

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION OF 1966 - 71

Tuesday, 22nd July, 1975.

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 12.10 o'clock. p.m.

PRESENT

His Honour C. A. E. HOPPIN, J.P., (Deputy Speaker); Hon. C. E. TALMA, C.B.E., (Deputy Prime Minister and Leader of the House); Mr. R. ST. C. WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE, J.P., (Chairman of Committees); Mr. W. C. B. HINDS; Mr. L. S. CRAIG; Mr. J. B. SPRINGER; Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, M.A., (Leader of the Opposition); Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, O.B.E.; Hon. F. G. SMITH, Q.C. S.C., B.A., (Minister of Communications and Works); Hon. P. G. MORGAN, C.B.E., (Minister of Tourism, Information and Public Relations); Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND; Hon. P. M. GREAVES, B.A., (Minister of Housing, Lands, Labour and National Insurance); Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE, (Minister of Health and Welfare); Hon. A. MORRISON, (Minister of Agriculture, Science and Technology); Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD, B.A., M.A. (Econ.), (Minister of Education, Youth Affairs, Community Development and Sport) and Mr. E. E. GREAVES, B.A., Ed.M.

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Minutes for Tuesday, the 15th July, 1975, are before you for confirmation. There being no amendments or corrections, I deem these Minutes duly confirmed.

PAPERS PRESENTED

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on behalf of the Minister of Finance and Planning, I beg to present.

(1) The Report of the Accountant General for the Financial Year 1972-73.

(2) Report of the Accountant General for the Financial Year 1973-74.

On my own behalf I beg to present the Report on Vital Statistics and Registrations for the year 1973.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on behalf of the Minister of Finance and Planning I beg to give notice of the following:-

(1) The Resolution to grant the sum of \$154,087 out of the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1975-76, Part I - Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1975-76, No. 1, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

(2) The Resolution to grant the sum of \$75,000 out of the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1975-76, Part II - Capital, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1975-76, No. 2, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

(3) The Resolution to grant the sum of \$30,438 out of the Harbour Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1975-76, Part II - Capital Annexed Estimates, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1975-76, No. 3, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

- (4) A Bill to amend the Development (Canadian Loan) Act 1970.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICES

Mr. E. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker I beg to give notice of a Bill to incorporate the Bishop of the Roman Catholic Diocese of Bridgetown-Kingstown.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Bill to amend the Sugar Workers (Provident Fund) Act, 1968.

FIRST READINGS OF BILLS

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to amend the Development (Canadian Loan) Act, 1970 be now read a first time.

Hon. A. MORRISON: I beg to second that.

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

Mr. E. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that the Bill to incorporate the Roman Catholic Bishop for Bridgetown-Kingstown be now read a first time.

Mrs. EASTMOND: I beg to second that.

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

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to amend the Sugar Workers (Provident Fund) Act, 1968 be now read a first time.

Mr. HINDS: I beg to second that.

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

MOTIONS FOR LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that leave be granted to the Hon. Minister without Portfolio Mr. George Fergusson for a period of two months with effect from today.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: I beg to second that.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have observed that the Hon. Minister without Portfolio has not been in his seat for a long

time, and I would have hoped that the mover of the motion would have indicated the purpose of the leave. We on this side would like to know if the Member is out of the Island or what not.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have no difficulty in acceding to the request of the hon. Member for St. James. I think it is known that the hon. Member for whom I have applied for leave underwent a serious operation, and that the House sent him wishes for a speedy recovery. The nature of the operation requires a longer period of recuperation than is usual after an operation, and according to observation, the hon. Member is improving rapidly. If, of course, his recuperation is accelerated, he will return to this Chamber perhaps before the further period of leave ends; but as lawyers say, *ex abundante cautela*, I am asking for this further period of leave, but the hon. Member may well return to this Chamber before the expiration of the two months.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I was not in my place when the House extended wishes for a speedy recovery, but I would like to associate myself at this stage in wishing the Hon. Minister without Portfolio a speedy recovery.

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

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I personally beg to apply for three weeks leave from this Honourable Chamber with effect from the 29th July, 1975 as I hope to take my holiday from the coming week.

There being no objection, leave was granted.
12.20 p.m.

ORAL REPLIES TO QUESTIONS

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to give notice that the Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 33 asked by the hon. Member for St. Lucy is now ready.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Deputy Speaker, owing to the volume of work we have before us today, I beg to move that the several Standing Orders be suspended to enable us to carry on, with the usual undertaking that if there is an important matter which the Opposition may wish to deal with, we will give them enough time to deal with it.

That being the case, I beg to move that Standing Orders 6, 16, 18, 20, 42, 43 and 44 be suspended for the remainder of today's Sitting.

Hon. A. MORRISON: I beg to second that.

Mr. CRAIG: Sir, we have no objection on this side to the suspension of the Standing Orders and we accept the statement by the Leader of the House that the Opposition Members will have the regular Private Members' time, and we also hope in the interest of the staff and yourself that lunch will be taken at 2.00 o'clock. There is a volume of work to be done here today and we would like it done.

The Question that Standing Orders Nos. 6, 16, 18, 20, 42, 43 and 44 be suspended for the remainder of today's Sitting was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the first Order of Government Business is in the name of the Prime Minister, and it is to move the passing of the Resolution to approve the guarantee by the Government of a loan of \$1,170,000 (Canadian) to the Barbados Telephone Company Limited by the Export Development Corporation of Canada.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE OF THE GUARANTEE BY GOVERNMENT FOR THE REPAYMENT OF A LOAN OF \$1,170,000 (CANADA) BY THE BARBADOS TELEPHONE COMPANY LIMITED

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Deputy Speaker, as the Addendum sets out, this resolution seeks approval for a guarantee by the Government of Barbados for the repayment of a loan equivalent to Can. \$1,170,000 to be borrowed by the Barbados Telephone Company Ltd. from the Export Development Corporation, Ottawa, Canada, for the purpose of purchasing telephone equipment and the extension of telephone services.

The principal sum of Can. \$1,170,000 is to be repaid in 20 consecutive semi-annual instalments commencing 6 months after installation of the telephone equipment, and interest will be payable at the rate of 8.5% per annum on the principal amount outstanding from time to time.

This matter received the Cabinet's attention, the question of the guarantee by the

Government of Barbados of a loan of \$1,170,000 (Canadian) by the Export Development Corporation. That is a Canadian Government Agency which is providing the Barbados Telephone Company Limited the funds for the purchase of telephone equipment and the extension of telephone services in the parishes of St. Philip, St. John, St. Andrew and St. Lucy. In consideration of the guarantee of a loan by the Government of Barbados, the Barbados Telephone Company Limited has agreed to issue 15,000 fully paid Barbados Telephone Company Limited ordinary shares at a par value of \$4.80 to the Government. A loan agreement has been drawn up between the Export Development Corporation and the Barbados Telephone Company Limited which *inter alia* will include the following terms:

- (1) Repayment of the principal sum of \$1,170,000 (Canadian) in 20 consecutive semi-annual instalments commencing 6 months after the installation of the telephone equipment;
- (2) Interest payable at the rate of 8.5% per annum on the principal amount outstanding from time to time;
- (3) Security and unconditional guarantee of the Government of Barbados in form and substance satisfactory to Export Development Corporation as to the repayment of principal and the interest to Export Development Corporation at Canada;
- (4) Other conditions. (a) All payments due to Export Development Corporation to be exempt from taxes, duties, import or other charges, and (b) conclusion of a loan agreement in form and substance satisfactory to Export Development Corporation.

It has been agreed in principle that interest payments to Export Development Corporation would be exempt from tax under the Double Taxation arrangements to be concluded between the Government of Barbados and the Government of Canada.

The financial statements of the Barbados Telephone Company Limited as of 31st December, 1974 indicate profits of the Company were \$1,888,077 compared to profits of \$1,670,214 for the fiscal year 1973. Returns on 2,358,625 issued ordinary shares at \$4.80 par value for the fiscal year 1974 was approximately 13.5%. Current liabilities of

\$13,374,000 at 31st December, 1974 exceeded current assets of \$4,493,886 by \$8,880,115. The Company is currently moving to improve its working capital and the equity position by issuing one million shares par value at \$4.80 per share.

12.30 p.m.

The long-term liability of the Company at the end of the fiscal year, 1974, amounted to \$21,746,220. The current position of the long-term liabilities payable and bank indebtedness total \$2,060,000 of the Company's equity debt. That will give Members an idea as to the financial status of the Company. There is a copy of the Balance Sheet for 1974 and, if necessary, I will have it copied and distributed.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. A. MORRISON: I beg to second that.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, before the question is put, I would like to say that this Resolution which seeks to guarantee a loan to the Barbados Telephone Company, presumably, for the purpose of the extension of the telephone services in Barbados, is one which I, personally, would like to welcome. I do this because I am aware of the fact that there are still a number of areas in Barbados which are without the services of telephones. If we are going to be thinking in terms of the total country, we have to ensure that the communication links between the various areas of the country are well established. One area, in particular, in which the Telephone Company has not carried out any extensive extension of their programme is in the parish of St. Lucy, the constituency which I have the honour to represent.

I would hope that the information which was contained in the prospectus of the Telephone Company when they issued the prospectus in order to raise shares on the local market is, to a large extent, the same. You will probably recall that they indicated that part of the loan which they were seeking to raise was for the purpose of building a Telephone Exchange to service the upper parts of the St. Lucy area which are not at present serviced with telephones, and also parts of St. Peter and the Belleplaine area.

I would, therefore, hope that the Company would be able to get on with this programme as quickly as possible. I do not see that it is fair to have the total concentration of the development of telephone services in the already built-up areas to the almost total exclusion of telephone

services in an area like St. Lucy. There is an almost total absence of the provision of coin boxes, which are in the other areas in St. Lucy. I can only think of one area where there is the existence of a coin box. I have made numerous inquiries about the provision of general telephone services in the area and the provision of coin boxes, and I was told that this Company would try to have these extensions completed as soon as possible, but it was a question of money. Now that the money has been guaranteed, I would expect that the Company would be able to keep its word and provide the service.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, when one lives at the distance that the people in St. Lucy live from the central area, one will see that it is very important that there is provision for this contact to be established. I would, therefore, hope that the Company would provide coin boxes in areas like Pie Corner, Josey Hill, Rock Hall, Crab Hill, Hope Road and Checker Hall. These are areas in which we would like to see these coin boxes established. We would also like to see the provision of telephone services in the areas not yet serviced. I would heartily like to support this Resolution in the hope that the Company would be able to get the services extended to the area I have mentioned as soon as possible.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the only reason that I make any intervention on this part of the debate on this Bill is that it is significant that of the Public Utilities of Barbados, the Gas and Water Utilities, are entirely owned and controlled by the Government on behalf of the people of Barbados, but the Light and Power Company and the Barbados Telephone Company are not owned or controlled by the Government, even partially, prior to the introduction of this Resolution in here. There has been a lot of agitation in the public domain about public ownership of the utilities. I can only think that the agitation comes from those people who are now under constraint to pay their bills to the Light and Power Company and who have to pay their telephone bills for fear of the services being terminated, and who feel that under the Government control, they would be absolved from any further disbursement on behalf of these two utility services. It has been our experience that, when the Government controls any kind of business undertaking, the people feel that they owe money to themselves and they do not pay bills.

Now, I wish to make the position of the Government abundantly clear. This is a Barbadian Socialist Government. They have different kinds of political philosophies and sometimes they have

philosophies rejoicing in the same name, but in different parts of the world have different interpretations. We hear about Jamaican Socialism, and we have the Barbadian Socialists. The popular 19th Century concept of socialism, as enunciated by a writer in the first half of the Century, was that the instruments of production, distribution and exchange must be taken over and controlled on behalf of the proletariat, the masses of the people of the country. In other words, out and out nationalisation of all the factors of production, distribution and exchange. The total running of the economy by State Corporations or a monolithic State Corporation.

The Party of which I am the political leader is a Socialist Party because it believes in the equality of opportunity for all people regardless of the circumstances under which they may have been born or brought up, their ethnicity, racial origin or religious persuasion, if they have any religious persuasion, or if they do not have any religious persuasion. But all people, who are citizens and who reside in this country under our philosophy, should be entitled to equal opportunity for whatever the country can afford and, therefore, we mobilize the resources of the country in order to maximise the gains which we may get for them and to redistribute those gains on the basis of the maximum social advantage to all the people in this country: those who vote for us and those who did not vote for us.

12.40 p.m.

Those who believe in Heaven and those who do not believe in Heaven, because we have not drawn up a proscription against those who have no faith or philosophy at all. In the words of the French Revolutionary poet Louis Aragon,

Celui qui croyait au ciel,
Celui qui n'y croyait pas.

In English: Those who believe in Heaven and those who do not. Some ecclesiastics may not like us to spend the taxpayers' money on those who do not, but the constitution does not allow us to withhold the benefits of our redistribution of the wealth of this country on the principle of maximum social advantage from those who do not share a particular political or religious view with the Government in power or with some people who would like to be the Government in power, but fortunately for the rest of us will never attain those dizzy heights. Let the shoemaker stick to his lathe; not that I am aware that shoemakers have written any letters to the newspapers recently.

I wish to get our position clear because in this Resolution we are being asked to guarantee

the loan of a sum of money to a private company which is predominately owned by what people call foreign monopoly capitalists. The Continental Telephone Company operates in something like 42 of the 50 odd States of the Union of the United States of America which is on the eve of its 200th Anniversary, a country which believes in the free enterprise system or rabid capitalism. In a developing country we have to make use of all the facilities which are available, financial and otherwise from more developed countries than ours on terms which are not inimical to the growth and developments of the economy and people of Barbados itself. The Barbados Telephone Company has been the target of much criticism particularly during hearings of the Public Utilities Board when they applied for increased rates. At the same time the Barbados Telephone Company had offered shares to the general public, which shares have not been taken. By virtue of the provisions of the Public Utilities Act and the Barbados Telephone Company all other utility companies are guaranteed a rate of return over investment and capital employed, which rates are finally determined by the judgment of the Supreme Court of Barbados. In spite of being granted by the last decision both of the Public Utilities Board and by a judge of the Supreme Court, what even in these days of inflationary interest rates must be considered to be a reasonable rate of return, there has been no capital formation reinvested in the Barbados Telephone Company when the Telephone Company went to the public with an offer of shares. In order to preserve the level of services therefore they have had to turn to one of the Canadian agencies, and I want to say at the beginning that as soon as the Telephone Company approached me, that is the parent Company, and said they would like the Government to guarantee this loan and that every other country they have been into the Government has guaranteed a loan, I said "well you are now in a different country because you are in Barbados; you are a parent company and therefore you can guarantee the loans for the company which you have so much confidence in that you acquired it and expanded it". It is not the policy of the Barbados Government to guarantee loans for foreign capital organisations.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it was only after prolonged negotiations and the imminence of curtailment of employment of some, I think, 170 workers and the failure to expand the services in the two extremities of the Island, that is, the parish of St. Philip and the one to which my colleague who has just sat down alluded, that is, the constituency of St. Lucy, where no further expansion could take place, that in the interest of

further expansion of the service and continuing employment to those workers who were about to be laid off, the Government agreed to guarantee the loan but I attached certain conditions. Those conditions are that the Government would be the beneficiary of an immediate transfer of a block of shares in consideration of the guarantee from the Telephone Company to the Government of Barbados. I think it is 15,000 shares and the reason why there are 15,000 shares is that I enquired from commercial banks both at home and abroad what would normally be charged by a commercial bank for a guarantee of a sum of money equivalent to \$Can 1.170 million, and they gave me the percentage and I worked it out at the par value of the shares to the Barbados Telephone Company, and it was on this basis that I asked for and received a transfer to the Government of Barbados of shares equivalent to this amount. So for the first time that I know of the Barbados Government is a shareholder in one of the private public utilities. This may sound like a contradiction in terms, but when I was private public utilities, public utilities being a term of art, something that serves the general public, but private in that it is private capital and not Government money which is invested. We are now shareholders in a public company, which provides a public utility but is virtually controlled by private interests. From this position we are at an advantage because we now have the right to nominate a director and to keep a closer inspection on the kind of accounting procedure like transfer and pricing that most multi-national corporations go in for which hitherto we would not have been able to do.

Before this Company was bought over by Continental Telephone, it used to be a British Company and the Barbados shareholders had non participating shares and all the voting rights were held in the United Kingdom and it will continue to be the policy of this Government that shares in public utilities and in every foreign corporation desiring to invest money in Barbados should be available to the general public of Barbados. There is a general shortage of capital throughout the Caribbean and the world for investment. People will hold money in fixed deposits but in the kind of economic climate which prevails today people are not prepared to take their money out of fixed deposits which I admit are a bit too high and which are coming down, and re-deploy their capital in private or public companies where there is a risk that the rate of return may drop below the rate of fixed deposits. In addition to that although the Savings Banks of Barbados — there is not such a thing as the Barbados Government Savings Bank, it does not exist, not that it has gone out of existence; it never had the breath of

life. There is an Act called the Savings Bank Act; it is not a Bank belonging to the Government of Barbados, it is a people's bank. It has over \$27 million in deposits and they pay out a very low rate of interest, but the reason why we can retain that amount of savings in the Savings Bank which belong to the people, and we do not lend out money to anybody, is because the people have confidence that their money is not being risked by any speculation and secondly that although the rate of return may only be 4½ per cent, they have a certain tax-free dispensation on that rate of interest which they do not enjoy if they were in a private or public company.

12.50 p.m.

When the Savings Bank move into its new quarters I hope there will be a considerable increase in the patronage and the number of persons who are making use of the facilities, because we intend to make the bank more attractive not only in its physical environment but also in its economic and banking policies. So I just thought that before we approve this Resolution, that the Government's philosophy about public utilities should be known, and I am not ashamed to say it and if anyone wants to criticise me because I say it, I am a Barbadian and I know how Barbadians react, and basically we are not going to take over public utilities to run up the public debt when people stop paying their bills, because there is popular superstition in the island that once the Government owns it it is their property and therefore they do not have to pay any Bills, but they will rush to pay the Bills at Rediffusion not only to save the 50 cents but because when the neighbours wake up in the morning and they do not hear the noise blaring out from their house they will say 'well, look you like you do not have any money to pay the Rediffusion and they cut off the Rediffusion.'

They like the telephone because they like to spend long hours gossiping on the telephone and when people come to borrow a phone call, as they say, they do not like to have to tell them the phone is cut off because we did not pay the bill; and the private managers of these organizations do not have any political debts to pay, we hope, and therefore when the time comes the services are discontinued, but if the Government tries to carry out the same policy had there been or would there be a government take-over, then the Government would be criticised.

Furthermore when one looks at the whole business of savings and investment and capital formation, I do not believe in substitute activities. If you are priming a pump by creating

something which did not exist before which the private sector is unwilling or reluctant or unable to perform or to invest — let us take the Hilton Hotel, for instance. There was no hotel in Barbados built as a hotel before we built the Hilton Hotel. All the others were just brought about when somebody started off with a glorified boarding house and expanded it. Except for Sandy Lane, we came along and we built the Hilton — the first international hotel, and the expansion in the number of tourists coming to Barbados then became phenomenal because we are now advertising on an international scale.

We do not intend building any more hotels. We will lend people money to build hotels. We are not in the hotel business; we are in the business of economic development. If you come to a situation like there being no telephone service at all and no one is willing because of the high risk in establishing a service, a Government is justified in establishing such a service.

We are one of the few countries in the Caribbean region in which the telephone services are not owned by the Government. During the past few years the Continental Telephone Company has invested over \$20 million or \$25 million in expanding the telephone services. Suppose they had nothing at all before — which we know to be far from the truth; there was some kind of service before. There were lines and wires and phones and income and everything that goes along with a viable operation before the expansion took place. It has just become more sophisticated. Therefore the minimum amount of money the Government would have to spend at cost for the expansion would be \$25 million.

Now we could not reduce the rates because having to raise \$25 million to pay off the Telephone Company the rates would probably have to go up and all the approbrium would come to us. This is the one reason; but if we had \$25 million I would prefer to see that \$25 million spent on housing, because it would be something for which there is a need, whereas we have the telephones already. So why should the Government for dogmatic and ideological reasons pick up good money and allow investors to make a windfall and take all the money out of the economy and invest it somewhere else and look on us as a bunch of simple-minded fools. That is what I call a substitute activity.

Similarly with the Light and Power Company. I have no intention during my regime — unless they become recalcitrant, and then I would like to expropriate them but the Constitution does not allow me to do so

therefore I could as well put that out of my mind — if you are speaking now about expropriation without compensation, well, I could see the advantage of that, but when you have to go before a judge or a series of judges with a lot of uncomfortable wigs and gown and all that kind of thing — and then there are more capitalists than the plaintiffs or the complainants and they think that the Government is there to be mulcted for exorbitant sums of money forgetting that they themselves are supposed to be taxpayers, then you have to think twice about even beginning to dream of the idea of public acquisition of growing concerns where the cost of acquisition is going to impose a burden on the community which burden the community could ill afford. Any money spent in the acquisition of public utilities is better spent on the provision of those facilities in the country which the people so badly need and which we all desire. Now this is not a departure from our basic socialism; but our socialism has got to be Barbadian socialism in the context of the social and the economic imperatives which exist in Barbados and not the ones which existed in Germany in 1848 or the ones which inspired the people to storm the Bastille in the 1780's — in 1783 or whenever it was — or the same imperatives which led to the American war of Independence in 1776. We have a different situation here with which to contend and our enemies right here are not so much the multi-national corporations which should always be watched, but unemployment and want and ignorance. These are the three enemies which we have to fight.

So in developing the socialist strategy to fight the real enemy or the real enemies which frustrate the development of the country, we cannot dissipate our forces on dogmatic measures like the nationalisation of public utilities. There will come a day, I hope in the fullness of time when the public utilities may feel it is time they turned over lock, stock and barrel, — or rather put it the other way, stock, lock and barrel, or barrel, lock and stock — whichever way you look at it or as we say here in Barbados, however the corn is selling — to the people of Barbados as being their lawful inheritance, but under our Constitution we will have to wait until that light of revelation dawns upon them, or find some money with which we do not know what to do, in order to take them over; but let us have no more talk about giving the Light and Power Company \$50 million just to say that we own it and then we lose money and we get more criticism than we get from funning the Barbados Marketing Corporation.

