Leader of his party would say, it is patently true. In answer to the question which he raised, what we propose to do is to set up a fund to which employers will pay a nominal fee for a worker. After the fund has reached a certain level, it is our intention to stop the contributions. We have no actuary here, but we are trying to get an actuarial report on the matter to see what would be a feasible amount the employer should pay. In a case where somebody goes out of work, the Government may be called upon to pay the severance pay to the employee and then recoup from the employer, but later it will be reversed where the employer will pay the employee and then recoup from the fund. We know we will have a lot of resistance to this, because when things first start in Barbados you get resistance, but when the fund becomes viable we will realise the importance of it and we will save a lot. After a number of years the fund will be self-containing and will have money that can be invested to stop people from contributing, but this is only to get the scheme off the ground. The Government may have to pay a certain amount into the fund initially to pay off certain people and later the Government can recover it. I think that answers the point raised.

What has happened, Mr. Speaker, is that this Bill was drafted almost to the letter from the English legislation where the employer pays money into the National Insurance. Here we have to look at it and see how it can be operated by the National Insurance; but these are details we will have to go into. However, we have to get this on the Statute Book so that these people are not left by the wayside as was the case some years ago.

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

On the motion of Hon. N. W. BOXILL, seconded by Hon. J. C. TUDOR, the Bill was passed and its title read and agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SPEAKER: In view of the intimation of the Hon. Leader of the House that the business is concluded for this day, I am only to remind hon. members that his House has already been adjourned until Tuesday of next week, 13th July, at 12 o'clock noon.
1.30 p.m.