1.00 p.m.

Let us have no more talk about giving the Light and Power Company \$50 million just to say that we own it. Then we lose money and then we get more criticism than we get from running the BMC because then we will be in a real disaster area; and if you want to see money being really lost just try to take over public utilities.

The final thing is the incompetence of us all, meaning me and the Civil Service, because we cannot even get an electrical engineer to run the Government Electrical Engineers Office. We have had to renew the contract of the gentleman who retired, a non Barbadian, four or five times. I do not remember how many times. We do not have a single Government Electrical Engineer trained and as far as I know we do not have a telephone engineer trained, and we have very few business managers even among the ranks of the Permanent Secretaries.

So, the final argument against the nationalisation of these particular concerns — there are other things which we will have to nationalise from time to time — but with these public utilities it is a matter of incompetence. I do not mean it in any derogatory sense, but the lack of competence, the lack of training, the lack of experience and expertise in the management and control of those two areas of our economic development.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Deputy Speaker, in dealing with a Resolution of this magnitude it is unfortunate that the expert and economics on this side, the member for St. Thomas is out of his place. *(Laughter)*.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Deputy Speaker, it only goes to show that might is not always right. The same member for St. Michael South West said that the Prime Minister was only a half baked economist. There is documentary evidence. I am saying that the member for St. Thomas, is an economic expert, and you hear that he has a whistle in his mouth and talking.

Sir, with a Resolution of this nature before us, the member for St. Thomas, who in my opinion, is an economic expert, is not in his place and therefore the Prime Minister like a conquering king towers over and above each and everyone of us today. The comment that I would like to make, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is that the Prime Minister himself referred to the

Telephone Company offering shares to the public and they were not bought up by the public in the manner in which each and every Barbadian would have been happy to see. I have had different chats with a few people and the impression that I had from them was that (a) it was the Corporation Tax that they were concerned about at that stage and secondly because the country's economy at that time seemed to be taking a beating they did not have the actual security more or less behind them to encourage them to put money into a place like the Barbados Telephone Company.

What I would like to wonder is if it is Government's policy at all times to undertake to underwrite all the things of this nature when the people of Barbados themselves do not have the actual confidence in the Telephone Company, and therefore the Government must come to the rescue of places of this nature.

I would like to hear a simple statement on what was the view of the Minister of Finance since he himself is directly connected with a subject of this nature. I would like to know what is his view as to why the public did not subscribe to it. I am not here trying to be at sea. I never try to bite off more than I can chew. I believe in the words of the song "I did it my way". I have asked a simple question which I am entitled to do if it be the desire of the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance to give just a simple reply as to his impressions why the public did not subscribe in the manner in which he himself would have hoped. You will get a chance to get up. You are James Browne and you are mad to jump up. I would be very glad if the Minister of Finance is in a position just to make a statement.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I had no intention of speaking again. *(Asides)*.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: The hon. Member invited me to make a statement and I want to declare my incompetence. He has invited me and therefore I can only deal with it at the level of my competence. I do not know who the potential subscribers were I do not know who has money in Barbados and who does not have money. I do not have the same facility of access to the persons who are responsible for capital formation or the capitalists as the hon. Member has; but he has asked me my opinion. My opinion is that the reason why they did not raise money is because

of the activities of the Opposition who went about trying to spread a lot of propaganda against the Telephone Company and create an unfavourable investment climate at all time in this island. If he did not ask me, he would not have got an answer; but he asked a foolish question and he got the right answer.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is not my intention to delay this debate, because as the hon. Member for St. James has rightly said, he is completely ignorant of what this thing is all about, and for that reason it is a question of what the Hon. Prime Minister spoke about – a matter of incompetence.

Now, the only serious thing about is that when we come to this Chamber we should have acquired if not before, after, some knowledge of what goes on in here. This is not the place for pleading ignorance especially in vital matters about things like telephone financing and public financing anyone in public life must make himself acquainted with these things.

But, Sir, the vulgarity you get is that they want to reduce this to all of the vulgar epithets that you get on a public platform, and the idea of beginning to believe that you can by these innuendoes say things about people that are not true, like what the hon. Member said, that he could get up and bring Hansard and repeating these statements each time. The hon. Member said that he could show in Hansard that I said that the Hon. Prime Minister was a half baked economist. That is vulgarity that is suitable for public platforms, but when they come in here I challenge him to bring Hansard and read to the House of Assembly and say where he could find the statement.

Mr. CRAIG: I said that I could produce documentary evidence. That is what I can produce. I can produce a book written by F. A. Hoyos.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, you would have to be a political ignoramus to suggest that you are going to get in this Chamber and talk about a member making a speech in the House, and when you are challenged about these things which have been repeated and repeated because you are not always in the mood to get up and make a reply – when you now reply you hear that you can bring documentary evidence, and the documentary evidence is a book published by F. A. Hoyos. Mr. Hoyos sent a messenger to ask me to buy a book that was just published. I asked the Head of the Labour College if they

had any of these books in the Labour College because we in a place like this do not discriminate. We buy everybody's books as a matter of taste. We do not have anything against any person; but I do not think that the hon. Member should continually get up and make statements like this which are improper.

1.10 p.m

What I would like him to deal with is the matter before us and not to suggest that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition is an economic expert. He must be a half baked one, and I would not even use the term "baked" because on whose authority is he saying that he is an economic expert? What is his basis for saying he is an economic expert? Purely because of his own inferiority he is saying that? You do not become an expert because you feel so, he must understand what he is talking about. What is very pitiable is that the Leader of the Opposition today is the hon. member, he stands now as the Leader of the Opposition because he is the Deputy Leader, and we are of the view that in politics these facades that we get and addresses that we get and names that we get to dress up things like Santa Claus at Christmas is not good enough for our political age. We expect a young politician to be able to deal with this matter today, and he is pleading like when you are playing cricket and cannot face the bowling and appealing for light when it is broad daylight.

I have now come from a telephone conference, and I will say that telephone companies in relatively poor communities should be watched and examined because the technology in telecommunications is greater than the technology in any other field. For example the Japanese who are very advanced are a little worried today. I listened to Japanese at a conference about two weeks ago and they were concerned about the technology in telecommunications because they go from what is known as the step-by-step into the crossbar and they are very concerned that so many of them are likely to be unemployed because of this, and the Europeans are looking upon this as sort of out of date because they are using computers, so it is not a question of the step-by-step to crossbar, it is like going from step-by-step to a computerised system, because when you have a lot of numbers and exchanges to deal with you no longer have the manual system because you can telephone to the moon now, you can telephone from New York to London by using about 14 or 15 numbers. In some instances it is easier in Paris to dial New York to get another number in Paris.

This is one of the problems with nationalisation. I would like to see water, light, telephones — all utilities — come under public ownership, but the reservation is if you have to start now in 1975 to do something that your grandfather or great grand father did not do in 1875 you have to be careful if you have millions of dollars to set aside or if you have the other things to set aside to do it, but I am one of those people who believe that when you come to the telephone system, the public utility systems, that they should be always at our disposal because they are vital to the life of the community as a whole. It is not a question of saying who is the expert or the economic expert in here, it is a question that when we come to this Chamber we should have done our homework and learnt about these things, it is not a question of pleading ignorance on serious vital matters that affect the community and you are looking at a certain person to say that this person is an expert. Soon they will tell you to turn over the House of Parliament to the universities to deal with.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am particularly interested in what has been said in respect of the Telephone Company offering shares to members of the public and the whole response from the public thereto. I believe, whether it is a case that the Opposition has gone about and created the type of unhealthy climate in investment or whatever it may be, I like to laugh at those things coming, let us say, from the Minister of Finance, but I believe the Minister very well knows he has a lot more to try to pin on the Opposition, a lot more of his own failures he will have to look for the Opposition to pin them on. We do not mind this, Mr. Deputy Speaker, what we are concerned about in respect of this loan is that since the Government has found it necessary to come and guarantee the loan to the Telephone Company nobody on this side, however unfavourable the investment climate has been made, would want to stand in the way of the Telephone Company or any other public utility services rendering to this country so necessary and vital a service as we find in communication, but our concern must be that with Government underwriting the loan the public want to hear not only that the service will be expanded, and as in my case it goes further north in St. Peter and over to St. Lucy, wherever they are going to expand the service we welcome this. We are satisfied that if there are services in St. Lucy today following with services for St. Peter and other parishes at a later date, the public will be looking forward to hearing that Government's guarantee to the loan gives Government greater bargaining power on behalf of the taxpayers and the consuming public

generally, because they concern must be that to expand as quickly and as far as you can, they would like to know that the service, if it is not to cost less than at present, that when the Government guarantees this loan it will be an assurance to the taxpayers, the consuming public, that it does not cost them more in the future
1.20 p.m.

Some reference has been made of the Public Utilities Board, its operation, and so on. Less than one-third of this population can really understand the gymnastics of the Public Utilities Board in dealing with the Telephone Company and as such nobody wants any further to be looking to the Public Utilities Board for any assistance. We would like to hear now that the Government is guaranteeing this loan, that the Government will be placed in a position to vote or will have bargaining power, so that the consuming public can be assured there will be no further increases in the cost of the telephone service. That is the point at issue and it has nothing to do with how incompetent somebody happens to be. One has to realise that, in whatever field one may go, one will find somebody excelling even in ignorance. One will find that some people excel in ignorance.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we want to know that, despite the absence of the technical knowledge required for the running of the telephone system, despite the absence of, perhaps, proper accounting staff to assist the Government on the direct information of the operation of the Telephone Company, in the face of all of this, we would like to have an assurance and be doubly assured that we are not placing the Telephone Company on a sound financial footing merely for the benefit of the Company. We take into consideration the fact that the Company employs a number of Barbadians. We would like to see that the Company is in a position to employ more Barbadians, but, despite all of this, we would like to know that our guaranteeing this loan today is not a means of giving the Telephone Company an opportunity to make out a case at a later date to get more money from the consuming public to repay the loan we are guaranteeing here today. That is the point that we want to make quite clear. We would like to know that, if the service cannot be made to cost less to the consumers than at present, regardless of world conditions, say, in the next five years, telephone users would not be called upon to pay any more than they are paying for the service as a result of the Government guaranteeing this loan today.

Mr. SPRINGER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, several reasons have been put forward why the Telephone Company has not been able to raise this money on the local market. Part of the reason is, and we have had to admit it, that 90% of the people in Barbados are black and they have not yet got accustomed to white people handling their money. The Telephone Company is a white expatriate organisation, and coloured people are not going to put their money in that organisation unless they have a say in the operation of the Company. That is one reason. The other reason is that black people in Barbados and Barbadians in general are not used to stocks and shares and investments. If you bring it down to a meeting turn and a man can draw every twelfth week, then that is our level good. If you bring it down to money in the bank at 7%, that is our level, but when it comes to large-scale investments in buying shares, the Barbadian is not interested at that level. Shipping and Trading might be interested. DaCosta & Musson might be interested. Wilkinson and Challenor might be interested, but even when the Barbados Government is offering debentures at equally good prospects they are not even remotely concerned, and that is the basic reason why the Telephone Company has not been able to attract investments from the local Barbadian investors. That is a matter of fact. It is as plain as light. All of this economic and political basic theories will have to be brought down to the basic human element. We do not have confidence, as Barbadians, in investing our money in a foreign concern, foreign owned, foreign controlled and foreign in its entirety. That is a matter plain and simple, and all of this window dressing trying to look for any other reason is senseless.

Before the hon. member leaves the Chamber, I want to say that there is this matter of the policy of the Utilities Board and that Barbadian is confused — 70% of the people are confused. Mr. Deputy Speaker, we are all confused with the Telephone Company. Why are we confused? This is the reason. The last Leader of the Opposition in this Parliament represented the Barbadian masses, the Consumers League, against the Telephone Company for an increase of rates just four weeks before the last election. He was on the side of the consumers against the increase. He lost his seat at the election for being with the consumers. A greater increase in the rate came up, and where does he find himself? He is the Leader of the Opposition in the Senate, a man holding some prominence in the community, and you would expect the man in the street to respect him. After he lost his seat at the election, which side was he on? He represented the Telephone Company. Against whom? Against the

consumers that he was with just six weeks ago! Is it any wonder that 70% of the people are confused? The former Leader of the Opposition Q.C., P.S., and all of those funny things; he himself is confused, and he is not among the average. Is there any wonder, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that we are confused?

1.30 p.m

No wonder, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that we are confused. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I was reminded just a couple of days ago about a certain sermon preached in New York by Clayton Powell in which he asked people not to be confused about God or not to let God be confused about them, because that is not the problem. The problem is that they were confused about themselves. They must look at themselves as Opposition and look at us, all blacks, all Barbadians and stop getting confused, stop being dividers of Barbadians because of the actions of some of them wanting power. Let us look at ourselves and see the real issues and see where we are going.

The Telephone Company of Barbados, the Waterworks, the Barbados Light and Power, all these services should be nationalised. Do we have the manpower and expertise? Do we have the finance? Do we have all the other things, the foreign connections necessary to really nationalise these? Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am going to say this again. One of the greatest dangers in the West Indies and in Barbados in particular is the type of deception you get from people of colour, not necessarily of this party or that, but people of colour using colour as a basis on which to get support. That happened with the Telephone Company previous to that last election and it went for the Telephone Company after the last election, and it is absolutely stupid for Barbadians whether White or Black to throw their money into the Telephone Company or any other Company as individuals unless there is substantial Barbadian participation in that Company.

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

THE PENSIONS (MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS) BILL, 1975

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order No. 2 is the next Order of the Day.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, Order No. 2 is a Bill to amend certain enactments relating to the payment of pensions, gratuities and making certain miscellaneous

provisions. It is really a non-controversial matter and one should have by now looked at the main legislation to see the amendments which are being made to the Pensions Act of 1947, the Statutory Boards (Pensions) Act, 1969, the Teachers (Secondary Schools) Pensions Act, 1962, the Widows and Children's Pension Act, 1964 and the Public Employees Pension Act, 1961.

At the opening of the session in the Speech from the Throne in October, 1971, it was announced by His Excellency the Governor-General that the Government intended to review all the Pensions legislation particularly to provide for the continuity of pensionable service where officers are re-employed after a period of resignation or retirement from the Service, and also that some form of retiring benefits be payable in respect of a minimum qualifying period of service only and not as at present specifically in relation to the actual age of the officer at the time of retirement.

If I may give an example of one of the defects, normally a person is not entitled to receive a pension until he reaches the age of 50. You can retire from the Service with special leave at the age of 50. The normal retiring age is 55, and some persons go on under the old Pensions Act, 1947, to the age of 60, and certain other former employees of the Local Government authorities have opted to go on in some cases up to 70 years of age, but generally speaking the retiring age is 55 or 60. You must go out at 60, but you can ask for leave to go specially at 50, or for special reasons you may be requested to retire after the age of 50 for medical reasons or other sufficient reasons. In order to get a pension you should have done under the old legislation 10 years' service. That means you can join the Service at the age of 40 and retire at 50 and get a pension. If you join the Service at the age of 18 and go on until you are 49, you would have done 31 years' service and under the existing legislation you would not be entitled to a pension because you had not attained the age. This is one of the anomalies which I have drawn to the attention of this Chamber on previous occasions, but it is part of our policy and I have expressed here before that there should be a lot more flexibility in entry and exit into and out of the Barbados Government Service. The reason for this is that there is a shortage of middle management and professional and managerial personnel particularly amongst the professions, whereas people who may be willing to do a certain stint of duty in a Government Department as an engineer or architect are not prepared to spend the rest of their professional lives working in what they may consider the rather restrictive atmosphere of a Government Department. They

are willing to come in and do a certain number of years and this may be at either end of the spectrum of the officer's active service in his profession.

The main purpose therefore of the amendments would be to make it possible for a person who is a professional or any other officer to come into the service, do a certain amount of time and go out and get experience in the private sector, and it will also be possible for the Government to recruit people directly from the private sector who will come into the service and work for a number of years, and they do not have to wait until they are 50 years of age before they retire, but if they retire before the age of 50 and go to work in the private sector they will wait until the age of 55 for a pension. So it does not mean that as soon as you leave the Government you automatically are entitled to a pension, but what it will mean is that there will be a greater flexibility and cross-fertilisation between the public sector and the private sector, particularly at the professional level, and particularly at the managerial level, and we hope that the whole outlook of the public service will benefit greatly from this.

I have referred earlier today to various bits of legislation. We have the spectacle now of Government officers reaching the age of 50 and asking for special leave to retire from the service and going to work in the private sector for much more money than they worked for in Government. Now I think this is at the wrong end of the scale. I personally would prefer to see these officers work outside in the private sector and come into the Government when they have gained experience outside so that we can benefit from what they have learned outside rather than the other way around where the private sector is gaining from their administrative training in the ranks of Government. So this is part of the overall strategy that we are working out which will eventually lead to the implementation of a national pensions plan for the total community in Barbados, where private annuities and pensions will be locked into our national pensions scheme.

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

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

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

1.40 p.m.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee on this Bill.

Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND: I beg to second that.

The Question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. W. R. LOWE took the Chair.

On the motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND, Clauses 1 to 3 inclusive of the Bill were called and they stood part.

The Schedule was called and it stood part.

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill be now read a third time.

Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND: I beg to second that.

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

BILL TO REPEAL EDUCATION ACT, 1890

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the next Item with which the Government proposes to deal is Item No. 4 on the Order Paper, which is the Education Bill. The Minister of Education may now proceed, Sir.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order No. 4 is the next Order of the day.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the measure that is before us now relates to the repeal of the Education Act, 1890, and seeks to provide for a co-ordinated and effective system of public education, related to the needs of the people of Barbados, the registration of private schools, the inspection of schools, the registration of teachers and for purposes incidental thereto and connected therewith.

Before moving the second reading of this Bill I wish to give notice that I propose an amendment in the Fourth Schedule to the Bill, in Clause 11(1) of that Schedule, in lines 2 and 3, that the words "Part 2 of" should be deleted, and similarly in Clause 12(1) of that

Schedule in the third line from the bottom that the words "Part II of" should be deleted. Those are the amendments that I propose.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this is a very important measure that is before us in that it relates to the education and the training of the young people and the adults of this country and it is one which can have a very far reaching impact on the social and economic development of this country. In the history of education in this country there are very few legal measures relating to education and its development. Indeed the history of education began with single classes or small private schools run largely by the clergy in the 17th century and at that stage official involvement was limited to the restriction which prevented or forbade anyone from keeping a school without licence from the Governor. In order to keep a school you had to have a licence from the Government. During the succeeding years enrolment in schools rose from some 7,632 in 1846 when the first legislative grant was made for education and that was a grant of £700, to about 60,000 pupils in 1967 when the provision was approximately \$11 million provided by the Government for education or related activity; but in spite of the growth in the numbers in the school system and in spite of the substantial increase in the public provision for education there have been few central measures governing education in this country.

One Education Act was passed in the four decades between 1850 and 1890 although there were some far reaching changes which were introduced during that period, and the developments which took place during that period may be summarised as follows: in 1850 an education commissioner responsible for devising and educational policy and administering an annual grant of £3,000 was provided for and a part-time inspector was also provided mainly to check on attendances which served as the base for giving grants to the respective schools. That was in 1850.

1.50 p.m.

In 1858 the studies in the school curriculum were determined, and the Pupil Teacher system was introduced, and the post of part time Inspector was for the first time made a full time post. Then in 1890 came the Education Act which consolidated the previous legislation into a single code, and the Education Commission was replaced by the Education Board with an Inspector and Assistant Inspector and officers and it was given control of Elementary Education

with power to require the Vestries to provide and maintain elementary school buildings.

Our provisions for Education in this country are still regulated by that Act which dates back to the decade before the term of this century – to the year 1890. It is still the main piece of legislation governing Education in this Country. It is a very old piece of legislation which is outdated and which has served its purpose.

There have been of course amendments to that piece of legislation, but the 1890 Act is still the main piece of legislation governing Education in this country. Since that date there have been important legislative measures and other types of administrative measures. In 1912 there was the establishment of the Rawle Teacher Training College which produced annually – and mark the number – six trained teachers for Barbados along with the another nine from other territories of the Caribbean region. That was in 1912. The Rawle Teacher Training Institute was producing six trained teachers for Barbados and nine for the other West Indian territories.

In 1928 there was the abolition of school fees in the Elementary Schools of this country. Education in the Elementary School up to that particular time was on a fee paying basis, and it was in 1928 that fees for attending Elementary Schools were abolished.

In 1937 the social measure was introduced of the provision of milk and biscuits for children in the Elementary Schools, and in 1943 there was the creation of a Department of Education and the first Director of Education. We are now in the war years.

The year 1944 saw the admission of Elementary School Teachers to the Civil Establishment, and in 1948 there was the establishment of the Erdiston Teachers Training College which at the outset was geared to produce some 32 trained teachers a year for Barbados. There was also provision for the establishment of the University College of the West Indies at that time as well.

In 1958 there was the creation of the separate Ministry of Education and in 1962 there was the integration of the Department of Education into the Ministry of Education.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, those briefly are some of the measures both legislative and administrative relating to the progress and development of Education. I wish to reiterate again that the main piece of legislation governing

the development of Education in this country carries the date of 1890. Now I think we all agree that there have been many changes both social, economic, political and educational and in whatever sphere we may think of. The world in 1975 is quite different from the world of 1890. I do not think that anyone would deny that there is need for the introduction of a new Education Bill on the Statute Book of this country.

Indeed, Sir, that indication was given in the manifesto of the Democratic Labour Party when it campaigned in the 1961 General Elections, and promised a new Education Act by 1962. So this particular measure that is before us here today is not one that is being sprung upon the people of this country. The need was there and it was made manifest, or clear or patent in the 1961 Manifesto of the DLP that a new Education Bill would be put on the Statute Book; and the date given for the introduction of that particular piece of legislation was the year 1962.

I would wish to indicate the steps that have been taken during the past years in order to ascertain first of all what are the proposals which should constitute an Education Bill, the types of discussions and consultations which have taken place and, as it were, the prehistory leading up to the introduction of this particular Bill; because I do not wish that there should be any misunderstandings on this matter at all.

There has been adequate time given for consultation and discussion of this Bill. Persons and bodies of this country, including teachers organisations have been consulted at important stages of the development of this Bill, and what is before us today represents the scope and range of those discussions, and what has been distilled out of those discussions.

Let me start with the year 1967. Before the Bill was actually drafted a request was sent out from my Ministry to teachers organisations and other interested bodies to submit to my Ministry views as to what provisions should be included in the proposed legislation. This was the start of consultation in the year 1967 before the legislation was actually drafted.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that the sitting be now suspended until 3 o'clock p.m.

Mrs. EASTMOND: I beg to second that.

The Question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER suspended the Sitting accordingly.

On Resumption:-

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The sitting is now resumed.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to move, Sir, that the bell be rung.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Let the bell be rung.

The bell was rung for one minute and a quorum was obtained.

THE EDUCATION BILL, 1975

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: When the Sitting was suspended the hon. Minister of Education was addressing. He may now resume.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the consultations on this Bill began in 1967 before there was actually a draft Bill and certain associations and bodies were invited to submit proposals and views as to what should be included in the proposed piece of legislation, and those bodies who were invited to submit those proposals were the Barbados Union of Teachers, the Association of Assistant Teachers in Secondary Schools — as the present Barbados Secondary Teachers Union was then called — the Association of Headmasters and Headmistresses which represents the Heads in the older Secondary Schools, the Barbados Independent School Teachers Association and the West Indies Group of University Teachers. I would like to emphasise again that this was before there was actually a Bill drafted.

Those bodies which I have just listed were invited to submit their proposals and views as to what should be included in the Bill. From the views submitted, together with the thoughts on those matters within the Ministry of Education itself, a Bill was drafted and this Bill was submitted. A draft Bill was submitted to interested bodies and individuals by letter dated 9th February, 1970, and those bodies were asked to submit their views and comments now on the draft Bill. There is now a draft Bill. They were first of all asked for views before there was a Bill, a draft Bill was then prepared and they were asked to submit their comments and views on that draft Bill by 28th February, 1970. A request was made

for an extension of further time to study the draft Bill and we acceded to that request, extending the time until 30th April. That was at the request of the bodies, and again I wish to enumerate the bodies who were invited to comment on that draft Bill, because I wish it to be abundantly clear that there was consultation and discussion on this Bill.

The bodies who were invited to comment on this draft Bill in 1970 were the members of the Education Board, the Chairmen of the Governing Bodies of the older and newer Secondary Schools, the Barbados Community College, the Samuel Jackman Prescod Polytechnic, the School for the Deaf, the Association of Assistant Teachers in Secondary Schools, the Association of Headmasters and Headmistresses which, as I indicated, represent the Heads of the older Secondary Schools, the Barbados Independent School Teachers Association, the Barbados Union of Teachers, the Head of the Moravian Church, the President of the Barbados Ministerial Association, the Civil Service Association, the Barbados Workers' Union, the Employers Confederation, the Lions Club, the Junior Chamber of Commerce the Rotary Club, the Principal of Mapps College, the Principal of Washington High School, the Principal of Presentation College, the Headmaster of Christ Church High School, the Headmaster of Seventh Day Adventist Secondary School, the Headmistress of Codrington High School, the Headmistress of St. Winifred's Girls' School, the Headmistress of St. Gabriel's School and the Headmistress of the Ursuline Convent.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not think that there was any recognised or important body of educators in this country which was not asked to comment on that draft Bill. This is the first draft Bill in 1970, so that is the second level of consultation that took place. Almost everyone who was involved in education in this country, whether substantially or with a less than substantial interest, from those Church interests which still have Church Schools to interested groups such as the Association of the Blind and Deaf and to the Approved Independent Schools and other bodies, including the Teachers' Unions. As a result of those discussions the Bill was submitted to the Attorney General for redrafting, and then as a result of that redrafting the draft Bill No. 2 became available and was circulated to Teachers' organisations by letter dated 2nd August, 1973 with a request for a response by 21st September, 1973. This is now the second draft being

circulated to Teachers' organisations by letter dated 2nd August, 1973 with a request for a response by 21st September, 1973. This particular deadline was extended to 23rd November at the request of the Union and a further request for further time was granted, and that further time the new deadline, became 7th January, 1974 again at the request of the Union. On this occasion for what I am styling as draft Bill No. 2 the Teachers' organisations which were asked for their comments on the draft Bill are as follows: The Barbados Union of Teachers, the Barbados Secondary Teachers' Union, the Association of Heads of the older Secondary Schools, and Conference of Heads of the newer Secondary Schools and the Independent Secondary Schools, so the major Teachers' organisations are invited to comment again on the second draft of this Bill, and we granted two extensions of time to them within which to submit their comments on the draft Bill.

On 9th February I held face to face discussions with representatives of the Barbados Secondary Teachers' Union and the Barbados Teachers' Union on the draft Bill. We have now reached the stage where we are having face to face discussions. We have asked for comments and then we are in the stage of face to face discussions, so those discussions took place on the 9th February, 1974. Further discussions took place on 16th February, 1974, on this occasion between myself and the Association of Heads of the older Secondary Schools and the Conference of Heads of the newer Secondary Schools.

3.10 p.m.

On the 4th March, 1974, discussions were held between myself and the representatives of the Barbados Secondary Teachers Union and the Barbados Union of Teachers also on the Draft Bill. Continuation of the previous discussions were also held on 8th March, 1974. As a result of these discussions, the Attorney-General was given instructions to revise that draft also. As a result of these revisions, Draft Bill No. 3 came into existence. It was circulated with a letter dated 24th December, 1974, to the Barbados Secondary Teachers Union, and to the Barbados Union of Teachers by a letter dated 30th December to the Conference of Heads of the newer Secondary Schools as well as the older Secondary Schools, and about the same time to the Independent Schools.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this Draft Bill was circulated to them, and they were invited to

further face-to-face discussions on 15th January, 1975. These are the bodies who were invited to those discussions: the Barbados Independent Secondary Schools Association, the Association of Independent Schools — I should now state that there are two bodies representing the different Approved Independent Schools and both of those bodies were invited to the face-to-face discussions — the Association of Heads of the older Secondary Schools and the Conference Heads of the newer Secondary Schools, the Barbados Union of Teachers and the Barbados Secondary Teachers Union. This is now the revised draft which the Union, as a result of the points made in the discussions and out of the consultations that took place, considered as the final draft. We were dealing with Draft Bill No. 3, and they were invited to face-to-face discussions to conclude discussions on the Draft Bill.

Now, the boycotts or threats did not start yesterday or Saturday. The Barbados Union of Teachers declined to attend the meeting on the 15th January, and by a letter dated 14th January indicated that they could not attend because the ground, I believe, was that they did not want to discuss the Bill but to negotiate the Bill. The meeting was duly held on the 15th January, 1975, in accordance with the invitation extended, and the only Union absenting itself being the Barbados Union of Teachers. The Barbados Secondary Teachers Union had a delegation of 8, the same number as the representatives from the Ministry; the Association of Headmasters and Headmistresses of the older Secondary Schools 4; the Conference of Heads of the newer Secondary Schools 4, the Barbados Independent Secondary Schools Association 4, and the Associated Independent Schools 2. On that occasion I welcomed those present, and I explained that the main purpose of the meeting was to conclude the discussions and consultations on the Bill. I intimated that a number of meetings and discussions and consultations had taken place with those bodies previously, and that, as a result, amendments had been made to the Bill. We took those points made at that meeting into account and, as a result of those discussions, the matter went before the Cabinet, which concluded that the Bill should be introduced into Parliament. As far as we are concerned, that concluded the negotiations and the consultations on the Bill.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think you will agree, and this House will agree, that there

have been ample opportunity and time given, between 1967 and 1975, for whatever view or opinion one had as to what should be included in the Bill and what should not be included in the Bill, and even to comment on the drafts that had been prepared by those who were legally competent to draft those Bills. There was consultations before there was a Bill. Three drafts were circulated to the body and, at least, three face-to-face discussions were held with the body. I think, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that I have given ample time for consultation and consideration of this matter, and this is now time for all of the consultation to stop. It had to stop at some time. We had promised this particular measure from 1962, and we have been very careful that, at those important stages when the drafts were being prepared, the drafts should be circulated and the views ascertained, and we have embodied those views in the measure that is now before us.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I believe that an educational system, or legislation for education, is very important legislation, and that is why I have departed from what used to happen, either in the good or the bad old days, depending on your point of view and how you look at it. You could consider it good old days or bad old days. I recall that, in the past, there was hardly any consultation on matters relating to education in this country. I think the only consultation that used to take place was hurried meetings in respect of salaries. Those, as I said, were either in the good or the bad old days, depending on how you look at it. We, for good or ill, instituted a process of consultation, and I believe myself that that particular process was in danger of being abused because on each particular occasion that we were trying to reach finality on the matter there was a request for further consultation.

3.20 p.m.

I believe, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that education is a very important instrument in this country for bringing about social and economic development. I believe that the purpose of education is to provide our young people and our adults with the skills, the knowledge, the attitudes and the techniques that are necessary both for the maintenance of this particular community as an entity as well as part of the wider Caribbean and indeed of the world at large. Hence I believe that the basic skills of reading, writing, and calculation or computation are necessary to to enable one to earn a livelihood, to make provision for one's family and to live in a civilised society.

I believe that all these things are important and these must be transmitted through the educational system as one of the instruments for the maintenance of the community as we know it, and also for the inculcation of these skills, the imagination which would make one flexible enough to bring about and to effect these changes which are necessary in societies such as ours.

I believe, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that education must relate to the individual in that it must cater for his or her physical well-being and fitness; I believe that it must provide for these skills as I indicated of speech, of writing, of calculation or computation; I believe that the elements of self-discipline and respect for law and order and the inculcation of worthy ideals should be part of the process of our educational system. I believe that in those age old qualities of integrity, of honesty, of kindness and such virtues there should be an attempt by the system to assist in the inculcation of those particular virtues. I believe also that whatever talents an individual has, whatever talents for good, not just whatever talents you may have, because one may have a talent for evil and one does not wish that they be refined to the highest or lowest possible level. I believe that we live within a community and that we must inculcate in our members the necessary skills as well as the necessary know how for living together in a society. There is the individual, there is the group or there is the society, and while we are individuals we are also a member of this larger group, and I believe that our educational system must insist in the imparting of these particular skills. We are a democratic society and we must aim to instil bases for such a free democratic society. This is a plant of very tender growth and it has got to be nurtured, and we believe that the school system has a part to play in the nurture and the support of free democratic institutions. We believe that our people must develop and maintain a love for the country. It does not necessarily happen by chance. We must develop a pride in what we are and also some direction as to where we are going, and hence respect for our national symbols and our national emblems must be an important part of the education that we provide in our schools.

I believe, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that our educational system must enable an individual to earn a livelihood by giving him or her the bases from which one can develop skills, a craft, a profession, so that they can earn a decent livelihood in this particular country, and it must also provide on a national scale those skills, those techniques and the training that is required for the broad scope of national development.

It is against this background, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the present Bill is before us, and in part 2 of the Bill the main purposes of the Act and the functions of the Minister are set out, and I will just refer to two of them. One is to promote the education of the people of Barbados and to establish and develop institutions for that purpose; (b) to frame an educational policy designed to provide a varied and comprehensive service in Barbados. Another one to which I will draw attention is Clause 3(e) to contribute towards the spiritual, oral, mental, physical, social and economic development of the community by ensuring that efficient education shall be available to meet the needs of Barbados.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, these are very onerous responsibilities because these are the functions set out in order to bring about implementation of these particular objectives, and it is necessary for certain other steps to be taken or other provisions to be made and hence the Minister in a permissive clause is empowered to establish schools and to do whatever is necessary for the achievement of the purposes and functions that were set out.

Finally there is an Education Commission which is a national Advisory Commission on education which has been established in order to assist the Minister in the examination of the educational system and to give comments and advice either in response to a request from the Minister or on its own initiative and volition to make comments on the educational system. In this particular part as well the Minister is given power to establish special committees.

One major criticism which was levelled at this particular Bill from early on was that it placed too much power in the hands of the Minister. I certainly recall these comments being made about too much power being placed in the hands of the Minister, as though this would make our educational system less democratic than it actually is or would make it into a dictatorial system. I would just like to react to this particular statement by relating to the powers that are entrusted to two other Ministers of Education in countries which are not normally described as dictatorial in their arrangements. I refer to the country of Canada and I quote from the Development of Education Act as follows:

"The Minister shall preside over and have charge of the Department. The Minister is responsible for the administration of this Act and the regulations and such other Acts and Regulations thereunder as may be assigned to him by the Lieutenant Governor in Council."

That is the Minister of Education in Canada. He has full powers not only in respect of administration of the Act and the regulations thereunder and such other Acts and Regulations as may be assigned to him, but he shall preside over and have charge of the Department.
3.30 p.m.

From England and Wales to which a large number of people like to refer as the Mother country, the Education Act of 1944 states, and I quote: "It shall be lawful for His Majesty to appoint a Minister herein after referred to as the Minister, whose duty it shall be to promote the education of the people of England and Wales and the progressive development of institutions devoted to that purpose, and to secure the effective execution by local authorities under his control and direction of the national policy for providing a varied and comprehensive educational service in every area." And it continues: "The Minister shall for all purposes be a corporation sole under the name of the Minister of Education and the department of which he is in charge shall be known as the Ministry of Education."

So the Minister of Education in England is a corporation sole and he is in charge of that particular Ministry, the Ministry of Education. Not only that. It continues: "The Minister may appoint —" note. It is the Minister doing these things. "The Minister may appoint a Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Education and such other secretaries, officers and servants as the Minister may with the consent of the Treasury determine, and subject to the provisions of the Ministers of the Crown Act 1937 as to the remuneration of the Parliamentary Secretary, and they shall be paid such remuneration as may be determined in a like manner."

So the Minister of Education in England under that main 1944 Act was a corporation sole and he had power to appoint a Parliamentary Secretary and such other secretaries, officers and servants. So these are the powers of the Minister of Education in the United Kingdom; and when we hear arguments that there is too much power in the hands of a Minister here we often wonder whether those who are making those comments are fully aware of the types of powers that are entrusted in societies, including those societies which would rank very high if not at the top of those countries which are regarded as democratic countries.

I have quoted from just two of them — Canada and the United Kingdom — so I will not deal with that particular charge any longer, or

any more about placing too much power in the hands of a Minister. Indeed by our own Constitution the Minister is granted the administration of the department to which he is assigned by the Governor-General. I do not wish to go into that any more. I believe I have given the necessary information to indicate that that charge, certainly, when taken against the law in other countries does not really stand up to the light of day.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Part 3 of this Bill relates to the system of education and it indicates that the stages of public education in this country shall be three – primary, secondary and tertiary. Long ago too there was some quaint argument that the word “tertiary” did not exist or that it was some figment of the imagination of the Minister. I remember one headmaster wanted to know where the word came from; and they used comments about this particular word saying that this is yet another coined by the Minister.

It is not my fault, Mr. Deputy Speaker, if persons do not keep abreast with developments in these particular fields, in the fields in which they are working. The word ‘tertiary’ is an English word; it takes its derivation from the Latin – I would not quote a foreign language in this country as the Prime Minister quoted some French for us earlier today – but it simply means, third level. and just as you have primary which is the first level and you have secondary which is the second level, so you have tertiary which is the third level; and if we preferred to use the word ‘tertiary’ in this context rather than ‘further’ or ‘higher’ which is used in other contexts, what is wrong with that? But not only that. It is an acknowledgement word in educational circles and if this was not known to those professionals who were commenting and whose echo was re-echoed by those who look to those persons for leadership, that is certainly not my fault. But we have three levels of education; the primary level, the secondary level and the tertiary level, and in that primary level we include provision for pre-school education relating to persons who are under the age of five. We believe that this is a very important stage in the growth and development of individuals and my only regret is, and it is the regret of this Government, that because of economic circumstances we are unable to provide more schools at this particular level; but we are certainly convinced, particularly in a country which has known privation for many years, which is not among the most wealthy countries on this planet, we believe that that type of education and the type of stimulation which can be given to the very young is something which we would

like to see particularly in those communities which are not as well placed, or to use an Americanism ‘advantaged’ as other families; and we will certainly endeavour as resources become available, to provide more education at this particular level.

3.40 p.m

We also make provision for special education; and this particular area of education is being included in legislation in this country, for the first time, certainly as far as former legislation is concerned. Here again we believe that, subject to the resources that may be committed, each person should be provided with an education fitted to that person’s interests, abilities and aptitudes because we believe that people should be developed as far as possible and there is provision also for adult education.

That, basically, is the broad system of education and the steps that we propose should be taken in our educational arrangements in this country. Then, there is provision for the management of our primary and composite schools, and this is defined as a school which offers both primary and secondary education, that is education for those persons who may be between the ages of 11 and 14 years or who may be enrolled in institutions offering education at that level. This is the term that we will be using in the place of the term formerly used of all age schools. We prefer to use the word “composite” because it embraces both primary and secondary education.

We make provision for the management of our secondary schools by way of Boards of Management and by way of Committees. For the older secondary schools which had governing bodies we are making provision here for the establishment of Boards of Management, and for the newer secondary schools who were never subject to the power of Governing bodies we have provision for Committees of Management; but there is also an empowering clause which permits the establishment of Boards of Management for the newer secondary schools as well; and it is certainly the policy of this Government to remove whatever distinctions there may be between the older and the newer secondary schools as quickly as possible; and I envisage that as soon as possible we will be establishing Boards of Management for these secondary schools as well.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, provision is made for the establishment of a Secondary Schools Teaching Service, and this relates to the teachers who are in the older secondary schools.

They will now all be part of the Secondary Schools Teaching Service, but the conditions of service will be no less favourable than those which were enjoyed under the governing bodies.

All of the properties, assets and rights which were vested in the Governing Bodies of the older schools will be transferred to the Boards of Management when these are established.

I would submit Mr. Deputy Speaker, that for the process of equalisation in our secondary schools this power of transfer would have been a useful instrument in terms of ensuring that as far as possible the teaching skills which may be available should be distributed as efficiently as possible.

Let me give you an example. At one particular school, let us say School X there may be four or five trained graduate teachers in Science, and at School Y there may be no qualified trained graduate on the staff; but the students who attend School Y are the children of Barbadians or of people who are resident here, and in order to give as far as possible equal educational opportunities, it may be considered desirable that one of these qualified and trained graduate teachers should be transferred to School Y. We have examined this very carefully and we had the advice of the teachers on this particular matter. They were not too much in favour of this particular position, and hence we could not in this particular Bill indicate that teachers would be transferable as rapidly as the circumstances might necessitate.

There is a provision under these present arrangements for consultation between the new body which has been established by the Constitution, that is the Teaching Service Commission — consultation between that body and the Board of Management of the Schools before any such transfer can be effected and as far as the teachers are concerned their rights are guaranteed, so that I do not think that there is anything to fear on that particular score.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Division 6 of Part III relates to the management of tertiary institutions and this also indicates that Boards of Management may run these institutions; I certainly envisage that as part of the process of decentralisation that will take place in the movement of our educational system that Boards of Management with the powers set out in this Act will be set up for tertiary level institutions such as Erdiston Training College,

the Hotel School, the Polytechnic and other tertiary institutions such as the Housecraft Centre as time makes it feasible.

Part IV makes provision for the registration of Private Schools, and with the passage of this piece of legislation it will in future be obligatory for private schools to be registered in cases where a private school is operating as a school in which there would be 20 or more registered pupils.

3.50 p.m.

This will enable us to keep a record of all schools, to give them whatever assistance is permissible and to ensure that so long as they are engaged in this very important business of education that the standards in those schools would be at a level acceptable to my Ministry. If there are deficiencies time will be given for the correction of those deficiencies, and I think the safeguards are all built into this particular Act. In future we will be styling these schools as Assisted Private Schools under the Regulations to be made.

Part V makes provision for compulsory education. It relates to the attendance of pupils at school. Mr. Deputy Speaker, this country has never had any legal provisions relating to compulsory attendance at schools. We have in spite of that achieved very high levels of attendance but we have felt that the time has come when we should make provision for compulsory education to deal with those cases where there may be truancy or maybe for some reason the child cannot attend school or is neglected. We make provision for compulsory attendance because we believe that regular attendance at school is necessary for educational progress, and hence Part V makes provision for compulsory attendance. If a child wishes to be absent from school there will be provision as there is now under the school arrangements for exemptions to be given, and there is a penalty for non-compliance with the school attendance provisions as well as the school attendance officers are given all necessary powers in order to carry out their functions, and anyone found obstructing or in any way hindering the attendance officers in their functions will be guilty of an offence.

Part VI, Mr. Deputy Speaker, makes provision for the registration of teachers, and I would like to reiterate that this particular section has been included after consultation with the Teacher organisations, and indeed one Teacher organisation indicated which model should be followed as far as the registration of teachers is

concerned. That model was, as far as I can recall, the provisions in the Jamaica Education Act, and that Union indicated that as far as it was concerned this provision should be included in this Bill unamended and unabridged, so this particular provision has been given very close attention and scrutiny by the Teacher organisations and I do not think that there should be any controversy surrounding this particular Part.

Part VII makes provision for the inspection of educational institutions, and inspection is part of the function of any Ministry of Education.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not wish to speak for much longer on this particular Bill, I would like just to refer to a few matters which relate to certain parts of this Bill and some of the action which has been taken in relation to this Bill. First of all, as far as the text book loan scheme is concerned, you may recall that during the delivery of the supplementary financial statement and budgetary proposals on 21st November, 1974 the Prime Minister indicated that text books would be provided in the Government Secondary Schools and the approved Secondary Schools. That particular process is well in hand, most of the books I believe have arrived, certainly most of the schools have received some of the books and they are now in the process of putting in the necessary identification in those books and carrying out the necessary routines which must be gone through if identity of the books is to be established and if they are to be issued in a normal way. I should indicate that we are being very liberal in our interpretation as to who would be eligible for text books. We have had some queries on this particular area, we are being liberal in our interpretation in that nationals or the wards of nationals or the offspring of nationals together with other persons who may be permitted to enroll in our schools are provided with the text books, and if there are any cases of hardship I am prepared to examine those cases, because these books are being provided not as any Santa Claus gift but because we believe that a good education is the birthright of all Barbadians, and we believe that no person in our school system should be denied the benefits of education if that person is unable to provide the text books. The cost of text books has been on the increase and we believe that in as much as this is a very important tool of education the children of this country should be provided with the means or provided with a system whereby they can obtain those text books.

4 p.m.

This indicates the philosophy to which the Prime Minister made reference earlier at this

meeting in that we are trying to ensure equal opportunity as far as possible. Some parents in this country have not found difficulty in providing textbooks for their children and others have found difficulty. What we are ensuring by this particular measure is that all children in our schools who qualify would be able to obtain these books, and the salary that a parent was earning would not be taken into consideration. There is a rental charge of \$5.00 a year for the use of these textbooks, and when this is compared with the total cost of the textbooks it will, indeed, be seen that this is a minimal charge. Any lost or damage to a book, over and beyond normal wear and tear, will be the responsibility of the parent of the child. With these two conditions, the textbooks will be issued during the early part of the coming school year.

I would like, at this stage, to issue a general appeal to parents, guardians, and children. These books are being provided and there is no direct charge for the purchase of these books to parents or to guardians. It is intended that these books will be used by succeeding groups of children, and the greater care that is exercised in the handling and use of these books will ensure that a larger number of children will be able to use the books, and we would not have to replace them as quickly as under other circumstances. I wish to make a general appeal, first of all, to the children in our schools, who will receive these books, to exercise very great care in using them. Do not mistreat these books; do not put marks in them; do not disfigure them; do not tear off the covers, or tear out the pages. We expect that there will be normal wear and tear, but we do not wish abuse. We wish to see use, but not disabuse of the books. The more misuse of the books the greater will be the cost of running the scheme.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to indicate that the charge of \$5.00 a year will be going towards the maintenance and management of the programme. There are certain charges which will be made. The Schools are being made responsible for the administration of the programme, and certain honoraria are being provided for the management of this particular programme. This is being done even though, from my investigation study tour of the United States during the month of May last, the duty of allocating textbooks, and textbooks are available free to children in the school systems in the United States, this function is carried out free of any additional charges by the teachers in those school systems in the United States of America, which has a very much higher *per capita* income than Barbados and is a much wealthier country than Barbados. It is a

normal function of the teachers in those school systems to distribute these books free of charge as a part of their normal duties. We have provided here some honoraria for the carrying out of those functions.

From time to time statements have been made that there have been no surveys of our educational system. I would like to indicate that there have been a number of surveys of aspects of our educational system. In 1969 there was a UNESCO survey following upon my visit to UNESCO in 1968. A team from UNESCO came here and studied education and priorities for development in Barbados, and we have implemented a large number of the recommendations of that particular Committee. We established a Committee also to review the performance of candidates in external examinations, and that was done under the chairmanship of Mr. Nicholson of the University of the West Indies School of Education. They presented a Report. That Report was discussed and considered by educators in this country, and we have also been implementing some of the recommendations of the particular Report.

Perhaps, I should indicate, at this stage, inasmuch as this Bill deals with overseas examinations, that there has also been some concern expressed in relation to Barbados Scholarships, and there has been some speculation as to what will happen to Barbados Scholarships. The Cabinet considered this whole matter in relation to the Bill that is before us, and decided that for the future there should be no limit on the number of scholarships that may be available in terms of the Advanced Level Examination results. Up to this present time, the procedure has been to award a number of Barbados Scholarships to those candidates who reached the standard laid down in the law and the Regulations, and there has been concern about the abolition of the Barbados Scholarships.

4.10 p.m.

Let me say here that I believe that wherever excellence is demonstrated, that excellence should be sought out and should be recognised. I believe if it is in the field of sport, your outstanding sportsman should be honoured. I believe if it is in the field of public service that those who display or exhibit or demonstrate an unusually high commitment to public service should be recognised by the community. I believe that those who are outstanding at the Bar should be recognised for their outstanding service. Our friends the journalists: wherever there is outstanding work in journalism and there is fair and accurate

reporting and brilliant interpretation of the events of the day and not distortion, I believe that that type of excellence should be sought out and recognised. So it is in the field of athletics. I believe if there is excellence in athletic performance that those persons who perform in an outstanding way should be recognised.

What the Cabinet has decided and I think this is definitely an advance on what we have now is, that instead of saying that there will be five Barbados Scholarships and one for girls or four Barbados Scholarships and one for girls, that there will be no limit on the number of scholarships that may be available in any one year. In other words, if ten persons reached the scholarship standard, then ten scholarships will be provided. If 20 students reach the level for exhibitions in lieu of scholarships, then 20 persons would be granted exhibitions, and I think this is a definite advance on the present provisions and we are all agreed on that particular matter.

I myself personally had a difference with some of my colleagues on this matter in that the Cabinet took a decision also to abolish, not the Barbados scholarship, but the term "Barbados Scholar". I myself did not agree with that particular decision and I was authorised by the Cabinet to express my disagreement with that particular provision. It is not a major point. I certainly believe that this has been a term which has been used over the years, and my personal position is that I saw no reason why the scholarships that are being awarded should not continue to be styled "Barbados Scholarship", but that is no major point.

From time to time concern has been expressed about the quality of the persons winning the scholarships or rather those not winning the scholarships, and I took the opportunity to check on the performance of some of those persons whom it was stated was not up to the standard as at previous times. Let me take one student who in 1971 did not reach Barbados Scholarship standard but was granted an exhibition in lieu of a Barbados Scholarship. The young lady, Miss Diana P. Callendar studied medicine at Mona. She was successful in the pre-clinical examinations held in March, 1973. She enrolled in 1971. She gained honours in anatomy. She commenced the second clinical year, April, 1974, gained honours level in the pharmacology examination in December, 1973, and was awarded the pharmacology medal and the May Barker prize in pharmacology and was

successful in the pathology, micro-biology examination.

(Mr. CRAIG: It shows that the people have ability.) They have ability and this can be complimented. There is another person who did not reach that scholarship standard, Mr. Darcy Boyce, also in 1971. He did Economics at Mona and graduated with a B.Sc. First Class Honours in 1973. What we are getting are very good reports on our scholars. They are most of them doing as well as those persons who were awarded Barbados Scholarships; but there is something I would like to say on the standards, and it is something which perhaps was not generally recognised in this country, and it is that under the existing legislation, our students, in order to be awarded a Barbados Scholarship, are supposed to reach the same standard as for the award of a scholarship at the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge. This is not a requirement in any of the other major Caribbean territories. It is not so in Jamaica; it is not so in Trinidad and Tobago, and as far as I know, it is not so in Guyana; but this is a provision which we have here.

I have a letter here dated 6th September, 1971, which is addressed to the Chief Educational Officer, and it reads as follows:—

"It is becoming increasingly difficult to relate the standard required to that which carries an award at Oxford and Cambridge since the letter is now very much influenced by the demand for places at the two Universities."

In other words, what this means is that there is growing competition for admission into the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge in the United Kingdom and this because of the rapid expansion of the Universities in that country. The pressure on these two old institutions of learning is becoming even greater and so the standards have gone up, and this at a time when our own students are not spending as much time as hitherto in the Sixth Forms and maybe are having other factors that prevent them from devoting more of their life to learning and scholarship that is required for those who acquire high academic distinction. I merely say this or gave this particular indication first of all to show that those who gain exhibitions in lieu of scholarships are performing satisfactorily even though they were not awarded something called the Barbados Scholarship, and that the authorities in the University of Cambridge Local Examination Syndicate are aware that the standards are rising

for the award of open scholarships and open exhibitions at the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge. I think they should have set the whole matter in a different perspective.

We have established another Committee to review the Common Entrance Examinations and to make recommendations on the system of transfer of pupils from the Primary to Secondary level of Education.

4.20 p.m.

Mr. Deputy Speaker we established this particular Committee because for many years now there have been criticisms of this particular examination. Those parents whose children are successful in the Common Entrance Examination do not come out in public and say that they are satisfied with the system. Those parents whose children are not successful under the system, of course, are dissatisfied with the system, and there are a variety of commentators who pass views on this particular examination. They range from those who have difficulties in transposition to those who believe that here should be no examination at all, to those who believe that something is being done to the psyche of the children if not to the parents, and as many people as you can encounter have views on this particular examination.

It was in such a situation that on my advise the Cabinet decided to establish a Committee to consider this whole matter and make recommendations thereon because in a situation like that it is best to hear the views and comments expressed and to analyse those views and comments and to make recommendation in respect of the problem that is being considered. That Committee was established under the chairmanship of Dr. Leonard Shorey, and, I read in some section of the Press here that I received the Report from that Committee in December, 1974 or some such time. That was not the Advocate-News to which I am referring. The Report from this particular Committee was handed to me by the chairman in February of this year — 17th February, 1975. I submitted the Report to the Cabinet for information on the 6th March, 1975 and commenced studies of this Report soon thereafter.

Sir, I concluded those studies with the Educational Planning and Development Committee of my Ministry before the end of April this year and instructions were given for the preparation of proposals to the Cabinet on that paper. I wish you to recall that this was a Committee which was established to obtain the view of any person or body who or which had a

view to express on this particular matter, to analyse those views and make recommendations, and that Committee carried out its work and submitted its report, and I am in a position to announce that the recommendations of that Committee have been broadly accepted by the Cabinet and the implementation of those recommendations will commence forthwith.

With effect from next year instead of two examinations for what is now called the Common Entrance Examination but which will be styled the Entrance Examination to Secondary schools, instead of Part 1 and Part 2 there will be one part for the examination. There will only be one examination which should be held in the month of May; so those persons who have felt that there was a lot of excruciating exercises through which the students had to go, will not have that burden or complaint to make any more. There will be one examination. We do not see why the children should be put through any staging process; so there will be one examination which will be held in the month of May. The examination will be based, as the Committee recommended, on the syllabuses that will be made available to the schools. There will be a syllabus in English—a syllabus or curriculum guide in English, a syllabus or curriculum guide in Mathematics—and for next year the examination will be in these two subject areas as it has been.

4.30 p.m.

We do not believe that Education is limited only to English and Mathematics, and we do not wish our educational system to be distorted by a concentration on those two subjects even though they are subjects of major importance in the system. We believe that there are other bodies of knowledge which are as important for the students in our primary schools to grasp and to master, and hence we have taken a decision that two other subjects will be included in the examination. Those subjects will be Science and what is called Social Studies and there will be syllabuses for those two subjects. The subjects, Science and Social Studies will not be introduced next year as examination subjects, but they will be introduced as soon as practicable after that year.

The examinations are in two subjects, English and Mathematics, and at the earliest possible date afterwards Science and Social Studies will be added; and for those subjects we will be establishing for each particular subject a special panel. In other words, for English there will be a special panel made up of a Chairman and four other members appointed by the Minister on the advice of the Chief Education

Officer, and the special panel will have the following terms of reference: To prepare all necessary examination papers and to ensure that such papers are based on the officially approved syllabus or curricula guide for the particular subject.

These will be the terms of reference of that particular committee so that in English there will be an English subject panel consisting of five persons including the Chairman and others appointed by the Minister and their job will be to take the syllabuses that have been circulated to the schools and set a paper.

Let us say that the subject was English. They will set a paper and set up a marking scheme saying what marks should be awarded on that particular subject; but this paper will be set locally. There is no point at all of our talking about being an independent country and not facing up to the realities of independence. We have got to manage our own affairs in Education no less than in other areas. Whatever our strengths are and whatever our weaknesses are we will have to live with these strengths and these weaknesses.

So, the paper will be set here. I have not said that it will be printed here. This does not mean that we will abandon all concern for security. The security of the examination is important, so we will take the necessary measures to ensure that the security examination is guaranteed, and I believe that they will be having this paper printed outside of the country, certainly for the time being.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Examination Committee also made other recommendations. They recommended that the Common Entrance Examination should be restricted to one age, that is 11 years. We have accepted that and therefore from next year only 11 year olds will be entitled to take that examination. We believe that the 10 year olds will have a chance and that they should allow the 11 year olds to take this examination. So there will be one examination and it will be for 11 year olds.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, there is a further development still. In this country there is a shortage of resources at the secondary level, and there is no point pretending that one of the major problems is not that there is not enough capacity for the 10 year olds and the 11 year olds in our secondary school system. Our schools which admit 10 year olds put those children into a form called Lower First and this is space which is taken up in the schools. We believe that the

secondary school programme should be basically a five year programme, and we cannot afford to have valuable space taken up by additional forms in the schools.

The basic problem is that we do not have so far the number of places at the secondary level as we have at the primary level. That is not the fault of anyone. It is a fact of our existence at this stage. Each new secondary school that we construct — I should say the last one that we constructed at the Garrison was constructed at an approximate cost of \$2.5 million, and we are in the stage of the final plans for the construction of a School at Deacons Road, the Fernyhurst Secondary School, but the budgetary estimates that we have been given is in excess of that \$2.5 million. I merely mention this to indicate that it is a costly business to provide schools, and those schools that we have we must use to the maximum capacity and as efficiently as possible.

Therefore, Sir, we cannot afford to have persons sent to schools at this stage who have not completed the primary phase of education. There are some persons who have not completed the primary phase of education, and there have been under achievers or low scorers. Some are zero scorers. That is nothing not to admit because the world is made up of such persons. There are persons in the world who, whatever examination you set, will not get off the mark. Not like myself in cricket. I was able to get off the mark. It is a fact that some people do not get off the mark. It happens in all examinations.

4.40 p.m.

But what we will be doing from next September is indicating that those persons who do not reach a required standard will not be admitted into the newer secondary schools, they will have to complete their primary phase of education in the existing primary schools, so that the low achievers or the non-scorers or the non-performers will have to make good whatever deficiencies there may be in the primary schools, and therefore in places in the newer secondary schools — what in the past have been termed the comprehensive schools — will be added to the number of places available in the older secondary schools and students will now have to reach a certain standard to be determined from year to year in respect of admission to those schools. If someone scored zero, or failed to score, in the entrance examination to secondary schools they will remain at their primary school or in whatever approved educational institution the parents so wish to send that particular individual. This will make a larger number of places available at this particular level. We will

continue to award bursaries to students of assisted private schools.

In terms of the allocation of places, we will continue to use the services of an Allocation Committee which will consist of the Heads of the Government Secondary Schools under an independent chairman for the allocation of the places in both types of secondary school, and that committee will be empowered to take into account the performance of the candidate in the particular entrance examination, the preference for schools indicated by the parents, and in addition the committee will now be empowered within the framework of the foregoing criteria to endeavour as far as possible to use its discretion to allocate children to schools which are most conveniently located in order to reduce or eliminate undue hardship caused by the problems of transportation, so I expect that with effect from next year the long trek from Christ Church to St. Peter, or from Christ Church to St. Andrew or from St. John to St. Peter should become a thing of the past. The committee should endeavour as far as possible to use its discretion to see that that type of undue hardship is not imposed on students.

There has been some talk about the girls' marks, the level for girls had to be higher in the examination than for boys. This is a fact and it has become more pronounced over recent years. It is my own view, and this has nothing to do with International Women's Year, that the female teachers in our system are exercising their skills as teachers in a more efficient way than the male teachers in our system. It is my view also that the parents in this country are being too lax generally speaking with their male children when compared with their female children. In other words, there is greater attention paid to the girls in the homes than the boys. Those are my views and I believe that these two factors are not unrelated to the fact that over recent years there is a higher level of performance on the part of the females in our system — I am talking about students now — than the males. Of course it is also true that there are fewer places available for girls than for boys, so that in the last examination while I believe the boys obtained a score of 204 for admission into one of the older secondary schools, and that would be a place at the Alleyne School, the corresponding mark for a girl was I believe, up to this particular time, 218 with an A for the Essay. That is the type of disparity we have had but we are not going to permit this condition to continue, we believe in equality of opportunity and as from next year that type of disparity should be a thing of the past. The allocation of places will be strictly on

the basis of performance and the other criteria that are indicated, but there will be no reference to whether you are a boy or a girl. If you are a boy and you get 216 and a girl gets 217, the girl will get the place. If you are a girl and you get 216 and the boy gets 217 the boy will get the place. What I am saying, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is that in any equivocation we are stating that education in this country must become co-educational and the number of places or schools from which girls can choose will be increased and we will work towards the transformation of all of our schools into co-educational schools.

With effect from next year Combermere School will be permitted to admit girls into the first forms, and we will be consulting with the Heads of Departments in Government secondary schools so that whether you are the Headmaster of the St. Lucy Secondary School or the Eilerslie Secondary School and you are the Headmaster of Harrison College they are all secondary schools and they will all be paid at the same level, and this will go for the Deputy Heads and the Heads of Departments who get allowances as well.
4.50 p.m.

This will go for Deputy Heads and the Heads of Department Schools who get an allowance as well. The Committee made a further recommendation. I believe it was recommendation No. 31, and that recommendation has been accepted by the Cabinet. The recommendations have been set out in two stages. Stage I up to 1981, and then thereafter that for the restructuring of the school system that these recommendations imply, and there are other steps to be taken. We have amended recommendation No. 31 to read as follows:

"That in order to complete restructuring of the Secondary School Programmes VI Form teaching in the Secondary Schools should be discontinued as soon as practicable so as to permit implementation of Stage II proposals."

The Cabinet agreed that VI Form teaching will cease in our Secondary Schools at a date to be determined by the Government. Those places will become available for those who are within the Secondary School age.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, there has been a question of doubt about the quality between the older Secondary Schools and the newer Secondary Schools. There are some provisions which are made in the older Secondary Schools

which are not in the newer Secondary Schools. The Cabinet has agreed that the Minister should take all necessary steps towards equating the newer Secondary Schools with the older Secondary Schools as quickly as possible. This is both in terms of the physical and academic facilities as well as the non-teaching staff. For instance, right now we have Library Assistants provided at the older Secondary Schools, but to date none has been approved for the newer Secondary Schools. Provision in the schools will be made equal as soon as possible.

I wish to state, too, that as part of our expansion programme and the provision for as many persons as possible at the Secondary level, there will be an expansion carried out at Queen's College. We will make provision there for additional classrooms and other ancillary facilities in order to ensure that that particular school is expanded. We will be working on plans for the provision of additional schools. This has already been announced, but we are working on those proposals for new schools to be established at Deacons Road, Ferniehurse, in Christ Church as well as in St. James. We also have an extension plan for the Foundation School, and these plans should be finalised shortly. The plan for Queen's College would lead to the introduction of a third stream, and it should lead to an increase in the school's roll by approximately 150 students at this stage.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we have been looking at the provision for our 14-year olds and those who have to leave school earlier than we would wish, and there is an empowering provision in this Draft Bill before us for raising the school-leaving age from 14 to such higher age as the Minister may determine and leave it to be prescribed by an Order. In the meantime we have restructured what is now called the School Leaving Certificate, and this will, in future, be styled the Barbados Secondary School Certificate. This will be a certificate which will be available for issue to students attending our Secondary Schools. It will be in two stages. Stage I, which will be taken about the end of the first cycle of Secondary education, that is, around the age of 14 or 15, and Stage II which will be approximately two years after that particular time, and we will be equating Stage II of the examination. If a student obtains a Grade I pass at the Stage II of the Barbados Secondary School Certificate, that Grade I pass will be equated as the equivalent of a G.C.E. O'Level pass. We now grant such equivalent to passes at the L.C.C. Intermediate and other Examining Boards, and we will be doing that for our own examinations.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think that I have done most of the things which are related to this Bill and to some of the measures proposed in this particular Bill. This, therefore, is not merely a piece of legislation for the sake of bringing a piece of legislation to this Parliament. It is intended to be an instrument for educational, social, and economic change and improvement in this country. I believe and know that, when once it is hopefully given the assent of this Honourable Assembly, the business of continuing to bring about educational improvements in this country will continue with increased momentum.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it gives me very great pleasure to move that this Bill be read the second time.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE: I beg to second that.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Deputy Speaker, at this stage, in view of the fact that Your Honour had been sitting there for the last 2½ hours, I beg to move that the Sitting be now suspended for 15 minutes.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE: I beg to second that.

The Question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER suspended the Sitting accordingly.
5 p.m.

On resumption:-

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: This sitting is now resumed.

The Bell was rung and a quorum was obtained.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: When the sitting was suspended, the hon. member for St. Peter was about to address the Chamber. He may now proceed.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, we have been at pains to listen to the Hon. Minister of Education in one of his marathon speeches seeking to introduce this Education Bill, but this is what I would like to say before I proceed further. The Minister was good enough to admit that the Bill has been promised since 1962, and this brings me to the point of saying that it cannot be thought of or considered in any

respect as something that has now been conceived. On the contrary after reading the Bill and listening to the Minister one must come to the conclusion that it is something that has been hacked together over the period. It took fifteen years to produce this Bill. For if we were to fool ourselves that it was now conceived, all I can say is that the mountains have been in labour for fifteen years and all they have produced at this stage is a dirty, ridiculous little mouse.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, one would have thought that in the year 1975 an Education Bill would deal with and we should say attempt to effect a few things for our benefit. I would say the centralisation of a system for education, the standardisation, socialisation and democratisation of education. I would say further that the Bill in fact only tends to complicate further, to confuse in greater measure, to sectionalise to a very considerable extent and to fragment the present system of education in this country. Why do I say so? I say so because it seeks to maintain and increase the number of teaching services that we find in the system the number of bodies for appointing, dismissing and to some extent disciplining of a person or persons; the number of bodies advising the Minister on matters of educational policy.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, what the Bill in effect does is that it seeks to centralise all executive, administrative, consultative and discretionary powers and throw them in the hands of the Minister.

Now the Hon. Minister in addressing the Sixteenth Session of UNESCO General Conference in Paris in 1970 said that: the philosophy underlying the Barbadian educational system is that the potential of every citizen should be developed to the fullest extent so as to enable him to live harmoniously in his environment and to make a useful contribution to the economic system."

Now you will agree, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and all hon. members will agree that after hearing this from the Minister, which does not project the unifying of the system of education, it would be totally inconsistent in my humble view with those remarks of the Minister at UNESCO in Paris. What this Bill seeks to do is to perpetuate and to continue the differentiation which one must see as undermining the morale of teachers and students in what you would call the less fortunate secondary schools. You will find, Mr. Deputy Speaker, following closely on the words of the Minister that he himself sets out further to undermine his own system in that he does not

seek to tell us about one set of secondary schools. He is very specific in telling us about the newer secondary schools as against the older secondary schools — not one system of secondary education.

The Bill was first promised in 1962 and after spending fifteen years trying to produce it, this is what we now find coming out of the mouth of the Minister who is responsible totally for the administration of the Bill and everything that goes with it. The Minister was at pains, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to give us what he thought would have satisfied us on this question of the Common Entrance Examination, and particularly I believe all that he had to say about the Common Entrance Examination arose out of the incidents with which we are so familiar as being related to the last Common Entrance Examination.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, what are we left to think of a system of education which labels more than one-half of its students of those persons taking the examination as failures? What kind of examination is this that labels more than one half of the persons taking it as failures, and evidently sets about to reduce them to being second class and perhaps third class citizens?

5.30 p.m.

You will find, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that whenever you find a certain type of treatment meted out to one school or one set of students as against that meted out or given to the more prestigious group of schools, if I were to put it that way, when you find a system that sets out to do this it tells us that there is something sinister in the whole system of education, because what one does at the common entrance examination level must be seen to have some very considerable bearing on future placing of the child and everything that goes therewith.

I well remember, Sir, that a circular was sent out from the Minister of Education intimating that the Ministry was giving consideration to unifying the public school system in this country. I remember this was not so long ago. Now if that is so, can the Minister tell us what the Government is afraid of? Can he tell us? After all, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we have got to be satisfied that education is heading somewhere or nowhere and when one gives consideration to the fact that the Minister had to spend a very considerable amount of his time — he found it necessary to spend a very considerable amount of his time — in making out a case to support the passing of this Bill, one must come to the conclusion that he realizes that he had no case

upon which to base any claim whatsoever for producing a Bill that can be seen to be easily workable for the advancement of education generally in this country.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we have had from the demonstrations in the last common entrance examination — we have seen nothing to convince us as to the Minister's competence, or his Ministry's competence, in administering a simple examination like the common entrance examination. Now this Bill does not at any point — do not mind what the Minister tells us — it does not try at any point to deal with the more pressing needs of this society. The Minister cannot escape it. He tried to make some reference to it, as to what will happen next year and what will not happen, but the Minister must come face to face with realities in this matter of education in this country.

The zoning of secondary education in this country has got to be given much more serious consideration than the Minister would give us to believe that he and his several adhoc committees that he has been functioning with from time to time would recommend. We must set about what I would call the standardisation of secondary education in this country and moreso, Mr. Deputy Speaker, of the examination system. The Minister was just telling us that a paper is going to be set — a certificate is going to be issued to be called the Barbados Secondary School Certificate and that its value would be equivalent to the G.C.E. 'O' Level. I do not know, Mr. Deputy Speaker if the Minister is referring to the examination which was taken in June by a number of pupils in some of the schools, and you might very well recall, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that it was brought to light that whilst the paper was tendered to the children as a paper on Religious Knowledge that last two questions on that paper took the children — some of them I believe — bolting down a dark alley to end up somewhere with dissertations on masturbation, venereal disease, menopause and things of that sort — a paper on Religious Knowledge.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Bill does not in any respect set about the upgrading or the updating of a comprehensive secondary school system. It does not; and nothing we have heard from the Minister is lacking from the Bill but although the Minister tries to patch the Bill up there is nothing which gives us any guidance whatsoever as to the updating and the upgrading of the comprehensive secondary schools in this country. All you are hearing about is the newer secondary and the older secondary; setting one set of schools against the other from the very

outset. One would have thought that the Minister in his position and with his experience, limited as it is, or might be, ought to have known better in a day and age such as this. Now what do we find? That the Bill does not set out to eliminate what we would call the hierarchy of the secondary schools. It does not. We have heard here that those schools presently retaining sixth forms will as from some time or the other be not carrying these forms; but the Minister makes this point, that he is trying to remove these sixth forms so as to provide places for the children who would be entering at the bottom, so to speak.

5.40 p.m.

It is not a question of deciding whether the presence of the sixth forms is advantageous to the system or not; but the Minister is now trying to catch up so to speak. They have been seeing it all the time, but now for some good reason they are ringing the bell early o'clock in this Education Bill. It is not school time yet, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

What you will find is that what they are trying to do is to entrench it in the body of the law. We have been led up the garden path on this question of free secondary education. I am going to come back to that later because I have to make it known where and when free secondary education really was in this country. For all that we might hear of this free education system, this Bill still provides for, still encourages and maintains the private school system. You will know, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that some of these private schools are more business concerns than educational institutions. The Minister cannot deny this. The Minister very well knows that this is so because I am sure that he has a very good experience in that some of these private schools are taking children and teaching them this and the other; and believe me, Sir, they are not even putting icing on the worst things that you can put icing on. The Minister knows what I am talking about.

Now, in fairness to the nation, it was nothing short of a fraud perpetrated on these people, I think it was in the month of August last year during the Constitution Debate. When the Government came to amend the Constitution it was given out to the people and everybody was looking forward to it. I am speaking on the educational side of it, the establishment of a Teaching Service Commission. Everybody had been looking forward to this.

They told the people, and everybody was given the impression that this was being done and now from henceforth you would have one

Teaching Service common to all teachers teaching at all the institutions of this country. That was held up to the people of this nation in 1974. I think that I am right in saying that we have been given to believe that as this had been seen in progress in Jamaica and had been successful, that it would be established here.

Well, Sir, let us see how far we have reached in this exercise. Undoubtedly the Minister must be ever mindful of the power that the trade unions have been wielding in this country. I mean the trade unions representing the teachers and one must wonder if it is a case where the Minister finds that he is too small to deal with one teaching body and one teachers union.

As I see it, Mr. Deputy Speaker, one teaching service would undoubtedly be more conducive to better planning and an improved co-ordination of the development, if there is to be a development of education in this country. As I said, you must bear in mind that this Bill is not well conceived at all.

Now, as for general administration, when it comes to the question of administration there must be power; but here we find a concentration of power, and this does not take into consideration the policy making function of the Ministry; but it concentrates all the powers of an administrative and executive nature in the hands of the Minister. I think that it is fair that Section 5 states that the Chief Education Officer shall be responsible for general administration. Yet we find that comprehensive powers throughout this Bill are given to the Minister. In other words we are being told that the Chief Education Officer is bound to carry out the administrative orders of the Minister. The Bill tells us that the Chief Education Officer shall be responsible for general administration, but since the power is concentrated in the hands of the Minister it means and it can only be taken to mean the only reasonable interpretation to be applied thereto must be that the Chief Education Officer must carry out the administrative powers of the Minister.

5.50 p.m.

Let us journey from there, Mr. Deputy Speaker, briefly and let us deal with the National Education Advisory Commission. To what extent is it a central advisory commission? We would like to hear from the Minister. Is it to advise the Minister on matters connected with the Bill? Is it to advise the Minister on matters connected with his functions under this

Bill? What is important to us is this, the Minister is free to refer some matters dealt with by the National Advisory Commission of Education to special committees, but the amusing situation surrounding this is that these committees are selected and appointed by the Minister himself. What a mockery of this whole exercise! The Minister may refer some matters from the National Advisory Commission to special Education Committees but mark you, these Committees to which the Minister will be referring these matters are committees carefully selected and by all means bearing the rubber stamp for all times of the Minister himself from whom matters will be referred. What is the purpose of all this? What is the purpose behind this, Mr. Deputy Speaker? Who is the Minister trying to fool in this? You do not educate people by trying to fool them, you tell them the truth about things. If you want your own children in your own house to learn you have to tell them the truth at all times, if you tell them lies what will be the total result of all you try to teach them thereafter? What is more, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Minister may refer these matters to these special committees after they have already been dealt with by the National Advisory Commission. What then is the purpose of the National Advisory Commission? After these matters have been properly dealt with by the properly constituted National Advisory Commission on Education the Minister then has authority to refer matters that this commission has already dealt with to these committees. What is the purpose then of this National Advisory Commission? All we see is this, the day the advice of the National Advisory Commission on Education suits the Minister he will be accepting it, the day it does not suit him he will be referring the matter to his specially chosen committee so that he can get all that he wants. That is as far as we have reached in the year 1975, this is what they have been hanging together from before 1962, because the Bill was promised in 1962. How smoothly does the Minister expect a Bill phased on a matter such as this, a system ironed out in this manner, how smoothly can he expect to have it functioning for the good of this nation?

Part III of this Bill provides this Hon. Chamber with nothing that is really new in the system of public education, it defines what is presently existing, that is what it does for us, but it does not add anything new. It sets about to increase what we should call the reduplication of management boards, that is what it does, when for the sake of standardisation and centralisation one would have been hoping to see a reduction in these.

As for the public secondary schools and the secondary school teaching commission, we cannot wink our eyes to the fact that there is a certain amount of snobbery and sectionalism in our public educational system. What the Bill sets out to do for us now is to entrench the class distinctions that presently exist in our system. That is what this Bill does for us.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have listened to the Minister telling us about consultation with teaching bodies and other organisations. I do not know if the Minister knows that we understand what that really means, I do not know if he knows this, because if he were *au fait* with what is existing in our present system when it comes to the question of snobbery and class distinction the Minister would not have had the gumption to stand up before this Hon. House and attempt to introduce in the manner he did a Bill of this nature and then to seek the support of anybody in this Hon. Chamber in giving it a second reading.
6.00 p.m.

Now, let the Minister explain why is it that all of our teachers are not brought under one umbrella, so that they would have one administration and the conditions of service applicable to one would be applicable to the others? Why do we have a system like this? This Bill, reviewing the present system, only seeks, in my view, to make the system more complex rather than simplifying, rationalising, and standardising the system. That is where we are heading. Rather than making it simpler for us, rather than making it more rational and standardising it, the Minister backs up the whole Bill in his efforts to make the whole system more complex. Why does the Minister set about in this Bill not to have one body appointing teachers but two bodies? Why has he seen it necessary to do this? You will find, again, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that one body makes the appointment. Do you know how it has to make the appointment? On the advice of another body. They have been exercising in what is called tomfoolery. You could not expect to associate this sort of thing with a Minister of Education. We come now to the question of vesting property in Boards of Management.

In the 1890 Act the same situation existed. What we are inviting, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is the centralisation of ownership rather than centralising of power. This is a power Bill. All this Bill does is to set about to centralise power in the hands of the Minister when it comes to the question of vesting the ownership of property in the hands of Boards of

Management. We want everything centralised. We do not want this person possessing this and that person possessing that.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we agree that if there is no attendance at school there would be no school, and we would not want any school places. We agree that we must try to get the children in schools, but, if one were to read this Bill carefully, the present system, or what is envisaged as likely to be the operation of our School Attendance Officers, makes one inclined to inquire whether they will be the Mongoose Gang people. This is what he has made those officers, and this is what the Bill seek to provide. There is nothing realistic about this matter. I believe it is Section 53 that gives these officers power to enter any premises and to arrest. You are giving these people power to enter any premises and to arrest any person that they believe to be of school age, of either sex, and to take him or her home or wherever he likes. Mr. Deputy Speaker, what would be interesting to know is, Who is going to give this written authority to those people? This, in my humble submission, is a pernicious section of this Bill, and the Minister, as Minister of Education, ought to have known this.

With regard to the exemption from school attendance, once a parent or guardian provides evidence showing the ground as specified in Section 51(1), I think there should be no discretion on the part of the Chief Education Officer to refuse. What kind of nonsense is this? This is a Bill for the upliftment and advancement of this nation educationally. That is what this Bill is all about. Now, to the Minister, mad already with power, this Bill provides an appeal. Do you know what is important to all parents and guardians? Who is to advise the Minister on his findings on the appeal? That is what we want to know.

6.10 p.m.

Who is to advise the Minister as to their findings on the appeal? If the Bill provides that the same Chief Educational Officer is to perform that function, it places him in the position of being (a) judge, (b) jury and (c) executioner. Could this be fair? Does this make for the upliftment of a nation?

Mr. Deputy Speaker, let us look at the registration of teachers another aspect of the Bill which in our view is vicious. A Registration Board is set up to decide on qualifications and matters pertaining thereto. We are very well aware, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that when reference is made to "after consultation" with this Board

or that Board or this person or the other person, it merely means that I have reached a decision and I will tell you the decision I have reached. That is consultation. You cannot say you have not been consulted, but you have been consulted as to what action I am going to take, and I just tell you about it. You need not open your mouth for firm and irrevocable is my doom which I pronounce or intend to pronounce; but remember it will be said that I put into effect whatever I propose doing after consultation with you. That is the type of consultation that you have about this place.

You will find, Sir, that an Appeals Tribunal is set up, but a further mockery is to be made of the system to be introduced. If for some good reason or another a teacher is refused registration, he is refused registration by the Board appointed for that purpose. All well and good. There is a tribunal to which an appeal can be made, but here you come to the point where under section 56 the same person who has been refused registration by the Board can be registered by the Minister. You are either going to have confidence in the Board which you set up and the Board be given elbow room to function, or you are going to name yourself as the Board, as Minister or whatever else and do away with anything called a Board or tribunal. Let us face facts in this matter. What you will find, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is that after the Board has refused to register a teacher, the Minister for Education can register that teacher and evidently we do not believe that the Board is going to function on any political party basis; so that when the Board refuses to register a teacher it must be assumed that the Board had reasonable evidence to justify its refusal. But that same teacher can be registered by the Minister who has power to register him for six years in the first instance, and that is not all. That teacher can serve for six years and have his registration renewed by his Minister without any reference to the tribunal or to the Board. If this is the case, Mr. Deputy Speaker, what justification could there be for the appointment of a Board or a tribunal? Why doesn't the Minister tell us he is going to run it as he likes or as he feels he should do, because if you are going to appoint a Board and set up an Appeals Tribunal and over the head of all these the Minister then has power if the Board or Tribunal refuses registration to say, you can refuse as much as you like; old boy you go up to Holy Innocent, I have sent you there for six years and at the end of six years I will renew it for you without reference to either Board or Tribunal.

What then Mr. Deputy Speaker is the purpose of all these safeguards the Minister tells us about? They could only be bodyguards for the Minister because somebody would have to lick him. If the Minister is going to perform the function of a Board, let us be told this in no uncertain terms and remove this section as we understand it will be, from the Bill. There is one thing about this Minister and it is that he might not like all this power.

Let us just look at it this way, Mr. Speaker. We have the medical practitioners who have a Board or council; the Legal Profession have their own organisation. What we are submitting is that in our view this Registration Board should comprise exclusively of teachers who have long experience and association with education and matters related thereto. After all, the function of this Bill must be to uplift the nation educationally, but it must at the same time safeguard the interests of the teachers who have a most formidable task to perform if the nation is really to be uplifted.

Now you come to the situation where you have a Board to discipline and to dismiss, but to be advised by the Teaching Service Commission.

6.20 p.m.

The danger, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we have got to look at is this. We have to ask who is to decide what? Now you have this Registration Board which will deal with professional misconduct. We must ask whose discipline and when; and I am submitting, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that there must be very good reasons for enquiring into these.

Now I am sure, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that we have before us enough to tell us that the Minister even at this stage is like some pupils, bolting down a dark alley. The Minister! We have heard what the Minister had to say on this question of the Barbados Scholarship which they do not propose naming the Barbados Scholarship any more, and what not, and that in any year there will be a no-limit to the number of scholarships.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is my view that the education of the nation at any level must not be left solely in the hands of a Minister of Education, that he decides this year there must be six, next year there must be seven, and one year there will be none. Let the Minister be honest in all of this. There is one reason why they want to do away with this Barbados Scholarship and call it by any other name or whatever they feel. The Minister must

understand that the public already realizes how the students - you have heard him say how well some of these people who have been granted scholarships and have gone abroad and have been studying at other institutions - have been performing. This is evidence, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the people have the ability but there is something lacking at some stage, that you cannot now produce anybody to reach the Barbados Scholarship standard of yesteryear and to get away from all of this the Minister is prepared to cheapen everything in the whole educational system. To cheapen it; that is all he is doing.

Even with our secondary schools, if you build one it is no longer a secondary school; it is a newer secondary school. All of this baloney from the Minister of Education who should be directing the nation far better. Why must the Minister be left from year to year to decide what is to be the standard? The Minister wants that authority. He must decide what is to be the standard; what standard is to be reached. The Minister alone. How do you expect to operate for the good of the nation, Mr. Deputy Speaker?

The Minister, how broad is his breast? How big is his heart? This year twelve scholarships, another year no scholarships; the Minister alone can decide all of this and say it is for the good of the nation that you bring this Bill in its present form

Mr. Deputy Speaker, today the Minister was again at it in referring to this consistent yardstick of excellence. He finds himself being followed or being led by an hon. member of the Other Place the Hon. Minister of Trade. He too is on this yardstick of excellence. If this, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is to be seen as the total achievement, why must it be left alone to the Minister to decide such vital issues in our educational system? (*Aside:* Because he is the boss.) The hon. member is saying he is the boss. We have bosses and we have bossies, but Mr. Deputy Speaker, we have been told and we appreciate the significance of an education Bill. All we see this Bill doing is showing itself in almost the same form as the 1890 Act. That is what we see.

6.30 p.m.

It cannot be denied that this is 1975 and that there is an abundance of room for improvement on any 1890 Act. Conditions are changing. Human beings are not what they used

to be in the 1890s. You have a far more outreaching community to cater for and all the things that go with that; but, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is very interesting that this Act cannot be seen to have made any preparation or provision at any point for delegating the technical responsibility. There is no delegation of responsibility for the day to day technical administration which this Bill seeks to make provision for.

Anyone, Mr. Deputy Speaker, who has to advise the Minister on any aspect of education must not be seen as any fly by night person but must be seen as a person with wide and long experience. After all a Bill such as this seeks to replace the Act of 1890, but we cannot forget that the 1890 Bill has itself been subjected to amendments on several occasions.

I have each year of each amendment noted, but the point is that it has been found necessary from time to time to upgrade the Act itself as best as it could have been upgraded to suit conditions as they were then seen or could be seen by those in authority.

I have heard the Minister try to recount the history of our school system. I still remember — it is difficult for me to forget the period between 1949 and 1950 — what was then the Department of Education. It tried as best it could to establish what we call parity of esteem. It tried to give equal status to the 10 grammar schools at the time, and they were then anticipating the secondary modern schools. The Department of Education tried to do all that it could to give equal status to those schools that were coming into being.

I want to tell the Minister of Education that in October, 1949, there was a Paper prepared by Major Glendon Reid. The number of the Paper is 53215. The Minister might not want to hear about these things at all. They do not mean anything to the Minister now. He has never read it or seen what that Paper has to tell him. Also in December, 1949 there was a sample curriculum. That Paper was No. 53227 of December 1949, and this dealt with what was then called the Common Course. Now, the Minister cannot state, he cannot have the effrontery to suggest that this bore no relation to anything in Education because publications coming out of his own Ministry held out these for the world to see.

When this Common Course was introduced you will find that Glendon Reid, an expatriate wrote this: "I consider the introduction of the Common Course a great step forward in the

Education of the colony". He was an expatriate undoubtedly surrounded by a number of Barbadians who had burned the midnight oil and who had come up from the ranks to occupy positions which brought them near enough to be able to assist Glendon Reid, the then Director of Education or whatever was his appropriate title at the time. That is what an expatriate wrote.

My reason for referring to this is to show that as we went through the years to provide our sons and daughters with a system of education, we did it proving that it was comparable with the requirements of the times. That is why there are so many proud Barbadians all over the world who must today rejoice and say that the 1890 Act, bad as some people might have us believe that it is, the system as revised from time to time after that Act has been established was such that no one had any cause for regrets.

The introduction of the Common Course was one way of trying to root out what we would call the elitism that we found existing in our Grammar Schools at that time. because in this Common Course you would find that children who now attend Speightstown Boys' School or Speightstown Girls' School, Black Bess School, Boscobelle School and such schools could remain at those schools and take the L.C.C. and even the G.C.E.

That is what the Common Course was set up to do, to lay the foundation for these children to remain in their respective school areas or district and getting the benefit of an educational system that would have ruled out all of this bussing that the Minister now admits today creates a hardship. 6.40 p.m.

He says that the measures he proposes taking in the very near future will rule out some of the hardships now experienced by children. Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is beastly unfair to this nation that between 1962 and 1975 our poor, underfed children have had to face these hazards, these hardships now known to the Minister of Education. He did not know them all the time even in making replies to questions that I tabled in this Hon. House the Minister pretended to be ignorant of all of this. Even then. On 15th July, this month, that Minister of Education there, in replying to questions asked by me said these words:

"Primary schools are located throughout the island and children of primary school age can reach these schools without having to travel very long distances by bus."

who did not know that primary schools are located throughout the island? we did not ask him if he did not have them throughout the island, but he says: "... and children of primary school age can reach these schools without having to travel very long distances by bus." He says children of primary school age. Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is the Minister losing his wits? he could not be, he is the Minister of Education and if he loses his wits the whole system is broken down, so it means that if the Minister is telling us that children of primary school age can reach the schools, it is not every child that is of primary school age that is attending the primary school in the district in which he lives, so the Minister must come to grips with the situation and face up to the fact that when they were trying to make people believe they could travel for as long as they like for five or ten cents it is not that they were caring for the children and for the children's future to the extent that the Minister would really have us to believe at that time, because the Minister is aware of the fact that it is not every child of primary school age that is attending a primary school in his respective district.

He says they can reach their schools without having to travel very long distances by bus. He says it is planned to continue the present programme of providing secondary schools to serve defined centres of population to eliminate the necessity for children to travel over extended distances. One reply to one sentence is confused with the other, but the Minister today tells us the school they built at the Garrison cost \$2.5 million, which means that we will have to go and borrow further hundreds of millions of dollars — the Minister has better postpone this Bill and come with a Resolution for the money — because what is needed is schools, and the Minister must admit that teams of experts from overseas have advised that the present schools are under utilised. The Minister must admit all of this, when they were trying to borrow money they were told this is no uncertain terms. The Minister has to let his advisers adjust themselves to come to grips with the situation and set about finding ways and means and not building one prestigious architectural structure for \$2.7 million. We are submitting that the Minister could certainly have schools built for far less than this to accommodate the people's children who are thirsting for education in this country of ours. That is what the Minister has to face up to, providing school places, not telling us you are going to chase out those at top to make room at the bottom for others, the ones you are attempting to drive out are being equipped to take their places that they can contribute to the economic situation of this country. That is what the Minister said at the UNESCO General Conference in 1970. Are they sufficiently equipped to go out to live

harmoniously in their environment? How can they live harmoniously in their environment when some of them only have seen the form and do not know what it is, and the Minister intends to send out those at the top.

It is fair, reasonable or just bearing in mind the relation to the millions of dollars voted annually to be spent on education in this country? Is the Minister setting his priorities right? We say no. Is the Minister receiving the best advice? He may be, he may very well be. Is the Minister acting on the good advice that he may receive from time to time? We say we see no evidence of this. He tells us now that he intends to implement some of the recommendations of the Shorey Commission forthwith. If the Minister of Education in this country finds himself or his Ministry or his educational system so subjected to an enquiry that he finds recommendations demanding implementation forthwith, one must come to the conclusion that the area covered by that enquiry must be seen as having reached the brink of disaster the day upon which the enquiry had entered upon it. It was on the brink of disaster. Can we therefore see ourselves, see this nation see any part of the educational system that this country has been proud of for all the years approach the brink of disaster and not call on the Minister of Education to resign?

6.50 p.m.

Could we be doing justice to this nation, Mr. Deputy Speaker? Education is on the brink of disaster, and the Minister of Education is telling us that he is sitting firmly in the saddle! What kind of saddle? We may not convince the Minister that he is playing possum with education in this country, but we are certain that we can impress upon the Minister of Finance in this country, who is the Minister's employer, certain things. We are confident that there are a sufficiently dissatisfied people in this country with the functioning of our educational system as to bring about, in no uncertain terms, the things they want to see. I say further that the Minister has achieved some measure to his own credit when he was pursuing his own studies, but his credit ended when he stopped studying for his own benefit. He has no credit at all, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in our estimation in his performance in the Ministry of Education from the day he took office. There have just been bungling and tumbling, sending people about, setting up Commissions of Inquiry, all to no purpose whatsoever.

If the Shorey Commission, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is now to have its findings, or some part of its findings, implemented forthwith, my only recommendation is that the Shorey Commission

should be installed in the Ministry of Education, and the Minister of Education and a lot of others in there with him ought to be shuttled out to some remote area to some little school somewhere and let the Shorey Commission, or any other Commission, do some more probing in our educational set up and see if we can come here with an Educational Bill that bears some relation to what this nation is aspiring.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, what does the Minister mean by telling us that it is planned to continue the present programme of providing Secondary Schools to serve defined centres of the population to eliminate the necessity for children to travel over extended distances? If on the 15th July, the Minister is telling us this. Where does the Minister set about to implement this in this Act before us? I will not support anybody who attempts to call the Minister of Education "a brother two-mouth" I would not do that at all, but we see the Minister talking through his hat — and he never wears one — at one time, and something else escaping from him somewhere else that bears no meaning in relation to the promotion of our educational system for the benefit of this nation.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, he tells us of his Common Entrance Allocation Committee. On the 15th July, in reply to Questions tabled by me, he says:

"Meanwhile, the Common Entrance Allocation Committee is being authorised to use its discretion in ensuring that in the final allocation of secondary school places, as far as possible, no undue hardship is imposed on any qualified candidate by requiring him/her to travel very long distances."

Mr. Deputy Speaker, what the Common Entrance Allocation Committee has to set about doing is to ask the Hon. Minister: "Mr. Minister, what allocations are you telling us about, when you do not have places in which to put the children to whom we must allocate these places in the schools? You do not have school places, so what allocations are you telling us about? Use discretion about what? About the impossible?"

Mr. Deputy Speaker, education is nothing with which lunatics must rant and rave. When the Minister puts something in writing and he reads it, he must understand what he writes. The Minister of Education must not find himself like the Minister of Health. The Minister of Health got up in this Honourable House and made a bold statement on the institution under his command, and then in a few months after the Prime Minister went on Television and made

people to believe that the Minister of Health did not know what he was talking about, or that he was a liar, and the Minister of Health said nothing about it. I do not want the Minister of Education to find himself in this position.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, throughout these replies by the Minister they bear out, in no uncertain terms, what I have been saying. They must now rest indelibly on the mind of the Minister. He wants his Committee to see that there is no undue hardship. If the Minister is aware of the fact that the children are undergoing undue hardship, is it not then incumbent on the Minister, as a Minister in charge of such a responsibility, to find places for which these children could be assigned from time to time in the various schools? The Minister will make us to understand that he has such things under such control that, year after year, he will weed out from the top to make space for those at the bottom. He will decide on how many scholarships there must be because they cannot now reach the standard of yester year, as I have said before. and he will have things in his grip.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, let the Minister of Education understand that people are not taking him seriously on matters of education in this country. We are not taking his Government seriously on matters of education in this country. You can bring school books, cheap bus fares, or what you like. You cannot at this last stage after the nation has been somewhat rebelling and people have been more vociferous on this occasion than they have been in the past, to do what he is seeking to do. The Minister must understand that people are not prepared to be fooled and bluffed by anybody. You talk of having this degree and the next degree, having taught at this University and the next University, but that does not necessarily mean that you can produce in reality the educational needs of the people in the community that you are supposed to serve.

7 p.m.

This Minister can never, Mr. Deputy Speaker, make the nation believe that he has ever been with the nation in matters of education or otherwise, and that being the case, the Minister must find it extremely difficult to comprehend the true situation facing this nation. I have every reliance on the education officers in our present system. They are the people who for the most part have been bound by their close association, by their devotion and duty to be the people who must know, who must be apprised and acquainted with conditions facing the youthful nation as we happen to be. Why is it like this? It

is like this, Mr. Deputy Speaker, because the Minister of Education throws on some double-decker big jacket and struts about the place not giving ear to his Chief Education Officer or any other officer for that matter. In this matter he has set aside his five constituent committees and what does he do? The Ministry of Education must comprise of a Board of Education with five constituent committees, but the Minister has no use for these Committees. You legislate to set up five constituent committees, but you hear the Minister's reply to questions tabled by me in respect of these five constituent committees neither of which has met in the past three years, or if they did meet, discussed nothing. But the Minister goes on the back of these five constituent committees that he puts out of existence and instals some little lackeys of his as an adhoc committee to administer the affairs and cause nothing but an unholy muddle of the educational system of this country.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Minister does not have any pride; his power has taken the place of his pride. He has a greater responsibility to this nation than any other Hon. Minister. Look at the total sum of money allocated for education in this country. When it was \$11 million spent on education, you could produce a Barbados Scholar. On the \$35 million or more what are you going to produce? You will produce in the future such as the Minister cares to allocate. The Minister does not understand that we have thousands of educated people in this community. What does he think it is? Does he think he is dealing with the 9+ or 10+, not even the 11+? The 11+ are giving trouble if he understands what is happening.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, education is a continuing process, says the Minister. What the Minister must understand is that whether he is alive or dead education will go on in this country. And the Minister must understand further that if there has been thrust upon his shoulders a responsibility which is too grave, the Minister ought to be sensible enough to shake it off.

Not many months ago the Minister was in truth feeling out in his Cabinet circles by making you to believe he was willing to resign. Mr. Deputy Speaker, when I learned that the Minister did not in truth and in fact resign or that his Cabinet colleagues did not insist on his going, I said that if a major disaster had never struck the educational system of this country on that day when we saw that the Minister would not be resigning, something more than a total disaster

had come upon this country and its educational system. It is not the Minister's qualifications that fit him to take the place of Minister of Education in this country; the Minister needs to bring much more than this to bear upon a situation such as this. The situation is indeed grave. Our nation of young people are crying out. The Minister is making preparation to add to the numbers who are already thrown on the streets to become bums, throw-offs and rejects by the nation. That is his total contribution to the educational system of this country.

Let the Minister provide the figures for the vast numbers who leave the various institutions year after year. Let the Minister tell us here and now what his Department has been able to establish for these young people who leave school to say how many are placed and how many are left on the unemployment role to fill the streets with the type of people that the Minister will be going out to in a couple of months to make believe that this is this and this is not that.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Minister told this Honourable House on the 15th July that he was the biggest hypocrite that ever stood as a Minister of Education. Why did he say so.....

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I object to those words used by the hon. Member, and I will ask the hon. Member to withdraw those words.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will ask the hon. Member to withdraw those words.

Mr. HINDS: If you call on me to withdraw any words, I withdraw them.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The words have been withdrawn.

Mr. HINDS: I withdraw them, but the Minister showed himself ranking amongst the biggest hypocrites that Christendom has produced when he said "it is the Government's policy to work towards the establishment of a unified teaching service and a unified secondary school system. However, it is not practicable to give a date for the total achievement of that policy objective."

Mr. Deputy Speaker, nowhere in this Bill can it be borne out what the Minister stood up in this Honourable House and read out on the 15th July.

7.10 p.m.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, you have this Education Bill before you and I thank God today Mr. Deputy Speaker that, we read, we mark and we understand. The Minister is asking us to digest what he gave to us on the 15th July in reply to a question and it is now borne out in the Act, or the Bill which is before this Honourable House.....

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: On a point of elucidation. Mr. Deputy Speaker, the hon. member is stating that I said on the 15th July that I was working towards a unified teaching service but that I could not give an exact date when that would be achieved. The hon. member appears now to be saying, or is in fact stating, that on 22nd July I present a Bill and there is no unified teaching service. Where is it that I have said that there would be a unified teaching service by the 22nd July?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Your point is taken.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, do you not now see why education cannot progress any further in this country? Do you not see for yourself? You have it from the Minister's own mouth now why education cannot progress under him. (*Aside*)

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have not made any sacrifice to compare with the hon. member for St. Michael South Central. (*Aside*)

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, Order. The Education Bill, please.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is all very well and good for us to hear from this quarter, or the other quarter, what some members cannot themselves do on the floor of this House; they can do it in an aside. The hon. Minister in his own report of the Ministry of Education for the years 1957-60 gives the public to understand quite truthfully that the small private schools to which he referred earlier today — they were first for girls whether or not he knows that is a matter for him — were established as early as 1627. The first elementary school, Mr. Deputy Speaker, for poor white children was established in the parish of St. George in the year 1686, and the money for establishing this school was provided by a Mr. John Elliott and a Mr. Roland Barclay.

Now we must be able, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to make a contribution on an

Education Bill of this sort. One does not have to boast that "I am a lawyer." That is the mistake that some people make in this hon. House and in this country; that one has got to be able to show off a badge or some string around your neck saying "I am a lawyer" and once you are a lawyer you have a licence to knowledge. That is what is believed by some of these people. Mr. Deputy Speaker, the private elementary school system as established in 1924 was by Bishop Coleridge and he left in 1942 leaving us at that time with about 200 of these elementary schools. (*Aside*) Not 1924 Mr. Deputy Speaker, but in 1824 and he left us in 1842, not 1942 — with about 200 of these schools.

Now it is of some credit to the Minister that he has not caused us to know whether he knows that the 1890 Act was in truth and in fact the fifth Education Act that this country has seen. This country had an education Act in 1850, it had one in 1858, it had another in 1878 and its fourth Act in 1890. This is education for the Education Minister. I must not be held responsible if the Minister does not know; I must not be held responsible if the responsibility is thrown on me today to educate the Minister of Education. I accept the responsibility.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, now what have we against the 1890 Act as such? The Minister has in no way given any broad outline as to the failure of this Act. He has given the broadest outline possible as to his own failure in managing education. Others might have failed before him but not to the extent that he has.

We heard the Minister telling us about consultation with these teaching bodies and what not — or teacher bodies rather — but he made mention of the establishment, I think, in 1912, of the Rawle Training Institute.
7.20 p.m.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Minister ought to be man enough to have told this Honourable House that members of the Rawle Training Institute still existing submitted memoranda to the Ministry of Education when invited to do so, and on no occasion was it acknowledged that anything had been received, nor was there an invitation sent out to any of these officers to attend any of these consultative meetings. On no account was an invitation sent out to any of the members to appear in person and discuss the memoranda submitted from time to time.

But, Sir, the Minister is still going to tell us that there was the Rawle Training Institute

which turned out six trained persons for Barbados and only nine for other West Indian territories. In other words, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Rawle Training Institute in 1912 and in those years made a valuable contribution to the educational system of this country and that of other West Indian countries.

How can the Minister justify excluding the Rawle Training Institute, an institute which merited the Minister's mention here today about the contribution that it made to this country's educational system when it did not merit an invitation to attend and have any of these discussions or consultations with the Minister? What kind of excluding system has been instituted in this exercise? Why did he exclude the Rawlites?

It is not for me to judge the Minister by a lack of performance. The public will judge. They are fooling 300 or 400 children that you have free secondary education, getting up all about the place, on platforms and school rostrums and making believe that they are providing free secondary education from the cradle to the grave. In truth and in fact what are they doing? They are soaking other taxpayers to provide a few school places for a handful of people. (*Asides*)

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to move that the House be suspended for supper.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: That will be taken care of by the Hon. Leader of the House.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I am saying as a member of the House that I would like the House to be suspended for supper.

Mr. HINDS: When we look back and see that we have a School Meals Programme — the Minister referred to how in 1937 milk and biscuits came into existence at the schools. He would not call it a nutrition scheme. If he had referred to it as a nutrition scheme it would take some of the shine off of his new ball. So it was a milk and biscuits scheme in 1937.

Whether it was a nutrition scheme or milk and biscuits reinforced with yeast, whatever it was, and however it may be criticised, there is one thing and that is that no child of primary school age, no child attending a primary school from 1937 on has ever been without the benefit of the milk and biscuits. All primary schools were served with the milk and biscuits. You have a school feeding programme and children have gone to school for their entire school life under the primary school system and they do not know what school meals are like or what the programme is all about.

You will find that these are prestige schemes for the Minister and for nobody else. Prestige has its mishaps and its bad spots, but we are not condemning that. What we are condemning is that after you have introduced a school feeding programme for children for primary school age and after you have been doing it for about 13 years, some children in some schools have never got it and will never get it. Is not that progress? It amounts to nothing short of a total disregard for the needs of the nation, a total disregard for the true needs of the nation.

You come forward with your school meals programme to get popular votes, but you never stop to think of the hundreds of thousands of mouths over the other side of the hill that will never taste it. They may pass by some school meals kitchen and smell it, and that pleases the Minister. How can the Minister justify his retention of a Ministry that serves that nation so sectionally, if I can put it that way?

You legislate, Mr. Deputy Speaker, not for one section of the nation, but for the whole nation. You initiate a school meals system not for one school. If it is a system it is a system. They call it a pilot system. These pilots have long ago retired. All of these pilots have had their licences withdrawn. They have been grounded so that the children are now left to fish for themselves.

That is the contribution by the Hon. Minister of Education. What has the Minister told us now about his school building programme? I do not know if he has promised some school up north. They promised this Education Bill in 1962 and it has come in 1975. Can you want it better? It is a first class contribution. I will serve you in 1975 even if I serve you out.

7.30 p.m.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, what is his total contribution? He is trying wherever possible to cause all the school population, or as many as he possibly can to congregate in the parish of St. Michael. He tells us now about his ferniehurst project and what not, but what the Minister has got to do, tell us not only that there are schools in certain areas where children can get their education without having to do this amount of travelling, but the Minister must also be seen to implement a scheme and he must be able enough to implement it if he is satisfied on the face thereof that it is the best for the nation. Hedging and dodging and shifting his body when it is convenient to do so and then coming back to

tell the nation he is doing this and that is what the Minister is really doing. He is fragmenting the system, he is destroying and is succeeding in destroying everything good that there was in this system of education which he found.

In 1944 some teachers were given what we call Civil Service status, but, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the teachers got what they themselves had asked for. We come to 1948 and Erdiston, but the Minister never told us that with all the many changes that the same Erdiston trained teachers in our secondary school system in this country. Why can the Minister be so unfair, so unreasonable, why can he act so unjustly in not bringing to bear these facts? If you are here today to ask us to change the 1890 Act and to adopt the 1975 Act let us know what was good in the old Act and let us compare it with what you would have us believe you intend to change in the old Act. Before the Minister can give forth this knowledge or information he must himself be possessed of it.

The Minister told us about their Manifesto; how they made it clear that nothing would be sprung upon the people. But if in the 1961 general election you told the electorate that you were going to produce a new Education Bill, you told the people then that if they gave you the tools you would do the job, you would scrap the 1890 Act and give them a new Bill. Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Minister has accomplished nothing, his Government nothing, if after publishing this in 1961 he could produce nothing better in 1975. We understand that the Minister told us of what steps had been taken before he introduced this new Bill. What the Minister has demonstrated that he is afraid of and is not prepared to face up to is the Trade Union and its negotiations. The Minister feels that he has 17 members sitting there with him on his side and that is that, but I will tell the Minister now that some teachers in this country sprang a surprise upon the nation by staging a strike. Some struck once, others struck again, let the Minister understand what he had better seek to introduce into this Bill is a system of policing his own administration under this Bill. It is very necessary, for the Minister is doing nothing but courting disaster when he sets about to use his numbers to have a Bill passed in its present state such as this in the face of mounting opposition from the actual people who are involved in this whole exercise.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we learn that in 1967 this Bill was drafted, or that there was a draft, another redraft in 1970, we understand that letters were sent out and all the extensions of time given. The Minister is only giving news to

the Press, or further news to the Press, so as to establish credit for himself and seek to rebut the teachers' unions, that is all, but I have already told this Hon. House that the Minister is making a mockery of education in this country if he believes that he is going to take the cue and act and make a casual reference to somebody as to what he intends to do and bracket it as consultation.

7.40 p.m.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Minister, like everybody else, believes that legislation for education is important legislation, but what the Minister fails to understand is that he is not legislating because the necessity arises to legislate, or he is not seeking to legislate for the better. The Minister is legislating because he has the numbers wherewith to back up his proposals for a second reading. How often, Mr. Deputy Speaker, have we not seen the abuse of such a situation? What does the Minister expect? Does the Minister really believe that anything he has told us here today can convince the nation, or hon. members on this side of the House, that this is a Bill setting up the work-bench on which this young nation can earn a livelihood, or setting out a situation where one can be turned out from a school, or any institution of learning, to work for one's family and to maintain one's family in the community?

Sir, nowhere does the Minister show us that there is any provision for persons to produce according to their ability. The Minister has something to his credit. I will refer briefly to the Common Entrance. I am not repeating myself at all, Sir. It was the *Democrat* newspaper that first editorialised these hurdles that parents and children were suffering. We have in this country a system whereby what is being now taught, or offered, at these newer Secondary Schools as against the older Secondary Schools, is a similar type of education to that obtained, at our Senior Departments is Elementary Schools. We need proper Regulations; we need a properly constituted Governing Body which could manage the schools in a particular area. As is the case in the parish of St. Michael, there should be one Board functioning effectively and advantageously to the benefit of all of these schools in the area.

I believe, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the Minister himself must by now be convinced that he, as an individual, as a politician, has absolutely no right and should not be seen in any respect as a person having anything to do with the discipline or disciplining of teachers under his administration. As a politician, he should be shying away from this, so that at no stage it

could ever be borne out, or attempts taken to justify that the Minister took a particular course of action against an individual teacher because it is felt that that teacher has, from time to time, demonstrated to him, in no uncertain terms, that he was not a member of the Political Party to which the Minister belongs. The Minister of Education should be shorn completely of any semblance of such an accusation being levelled against him. (*Asides*). I thought the Leader of the House was saying something to me. Time does not worry me. Mr. Deputy Speaker, time is on my side.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is worthy of note that at a recent retirement function an officer of the Ministry of Education stated that, since parents and guardians had been invited since 1962 or thereabout, to go on Wednesday afternoons to the Ministry, or to the place provided there to lay their complaints against Head Teachers and their staff, that has been given a fair measure of responsibility for the decline in the disciplinary standards in some of our schools. 7.50 p.m.

The Minister I am sure, Mr. Deputy Speaker, would by now realise that these officers of his Department who are retained to carry out this maligning exercise could be utilised for the benefit of the improvement of the school system. It could only have originated from a mind that was not bent on improving our educational system in this country. No good could have come out of it. It was a system devised to encourage some people to go and make statements that they were later not prepared to justify or substantiate in the presence of the respective officer against whom such complaints had been made, and the Minister must stand condemned for this course of action. He has not stated while standing on his feet that he does not intend discontinuing that unwholesome exercise, he does not see this as one of the appropriate measures to be taken to improve the standard, the discipline, the quality of service that his Ministry must render to the nation as a whole. If he does not, he must blame himself.

Now, pray tell me, Mr. Deputy Speaker, what is the purpose in having almost fifty Boards of Management for 120 primary schools? In years past, for a very good convenience, because there were some schools belonging to the Methodists and the Anglicans and under the control of the Ministry, to work well and serve well, and I should say that they served till they died.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended until tomorrow, Wednesday 23rd July, 1975, at 12 o' clock noon.

Hon. A. MORRISON: I beg to second that

The quesiton was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.
8.00 p.m.

On Resumption:

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The sitting is resumed.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am asking for leave to deal with a Resolution introduced yesterday in connection with the purchase of a dredger for the Coast Guard Service. Also a Bill to amend the Development (Canadian Loan) Act in connection with water resources.

Both of them are very urgent, Sir, copies have been circulated and I am asking for leave to deal with them at a later time today.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Deputy Speaker, what is before the House now is the continuation of the address of the hon. member for St. Peter on the Education Bill, nothing at all to do with leave.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: On what has the hon. member risen?

Mr. CRAIG: On a point of order, Sir. I was in here long enough to know what this is all about. All we are concerned with now is the address of the hon. member for St. Peter.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order, the hon. member has been in here long enough but I have been in here longer than he and I know that at the resumption of a sitting is the correct time to do this.

Mr. CRAIG: All I am drawing to Your Honour's attention is that this is not a new sitting, this is continued from yesterday and all before you now is for the hon. member for St. Peter to continue his address if he so desires.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: My ruling is this. Technically you are right, but the sitting was suspended and I want to bring to your attention that the Leader of the House has only been asking for leave to deal at a later stage

with two measures. He has not prevented the hon. member for St. Peter from addressing the Chair, because I know he has the right to speak and I am going to ask him to continue his speech on the Education Bill if he has not completed his speech.

Mr. CRAIG: Your Honour, I am well aware of that fact.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: On what have you risen?

Mr. CRAIG: I have risen on a point of order. I am well aware of the fact that the Leader of the House has a right to ask leave to have a Bill or Resolution dealt with in all stages today. What I am concerned with is that after this Item has been disposed of, during the course of the day, the Leader of the House can ask for leave then. What I am drawing to Your Honour's attention is that all that has to happen this morning is for you to draw to the attention of the hon. member for St. Peter that he may resume his speech if he so desires, no Bill, no prayers, nothing at all because this is a continuation of yesterday's sitting.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is the hon. member for St. Peter ready to resume his discussion on the Education Bill?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Deputy Speaker, leave has not yet been granted to me.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: There being no objection leave has been granted.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, are you suggesting that the member for St. James raised objection for me to continue?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: He said you should continue your speech immediately, but I drew to his attention that the Leader of the House during some time today would like these matters to be dealt with.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I object to the Bill being dealt with today. (Hon. F. G. SMITH: How can you object now when Mr. Deputy Speaker has already granted leave?) The Deputy Speaker had absolutely no right or authority in the matter.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Will the hon. member continue his debate on the Education Bill?

Mr. HINDS: There is a matter which trespasses on the privilege of hon. members, and a question of privilege comes before any other matter of the House. Here it is that the privilege of the Opposition is being trifled with on an occasion such as this.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: That is a reflection on the Deputy Speaker. I told the hon. member for St. James that the Leader of the House was not preventing you from continuing your speech. The hon. member for St. James spoke about the matter but he did not object to it, he never mentioned any objection, and the Reporter is there.

Mr. CRAIG: I did not use the term "I object", what I said was that I did not see how a measure of this nature could be dealt with today. If you are going to entertain what the Leader of the House has asked you to entertain you must put the motion and we can object at that stage by voting yes or no. I said I cannot see how it can be done today and went on to draw to Your Honour's attention that the only thing which should be going on now is the continuation of the hon. member's speech. All that I am concerned with at this stage, and this is no reflection on your high authority, what I am saying is that at this stage of the sitting the only thing that should go on this morning is that the hon. member for St. Peter should continue his speech, but Your Honour has entertained the Leader of the House and it is at that stage that I said I saw no reason why it should be done. That is an objection Might is not always right.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the procedure in this House has always been that anything like this should be done at the beginning of a sitting. We know that the hon. member is delivering his speech, but I merely asked for leave to deal with these two measures at a later stage during the proceedings, I am not interrupting the hon. member, I do not want to deal with these measures now, maybe tonight if I get a chance. It is his vested right to continue, but if you want me to make a motion since it seems you are questioning the ruling of the Speaker.....

Mr. CRAIG: On a point of order, Sir, I am going to call on the Leader of the House to withdraw the statement that we do not accept the ruling of the Speaker. I object to the Leader of the House saying that I object to Your Honour's ruling, and I am calling on the Leader of the House to withdraw.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I said that it seems to be so.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: At the suspension of yesterday's sitting, and to be more precise, this morning any one from the Government Benches or from the Opposition Benches could move that further consideration of the very Education Bill be postponed, or for that matter any other matter before the House. All that the Leader of the House has done is to ask the House for leave at some later stage, it is as simple as that,.....

Mr. CRAIG: Your Honour, I agree with you. You are perfectly correct that anybody from the Government's side or from this side can move the postponement of the Bill because it relates to the Item before this House, but what I am objecting to is any new measure being introduced at this stage. All that is before this House right now is the Education Bill on which the hon. member is still addressing the Chair, and any member can move that it be postponed because it relates to the measure before the House.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order, Sir, these two measures were introduced yesterday. I am simply asking for leave at a later stage, if possible, to deal with them as they are pressing and important.

Mr. CRAIG: Your Honour, are they on the Order Paper for yesterday? Why did he not ask for leave yesterday. We are in the same sitting. 12.10 p.m.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the point, I believe, we are losing sight of is that there was nothing before this House upon which Your Honour could rule. The Leader of the House said that he intends asking for leave later.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I was asking for leave now to deal with these two matters at a later stage of this sitting. It is not that I intend asking for leave.

Mr. HINDS: If the Leader of the House sought that way of making the Motion, Your Honour had one duty to perform and that is to put the matter to the House. On reflection, Your Honour will recall that you made no attempt to do so, because you felt, as I do, that there was nothing upon which you could rule. The matter was never put to the House for us to say "Aye" or "No", and I believe that you will take this opportunity to put the record straight.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that leave be granted to deal with a Resolution in the sum of seventy-five thousand dollars to be granted from the Consolidated Fund and placed at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1975-76 Part II - Capital as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1975-76 No. 2 which form the Schedule to this Resolution.

Also a Bill to amend the Development (Canadian Loan) (Amendment) Act, 1975. These two measures will be dealt with at a later stage of this sitting.

Hon. A. MORRISON: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:

Ayes: Hon. C. E. TALMA; Hon. A. MORRISON; Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE; Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD; Hon. F. G. SMITH; Mr. LOWE; Mr. WALCOTT; Mrs. EASTMOND and Mr. WEEKES - 9.

Noes: Mr. CRAIG and Mr. HINDS - 2.

THE EDUCATION (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1975

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. Peter, if he so desires, may resume discussion on the Education Bill.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I take it that the presentation of this Bill must bring us to the point in feeling that we are approaching a stage of educational reconstruction in this community. My reason for saying so is that there has been more than an abundance of evidence to support the failure of the present administration relating to matters of education; hence, the next step must be not merely to place on the Statute Book a law, but we have to do so taking into fullest consideration, Mr. Deputy Speaker, how the law is to operate.

I believe, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the Hon. Minister of Education would, by now, have turned over in his mind the fact that there is a wide area of discontent with the Bill being passed in its present form not merely by hon. members on this side of the House, but by persons who are themselves involved in education and whose bread and butter is education. I refer to people who must know about the working of the system and whose energies must be called upon if any new Bill, when passed, is to bring improvement to the present system of education in this country. I

am confident, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the Minister would be adding to his stature, if he so desires, if an opportunity is given, even at this stage, to persons who can make a contribution and have those persons assist him in moulding the type of Education Bill best suited to this nation, and give such persons an opportunity to throw in their lot.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, what the Minister must realise is that, the more people he can involve in this exercise and bring into the field and draw from their experiences, he would be able to learn from their views, and the more smoothly he could expect to launch his Ship of State when the Bill becomes law. We believe, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that there has not been enough to show to all and sundry. We have had the experience of what the Government of Trinidad and Tobago has done in a matter of this sort. These are examples that we must follow.

12.20 p.m.

These are examples that you must follow. It is of some importance to us not merely to be strongheaded but to give due consideration to whosoever can assist us in building the nation, and not only in building the nation but constructing the educational pathway along which we want the young nation to tread. Let us tell ourselves, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that there is no evidence that this Bill has gone sufficiently far beyond the days of what the Hon. Minister was proud to refer to yesterday as the milk and biscuit scheme and what not. It was part of a nutrition scheme, and ever since 1938 when it came into full existence enough experience ought to have been gained by now that this Bill should have been so constructed around this as to use the experience gained in that respect to be the nucleus of what we would call a schools' health service.

You and I know, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that for many years now we have had the benefit of a dental health scheme for our school children, we have had an optical service and I am sure that with the nutrition scheme thrown alongside these and broadened, we would have no problems whatsoever in seeing a smooth functioning of a schools' health service that is so sadly lacking, of administration and consequent fulfilment in this community of ours.

You and I know, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that even today with all that has been attempted in the past, there are still numerous children attending our primary and secondary schools

whose backwardness can be claimed upon defective eyesight or defective hearing, and as you and I know, bad teeth in the mouth can cause a tremendous setback in the progress of any school child. It does in the case of others, and much more so in the case of little children. We believe that if these matters could engage the attention of the Hon. Minister and if he were to apply them, he would find an opportunity where the system could be somewhat perfected when this Bill becomes law.

We have been hearing a lot about our secondary education and what not, but I believe that the Minister's first duty must be to examine the primary education system and wherever possible to introduce new programmes. We have had a report of children taking the Common Entrance Examination and not scoring a single mark at all. This is a very serious matter and the Minister's duty must be to find out wherever possible what it could be that is contributing to that state of affairs in a system for which the Hon. Minister must accept full responsibility. I agree, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that it is not always as easy as one might find it to say, but if the system is to produce anything in relation to the money spent thereon, it should bring into focus the activities of our education officers. If these officers were allowed to function and if when they make recommendations they could get the feeling that the recommendations are given consideration and wherever necessary implemented, then the system could be improved, because one has to bear in mind that these officers are for the most part people who have come through the system, and are better able to determine what is good or what is defective in the present programme.

This brings me, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to the provision in Section 63 in relation to inspection of schools. Provision is made for the inspection of schools, but nobody who is familiar with our present educational system could be happy with the provisions as contained therein. As at present a primary school should be inspected at least once per term. Some of the secondary schools get an inspection perhaps once in five years and others once in ten or fifteen years. There could be no suggestion that this is good enough.

12.30 p.m.

We feel that the least there should be in respect of a secondary school would be once a term but there must be an inspection more often at the primary level.

Now the education authorities, Mr. Deputy Speaker, seek to list three types of inspection. There is a casual inspection which amounts to what we would call a surprise visit by an education officer. There is then what is called an inspection visit. An inspection visit is an occasion by education officer or persons in similar capacity paying a visit without giving notice of his intention, or advanced notice of his or her coming to the school, and this surprise visit should last for one hour to half of a day — it could be longer. There is then a full inspection. Full inspection should go from a full day to possibly a full week depending on what areas the officers concerned are carrying out their inspection or their examination. If we can get a system functioning along these lines and if as is stated here in this Bill, those persons carrying out these inspection must give assistance and guidance to teachers and the like as the case may be, you would then have in operation something that is tangible, something that undoubtedly must be seen to be beneficial to the system as a whole.

I believe that the Minister would do well if he were to give some consideration to matters such as these to which we are referring. Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, this Bill makes provisions somewhat for educating children according to their age and according to their ability but I do not see any provision made for what the same education authorities referred to as the three A's, that is, age, ability and aptitude. Nowhere do I find that provision is made for educating children according to their aptitude. I make this point because I very well recall that in the St. Leonard's Girls' School, Miss Watts the Headteacher, who was able at one time with the assistance of other members of staff, to place a number of her girls into Queens College and, I can't recall any instance where any one of those children has let us down. We are to hope that whatever regulations are going to be made, whatever the Minister proposes doing, that he sees to it that according to the child's aptitude in addition to its age and ability, an opportunity is provided therefor.

There is one other thing that comes to my mind. I think it is the Thelma Vaughan School that we learn is threatened with financial difficulty and may be closed. This Bill should make provision for Government taking full control of all these institutions with a view to protecting their image and projecting further the purpose for which they were established, for the benefit of the children and others who are in these institutions. But we feel that Government should so have its business arranged that there will be no possibility of voluntary subscriptions

being refused or the impression being given that there is no further need for voluntary subscriptions to help these schools through. After all, Mr. Deputy Speaker, these institutions, whoever they cater to, they cater to human beings and for the most part, Barbadians, and it is our duty under this Bill to make ample provision whereby we can feel and rest comfortably in our minds that we are doing our duty to the nation as a whole.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: May I remind the hon. member that it is the Thelma Vaughan Home; not school.

Mr. HINDS: Yes, the Thelma Vaughan Home.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: But we are dealing with the Education Bill. The education of the children will be dealt with at another point.
12.40 p.m.

We are dealing with the Education Bill and not with an institution. I do not want to stop you, but I would prefer to hear you on the Bill. The children will be educated. I would like you to confine your speech definitely to the Bill and not to an institution.

Mr. HINDS: Is this an institution for old people? Anyhow I will go on from there. Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, if we cast our eyes back to Section 25, I do not know what the experts will have to say on this, but it would appear to me that the wording of that section amply demonstrates that a teacher as such is experiencing or must experience some variation in employment, and that when this comes about the teacher will have no choice. It says in the middle of Section 25 "..... with effect from such commencement, be deemed to have been appointed in accordance with Section 24(1)". In other words the teacher has no choice. He is there and he is deemed to be employed. He has no say in the matter.

We are hearing that this is favourable or rather that it is not less favourable to the teacher; but that is not the point at issue. We are not dealing with little children in saying that you must be transferred from this school to another one, but with grown men and women who are expected to put into motion the programme upon which the nation must depend; and if teachers are to be treated in this way that they themselves are denied an opportunity, whether it is for the better, whether it is a situation in which they are placed in a no less favourable position than at present, that is not the point of

issue at all. But if they are going to be placed in a less favourable position they still have no choice.

Does the Minister see this as fair, just and reasonable? Does the Minister see this as something that will encourage teachers to give of their best for the good of the nation? The teachers themselves have got no choice. I am sure, Mr. Deputy Speaker that you will agree that whoever is the employer, whether the Government, the governing bodies or else, no employer has it for himself or to himself to dictate such terms as to effect a change in the work of a school teacher, a postman or what not without the employee having the option of saying yes I agree with this or no, I do not agree with this. We view this as a very serious matter.

In the same way if one were to look more closely into the provisions of Section 26(3) one will see that the Teaching Service Commission can place a Board of Management above the law because the Section says:—

“Where a Board of Management is required to or authorised by or under this Act to exercise any function in accordance with the advice of the Teaching Service Commission the question whether the Board has so exercised that function shall not be inquired into by any court.”

Mr. Deputy Speaker, what is this? This is something outrageous. You find that a Board can act or not act on anything, but in any case there can be no question of putting before a court whether the Board has exercised its function in a proper way or not. Can this be right — placing a Board of Management above the law?

So it will mean that a teacher automatically loses his rights. He has no more rights. Is this for the better? When we say that this is something for the better, do we mean for the service or the system that we want to bring into being? Is this what we want?

If you turn to Section 27 and read this in relation to Section 24, not even a NOVICE would fail to see that you are changing the terms of employment of the teacher materially and substantially.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we are of the opinion that if we are to have a new Education Act on the Statute Book the opportunity is still open to us and to the Minister of Education to have an Act that will not need an abundance of amendments week after week, month after month and year after year. He has an opportunity now,

and this is our contention, to place on the Statute Book something of which he can be proud and of which this Honourable House can be proud.

I believe, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that there is some concern here and there about the functions of Chairmen and they possessing an original vote and a casting vote. I believe that there are areas which beckon to the Minister to let people with wider experience make their contribution in helping to place on record for all time the type of Education Act that we would wish this country to have.

12.50 p.m.

There is, Mr. Deputy Speaker, definite information that is brought out before us where this Bill sets out, whether intentionally or otherwise, to change the conditions of service of the teachers, and this is a very serious matter, it is a matter that can have very serious repercussions. We have to frame our Bill, taking into consideration the atmosphere that is presently obtaining and is likely to obtain in the future resulting from our work in this respect. Since this Bill make provision for school boards acting in accordance with the conditions of the Teaching Service Commission, this is something that was not in operation before and I am submitting that it would appear to me to be an attempt at changing the conditions of service, and this is something we must warn the Minister to try and avoid.

We are hearing now that those schools with sixth forms will not have them any more. I remember Mr. Cameron Tudor going to the Springer Memorial School and making a speech promising that even the Comprehensive Schools would be given sixth forms, but what we have witnessed from 1962 onwards is just a bungling with the people's education, one person promises this and the other person promises something else or does something else and we get absolutely nowhere. The point to which we have just reached where we are now seeking to provide something better than the 1890 Act; that is what we believe we are trying to do, but in truth and in fact are we succeeding in this on the face of what is here before us and what the Hon. Minister has asked us to give a second reading to? You come to the point, Mr. Deputy Speaker, where a teacher seeking to have a transfer to another school is to have the views of the board to which he is going before he is transferred. This again we say has not been established as the operative system up to the present, so the minute that you introduce this new situation, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we are saying that you are

limiting the authority of those boards which presently employ persons, and you are placing the teacher at what we must now call a serious disadvantage.

I do not deny any hon. member his right when he gets up to make his own contribution in whatever form and upon what aspects of the Bill or of any hon. member's speech he may care to, but as if this Bill is to present us with one of its hugest jokes, section 74(1) deals with free public educational institutions and then section 74(2) only reminds you that "notwithstanding subsection (1) the prescribed conditions may include conditions with regard to the payment of fees....." In a free public institution education is free but you may have to pay fees and other charges.

1.00 p.m.

You will have to pay fees and other charges in such amounts, for such purposes and by such persons or classes of persons as may be prescribed. Is it that Section 74(2) is contradicting 74(1)? I do not know, Mr. Deputy Speaker, what is the cause for our having to look at this Bill in the way we have found it necessary up to the present. The Minister, who introduced it and is in charge of it, has, in our view, failed miserably in convincing people who would be glad to see and know that our whole system of education is functioning as efficiently as possible and is producing and turning out boys as worthy of the nation today as it has been turned out in past years. I wish, hon. members will realise how necessary it must be for all of us to urge upon the Minister to act tactfully in seeking to bring into being all of the changes that are envisaged in this new scheme.

Now, I understand that there is some Report somewhere and that the Chief Education Officer said that he was misreported when it was thought that he had been heard to associate education with sleeping, but the point I want to make is that, whether it was sleeping or not, the slumber period could be very closely associated with the present administration because you cannot deny that our system has made in years past, such a tremendous contribution not merely to our own, but to countries abroad and their development. There is evidence that our system of education had been moving with the times until the present Government came and started out with its numerous experiments.

You will find, Mr. Deputy Speaker, for instance, the system whereby there was a booklet on Teachers Notes. I believe that the institution of the system of Pupil Record cards has meant quite a bit in helping to assist smooth transfers from one school to another, and it has been able

to help in very many other areas. We believe that there is not every tradition of the past that was good, but whatever it was it was founded upon something and it should be examined rather than totally discarded, because there has been some good done to somebody and, in the case of education, some good to so many that one must now wonder, what is the reason for the total collapse that we are witnessing?

I believe that the Hon. Minister should be broadminded enough as to send this Bill to a Select Committee. I believe that it would be for the good of the nation; it would be for the good of the Teaching Service, and it would be for the good of education as a whole, if the Minister sought to hear further views of people, who could assist him in opening new vistas, so that those who have not been given an opportunity to do so can for the good of all.

1.10 p.m.

We entreat the Minister to pay a very special attention to the primary school system. It is through the lack of a proper foundation given to children in the primary school stages that we see its reflection as we go on to the secondary schools, and I do not want to say to the tertiary stage, because the Minister ought to know that the English educationists have urged upon us the fact that the word "tertiary" is lacking in true meaning and suggestions have been made from time to time that we should use the word "further" rather than "tertiary"; but for us that is no big thing here.

We are asking the Minister that rather than taking upon himself as Minister of Education to abolish the present Sixth Forms that he should first seek to draw upon the experience of the heads of those institutions which presently have Sixth Forms and not merely to consult with them to the extent of telling them that as from the end of next term or this term there will be no Sixth Form. We would like face to face and heart to heart discussion on matters as important as these in our educational setting.

In the same way, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to chance upon the opportunity such as this to abolish the Barbados Scholarship, I would say that here again there is a wide school from which the Minister can gain experience. There have been numerous Barbados Scholarships all over the globe, and I am to wonder, if the Minister can lay his hands on half a dozen of them with whom he had consultation before he decided on abolishing the Barbados Scholarship. He can abolish it now because he has passed through that stage already.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: On a point of order, object to that misrepresentation that I am abolishing the Barbados Scholarship or that the Government is abolishing the Barbados Scholarship. What I indicated was that the number of Barbados Scholarships is now fixed at five or six, and that in future what will be happening is that scholarships will continue to be awarded on the same examination, but the number will not be limited. If there are ten people who reached the scholarship standard, ten people will be awarded scholarships. I made the point that there is no abolition of the award of scholarships as such.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Point made.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Minister talks about scholarships; I am talking about the Barbados Scholarship. All the Minister has said has not convinced anybody inside here except the few people who belong to his brigade, so to speak. What we are saying is that this Bill makes absolutely no provision for the Barbados Scholarship. The Minister's learning is not going to fool anybody on this side. He cannot in truth and in fact get up and say that provision is made in this Bill for the retention of the Barbados Scholarship, and go on to say that if in any one year ten persons reach Barbados Scholarship standard, there will be ten Barbados Scholarships awarded. I challenge him to get up here and say that now. (*Asides*). There are some people, Mr. Deputy Speaker, who believe that the only way that you should be able to get up in here and talk about the Barbados Scholarship is if you were a Barbados Scholar yourself. All this is a reflection not on the hon. Member for St. Peter, but on the Chair.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have asked for order and I have been hearing you clearly. When the hon. Member is ready to speak he will stand, otherwise I will ask him to leave the room.

Mr. HINDS: We have been hearing a lot of what the Minister may do and may not do throughout the Bill, and we are submitting that education is so serious a matter that the Minister must be charged with a responsibility to do this and to do that for the good of the nation. We are not prepared to leave it to the whims and fancies of a Minister who if he wakes up any morning with his right foot hurting he can dictate according to his feelings on that particular day, and on the day he does not feel that way, everything goes smoothly. This is a new Education Bill and if he is going to award Barbados Scholarships, let him say so, and not mere scholarships to the glory of the Minister of Education. That is point at issue.

In the same way you have heard the Minister tell us about these secondary school certificates, and that if you get a Grade I certificate, that it will have purchasing value or an earning capacity in our community. (*Asides*).

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Has the hon. Member completed his speech?

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, you can honestly believe that until I take my seat I have not completed.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I see you were standing without saying anything.

Mr. HINDS: That is quite unlike me, but I like to listen to asides. They help to provide grist for my mills.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Let us have some order.

Mr. HINDS: The Minister of Education must know whether or not he is leading the holders or possible holders of these certificates through a blind alley when he is trying to have us believe that these Grade I certificates would be equivalent to the G.C.E. certificates.

1.20 p.m.

This is what he knows; that they cannot be reckoned upon to assist the holder of this secondary school certificate to get into any university, not even the UWI. The Minister has found it possible that persons holding the LCC Intermediate be registered as if they held the GCE. In other words, he equates it with the GCE for registration purposes to help them secure their jobs. All right. If the Minister has found it necessary, let us say, to cheapen the system by so doing, all well and good where the Minister is concerned. We do not want to put a single person out of a job; but now let the Minister tell us about the persons who will be awarded a grade II certificate. What earning value would such a certificate have? Is it not that the Minister is telling us that here they are going to make preparation for throwing numerous persons who will be holding these grade II certificates, on the rocks, on the bridges to pick a lime? Is that not what he is telling us, Mr. Deputy Speaker?

I cannot, Mr. Deputy Speaker, tell the Minister all about how these schools should be run; how the system should be operated. (*Aside*.)

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order. The Hon. Minister has his right of reply also.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, if I was shadow Minister and Attorney General I would go out building roads. (*Asides*)

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order. Continue on the Bill, please.

Mr. HINDS: We must, Mr. Deputy Speaker, turn for a moment now to see what the Minister has to do to improve the image of Erdiston. We heard from the Minister at length yesterday about which institution provided this, what institution did not provide that, and the like, but now, we have Erdiston there. From the time that the Minister told us that Erdiston had been established, can the Minister say in truth and in fact that Erdiston has progressed with the times? Can he say so? Let the Minister look at the numbers that are being turned out at Erdiston annually. Let the Minister look at the quality turned out by Erdiston periodically, and let us see how the Erdistonians have been able to fit into society and to make worthwhile contributions, the type of contributions one would have made in education. Let us see what they have done.

After a teacher leaves Erdiston and is sent off to his or her school, the streams at these schools, particularly the C stream and B stream, that really and truly need the attention and the coaching that the Erdiston-trained teacher can now provide are not paid the necessary attention. That is denied the children in the C stream or the B stream as the case might be, who really need it. There is in our system a total neglect of vital areas, and upon whose shoulder must blame be laid except upon the shoulder of the Minister of Education?

At Erdiston essay writing is engaged in to such an extent that everybody must be turning dotish now writing essays; but what we need, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in the case of Erdiston is more practice teaching. Let the teachers identify themselves in the class rooms with the children who really need the type of education that these trained teachers can provide. This is lacking, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and this is where our system falls down. That is why you get some children taking the examination and they cannot begin to think what it is all about.

I would wish, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to conclude at this moment. I would wish to let the Minister know that he will be expected to use his period for replies, to the fullest. I believe the Minister knows he has some lieutenants who are willing to fight his own battle, and I believe that that is the one reason why the Minister has failed so miserably so often — depending on others to pull his chestnuts out of the fire.

I believe, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that for all that has been said so far on this debate by myself, that the Minister could return to his office or elsewhere and with the assistance of the draftsmen return to this Chamber with a Bill that is untouchable; nobody could touch it. 1.30 p.m.

The poorest thing now about here is Health and Education and the Prime Minister gets on television and tells the world that you do not know what you are saying.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I want to hear you on the Education Bill.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, we are asking the Minister to consider having this Bill sent to Select Committee not merely for his benefit or for the benefit of the Opposition, but for the benefit of the nation as a whole.

Mr. E. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, we have been subjected to a rather lengthy reply not having very much substance from the main speaker for the Opposition. Yesterday it would seem as if he was on one theme and today he has gone on a completely different theme. You will recall, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that yesterday the Chief spokesman for the Opposition when he started, indicated that this Bill is seeking to concentrate power in the hands of the Minister. Today the same hon. member stated that the Minister must be charged with the responsibility of the education of the nation; and in the remarks which the hon. member for St. Peter made on Erdiston College he again alluded to this responsibility which is the Minister's and he said that it was the Minister on whose shoulders must lay the blame for the failure of Erdiston.

Against that background, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think that there are a number of points which I want to make as regards this Bill. The first one I would like to make is that when one is talking in terms of educational policy that is a political matter. It is the Government which is

made up of the party in power which will conceive an educational policy which it will take to the electorate; and if it succeeds the Government has the responsibility of pursuing that particular policy.

In the 1890 Act most of the power for directing the educational policy for the country was in the hands of the Director of Education, or more recently the Chief Education Officer; and if we are to accept that educational policy is a political matter, then perforce it will be that the political head of the Ministry must have the power and indeed the responsibility for establishing the educational policy of the nation. Quite naturally this would be done with the advice of the various experts in the various fields of Education on whose experience the Minister will be able to draw from time to time.

So, I do not think that we should get too worked up about where the power lies. In other words, if the power was in the hands of the Minister that is quite naturally the correct area where the power should reside.

This Bill, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is of fundamental importance to all of us. It is of importance because it touches society at all levels, and indeed all products from the school system will and have always determined the kind of society in which we live. We must therefore examine the whole purpose of education. What is education for? I was rather surprised yesterday when the Hon. Minister indicated that one of the purposes of education was to maintain the community as we know it. I suspect that he was probably talking about democracy; but I think that we ought to have a broader view, and indeed I believe that the Ministry headed by the present Minister does have a broader view on education rather than just the maintenance as we know it, because to follow this rather restricted view of Education, we would have enormous room for change.

We are living in a society in which change is taking place at a rapid pace and we must have the means to meet these changes and get the best of the rapid changes which are taking place. Therefore our school system and our education policy must be geared to meet these changes and accommodate the pressing demand made on the system from time to time.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of elucidation. I certainly agree with the statements that the hon. member for St. Lucy is making about change, and it is in that connection that I do not wish anything that I have said to be misconstrued.

I made the point that one of the functions of the educational system is to pass on to the younger generation the knowledge, the skills, the aptitudes and techniques of previous generations. I also made the point that one of the functions was to ensure that young people have the imagination to change and bring about changes. That is a small point of elucidation.

Mr. E. GREAVES: I will take up from the last point which the Minister made, the question of imagination. I think that it is a very important aspect of education, and I feel that this is where a lot of our efforts in education have been frustrated in that it would seem to me that there is a total lack of imagination in the carrying out of the educational policy of this country.

That is not any reflection on the Ministry or indeed the political head who lays down the education policy. If for example you were to go into a school and examine the kind of approach which is adopted in a number of schools in this country you will see what I am speaking about. There is a total lack of imagination in most of the public schools, and this, to a large extent, is responsible for the failure of a number of people in the society to get as much as they possibly could from the system of education which we have.

Education is something which deals with people, and we cannot get the best out of the system unless the people who are involved in the working of the system clearly understand what we are trying to achieve. Indeed they have to EMPATHIZE with the objectives of the educational policy which is being pursued.

I am sure that this is where we should be paying closer attention because you can have all kinds of policies, you can make laws and change law until Doomsday, but when it boils down, if the people who are involved with the system are not aware of or do not feel committed to make their contribution to making the policy work, all that we do here and all of the policies that we devise will fall to the ground.

1.40 p.m.

In this context, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is important that the point which was made by the hon. member for St. Peter relative to teacher training, and indeed to the kind of programme which is being pursued at Erdiston Teachers' Training College, be looked at because for people to be effective in teaching they must be trained. We know that there were a number of people years ago who did not have the benefit of

training but who made excellent teachers. Generally speaking it is accepted that teachers must however be trained, and we therefore have to look not only at providing more opportunities for training for teachers within the system but also we have to look at the type of training which these people get, because in the final analysis this is going to have an effect on their performance in the schools when they go back to work. I think it is still generally true that there are large numbers of people who are teaching but are not trained or have not had an opportunity to be trained as teachers. I would hope that the day is not too far off when we will see teachers before they come into schools get some teacher training. That is probably the one profession, and I do believe that teaching is a profession, where the practitioners started to practise before they had been trained. I would sincerely hope that we will be moving towards a system where people will be trained before they go into the schools.

Then too on this question of training we have to look at the numbers of people who are being turned out for this school system, and this is an area where hopefully the Hon. Minister will be able to give some attention to, namely increasing the number of places at Erdiston and indeed increasing the number of opportunities which exist for teachers to be trained. I spoke earlier on about the context of the training programme at Erdiston and all that, but I would just like to make one other point and it relates to the whole question of the ability of teachers to be able to identify a number of disabilities which affect the learning of children. I am not speaking only of a disability like deafness or blindness, there are other disabilities which can affect the performance of children in schools, and I am told that there are a number of children in our school system who have these disabilities but who unfortunately are still expected to perform in the same way and indeed to compete with children who are normal. I would hope that the training programme of the curriculum at Erdiston would be so extended as to make provision for teachers to be exposed to the kind of knowledge which would enable them to identify these learning disabilities at a very early age so that they could be corrected. My information is that a number of these disabilities are not that difficult that they cannot be corrected, and if they are caught early the child can become and perform like a normal child, and we would hope that this is something to which some attention will be given.

I was a little surprised, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to hear the chief spokesman for the Opposition stating that to have teachers in the secondary system under a common Teaching Service

Commission was a kind of step which his Part could not go along with. What is surprising about this is that we have a situation where as the Hon. Minister pointed out there are occasions when you might find a large number or a surplus of teachers in a particular subject at a particular school and a shortage of teachers in the same subject at another school. This, Mr. Deputy Speaker, could never be fair in a system where we are trying to give all of our children an equal opportunity to education. I remember years ago when I was at school at Coleridge-Parry they started a programme in Science and for almost five or six years we had to go without a qualified Science teacher, we had to be taught on many occasions by people who had done only 'O' Level Science and at the other schools they were large numbers of people, trained Science teachers, who were teaching as far down as the first form, but here it is you had a school which had a fifth form Science class but did not have any person qualified to teach that fifth form. I see the establishment of a common Teaching Service Commission as a means of getting around this problem, and I would hope that this is implemented as soon as possible.

The Minister indicated that he hoped to be able to transfer teachers in the teaching service, and I would strongly believe that this is one matter that we should be deciding here on today, that is, that with effect from a particular date when this bill comes into effect that teachers could be transferred from one school to another because in truth and in fact the Governing Bodies of the schools do not pay the teachers, they are paid by the taxpayers of Barbados and therefore the people of this country must have an equal opportunity for their children wheresoever their children are going to school, so that one can see this step as a progressive one, as an attempt to make education as equal as possible. We talk about equality of education and the equality of opportunity for education. We know that in a number of instances this is the ideal, it is something after which we reach and after which we have to continue reaching.

1.50 p.m.

It is not something which can be achieved overnight, but there is no doubt that it is the direction in which the educational policy of this country is moving, and every effort should be made to bring about such equity in education as quickly as possible. When one listens to the distinctions which still exist in the Bill, between older Secondary Schools and the newer Secondary Schools, one wonders whether it could not be found possible to eradicate more of these distinctions.

The Hon. Minister, in introducing the Bill yesterday, referred to the sweeping changes he was contemplating introducing as soon as possible. For example, in the Bill we have the Boards of Management for the older Secondary Schools, and we have a Committees of Management for the newer Secondary Schools. Now, these little distinctions some times make a lot of difference in the minds of people. We have to bring the entire Secondary Schools to a stage where they will be accepted by the people in the community as being equal. This is something which should be exercising the attention of the Ministry as soon as possible. How, for example, are we going to get parents to understand that to send their children to one of the newer Secondary Schools is the same as sending their children to one of the older Secondary Schools, that is, that they will have the same opportunities?

This brings me back to the question of travelling once more. Every effort should be made to upgrade staff to ensure that the staffing of the newer Secondary Schools is equal to the staffing of the older Secondary Schools. Again, I see the Teaching Service Commission as a means whereby this can be established. From the point of view of equipment, we hope that this will be an area in which everything will be equated. There is no point in giving one school the type of equipment which is better than equipment at another school because competition will not be on an equal footing.

Under the Education Bill, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is suggested in Part III that public education shall be organised in three stages: primary education, secondary education, and tertiary education. Section 9(2) states:

"In addition to the three stages of public education mentioned in subsection (1), there be provided as part of the system of public education — "

There will be pre-school education, special education, and adult education. Now these three areas, Mr. Deputy Speaker, are areas of some concern to me and areas in which I have some interest. Whereas I know that the Ministry and, indeed, the Minister are interested and will do everything possible to encourage these three other areas of public education, I think that the wording of the Act is a little weak. Whereas in one section it says:

"Public education shall be organized in three stages....."

in other sections they say:

"there may be provided as part of the system....."

These words are fundamental to our educational system. If we look, for example, at pre-school education, what is the whole basis of pre-school education? In a number of countries it has been accepted that all children do not start off on the same level. Children coming from a certain environment have a head-start on other children and, as a result of this, a number of countries have provided opportunities for children from disadvantaged homes to catch up so that when they reach the primary system they would be on the same level as the others and can move on. I would have preferred to see a firm commitment towards this type of education.

We know that there are constraints in this matter. We can talk for a long period of time, but in the final analysis we are talking in terms of money, and we know that money is not in an unlimited supply, and, therefore, the best use has to be made of it. Nevertheless, I hope that I will see much more emphasis being placed on this kind of education.

On the question of adult education, I also consider that this is fundamental to our society. There is no doubt that there are a number of people in our society who have passed through school, or who have not had an opportunity to be exposed to education, or to what goes on in school, as much as they should have been and, consequently, they are not as well equipped for facing life as others. We consider that it is important that opportunities should be provided for these people. What is more important is that we talk of education as being a continuous process, and we have to get away from the idea that a lot of people have that once you pass out of the school system your education is finished and you have finished learning. That, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is false and it can be self-defeating.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member has two more minutes to complete his speech.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, it can be self-defeating because we are living in a world which is changing so rapidly that people must be continuously upgrading and changing outlook in order to match this changing system.

The other point, as far as the Bill in concerned, to which I wish to refer relates to the Higher Education Loan Fund, or, what is called in this Bill, the Tertiary Education Loan Fund. The Bill incorporates the provisions of the 1952 Higher Education Loan Fund Act lock, stock and barrel.

2 p.m.

Now in 1953 the cost of education was not what it is today, and I would have thought that an opportunity would have been taken to increase the amount of money which would be available to people who are seeking aid for their education under this particular scheme. I hope that the Minister will have a very hard look at this with a view to ensuring that the scheme benefits many more people. At present there are few people who apparently can get money out of the scheme because of the fact that there is little there and also the limited amount of money which is available to people.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Deputy Speaker, at this stage I beg to move that this Sitting be now suspended until 3 o'clock.

Hon. A. MORRISON: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. Deputy Speaker suspended the sitting accordingly.

On Resumption:

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before the sitting was suspended, the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works was about to address the House. He may now do so if he wishes.

Mr. CRAIG: Sir, I should just like to draw to your attention that there is no quorum. It is the duty of the Government to form a quorum.

The Bell was rung and a quorum was obtained.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I shall not be very long on an issue such as this because I think it has been accepted on all sides of the House that the time has come when a new law should be placed on the educational policy of this country.

I should first like to pay tribute to the Hon. Minister of Education for the very lucid, frank and forthright explanations he gave to this Honourable House and to the nation of the changes which this new Bill is likely to bring about, and which he himself in his Ministry has planned for this country. Let me say at this point that knowing Barbadians as well as I do, every Barbadian is an authority on education, and I do not think there is any topic on which one can have more diverse views and opinions than on the topic of education, because education

deals with people, and apart from the Government's views on education, every parent who is fortunate to have a child who is going to be educated has his views, hopes and aspirations for his children, and very often uninformed as that parent is, his views, opinions and hopes may very well conflict with the Government's views and the nation's views on education. I think the Hon. Minister very frankly explained to this House that the time had come when a new order must be introduced, new thinking must be brought and he was prepared to update systems which have been tried and not found wanting but which in changing times must be updated.

On the other hand, I have listened to the Shadow Minister of Education in the Opposition, and I must say as a parent and as a member of this nation, apart from political considerations that if I had a choice to make between the Hon. Minister and himself, as to who should look after my child's education I do not think there would be any doubt in my mind, having listened to him for all the time he has spoken, that my choice as an intelligent parent and a person who has benefited from education in this country would undoubtedly rest with the Minister of Education. I think when the debate is printed and parents have had an opportunity to read the quality and content of the two speeches, there would be no doubt in anybody's mind in whose hands the destiny of this country's education should be placed. Undoubtedly it will rest with the Minister of Education because all the Shadow Minister did was to attack the Minister of Education personally. Of course he was catching at the shadow and missing the bone. This is the Government's idea. This is not the Minister's idea. He cannot introduce any policy without Cabinet approval but he spent hours and hours criticising the Minister whose policy is the policy of the Government.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am involved because I am a member of the Government in which collective responsibility is one of the cardinal points of governmental administration. As I said, I would prefer my child to be in the Minister's hands than in the hands of the Shadow Minister of Education. I think that if the people of this country are as discerning as they ought to be (I have listened to the hon. member for St. Peter as Shadow Minister for hours, and I have not heard what his Government would do if they had this policy to introduce), it is no sense keeping it from the people until 1976 to tell them that what they would do if the people give them a mandate. We are passing from an

old era into a new era, and now is the time when the public should know if the Opposition has any idea, because children's lives are involved, the future of our nation is involved, and to me education should not be a partisan matter. Education should be a bi-partisan matter because children are involved, the future of this nation is in their hands and any constructive suggestions for the betterment of the educational system which is going to mean the survival of Barbados as a nation should be trotted out today now that we are passing from an old era into a new.

Apart from the general criticisms which we hear at budget time and on Supplementary Estimates, I have not heard one criticism or one constructive suggestion to the measures which the Minister suggested he is about to take, only a blanket condemnation of a Minister of Education who is tired, who wants to resign, and all those old outworn criticisms which we have been hearing from 1966 up to 1975. Education to me Mr. Deputy Speaker, is a bi-partisan matter. I am concerned with children; I am concerned with the future of Barbados; I am concerned to see that the young people of this nation get the best education that this nation is capable of offering, because long after we politicians are passed a new breed will come and it is the young generation who have got to carry on the charge which has been handed down. Therefore all parties should be concerned not with criticism or denigration, but should be concerned with the establishment of a system in which the God-given talents of all citizens of this country should be developed. I, as a Christian, believe that God has never put one young person unless he has given him a talent, some ten talents, some five, some one talent, and it is our bounden duty to create the atmosphere educationally in which these talents can be developed for the betterment of the nation and for the furtherance of God's work here on earth. I have not heard the Opposition come up with any constructive suggestion to that effect. Criticism of the Minister, big jacket and pretty shirt and that nonsense, gets us nowhere. Let us parliamentarians know that we are introducing a new Act, settle down to devise ways and means by which the future generations of this country can be as well educated as is humanly possible to make their contribution to the benefit of this country.

I should like at this stage now that we are passing from one phase to another to pay tribute to all those teachers of the past whose dedication, commitment and self-sacrifice have

given to Barbados the literacy reputation that it has throughout the world and especially in the Western Hemisphere: all the Chappy Cricks all the George Warners, Bert Moores, Charlie Broomes, Mr. Cumberbatch, Mr. Francis, Mr. Charlie Phillips, my dear departed father and a million and one other teachers who started out at \$1 and \$2 a month and got 33 cents as an increment in 1911 and 1912, who have given to Barbados the reputation today which we enjoy without all the frills and positioning of a modern Barbados Union of Teachers. I should not like a new era to be ushered in without this Honourable House going on record as saying that this country's high reputation for literacy is based on the self-sacrifice, the dedication, the commitment and the vocation which they felt which has made you and me, the Leader of the House and the older members of this Parliament the people that we are today, most of them without the benefit of a secondary education, but who today, because of the grounding they got under these dedicated persons, can hold their own in this society.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I may have omitted a few. There are members in this Honourable House whose headteachers and teachers have taught them and brought them to the peak today where they can hold their own without a secondary education, and I should like to include those unnamed teachers of the past whose dedication and whose commitment have made this country the country that it is today.

I should like also to say that whatever criticisms you hear from the Shadow Minister of Education, there is no Government either under the old colonialist regime or in the days of parties even of today which has made and contributed to the education of this nation to the extent that the Democratic Labour Party has done, bearing in mind that education, as the Minister said, is a continuing process, that each and every Barbadian apart from education is an authority on what education should be and the way in which it should go.
3.10 p.m.

But let me go on record for the nation to understand that no other party since its ruling, since its Government of the country, has contributed more to education than the Democratic Labour Party. We have contributed in terms of revenue to education more than older developed countries have done, more in our area than Jamaica has done, more than Trinidad has done, more than Guyana has done, and more than the Associated States have done towards education, and when you look at our annual

budgetary contribution, no Government that is not conscious of the importance of education could make the allocations that this Government has made towards education. Those are statistical facts. There is no Government in the world that has done more. Let me recite for the public's consumption because the late Sir Grantley Adams of blessed memory said that people have short memories, and I want to use that to remind Barbadians of what the Democratic Labour Party has done for the education of this country.

When the Opposition said that it was not humanly possible, we introduced free secondary education in Barbados. There are people in this Parliament and in this country, I know, who could not go to Harrison College because their parents could not pay the \$8 or the \$24. You may be one, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and I can think of others.

When the matter was raised by this Democratic Labour Party we were told it was humanly impossible, but we did it, and today we are moving towards a position of providing as many places as possible for all those who are capable of attaining secondary education — and naturally at this point it is a process towards which we are moving. We introduced that, in spite of the Barbados Labour Party poo-pahing the idea and telling the people of this country it was not humanly possible. We introduced in this country hot meals for school children at a nominal fee. This party, you hear, is not interested in the education of the masses and are a wicked bunch of people who are just masquerading as socialists to fool people. Today we are feeding over 27,000 school children a hot meal each per day, ten cents per day in order to improve and create a climate in which a regular meal can enable them to learn. Such a Government is, we hear, not interested in education.

We have also, Mr. Deputy Speaker, subsidized bus fares to the tune of ten cents per head, costing millions to the taxpayers of this country, in order to alleviate the hardships on children who have got to use buses. Such a Government, we hear, is not interested in education. We have created national development scholarships to train people in areas in which the country's future demands experts. Such a Government, we hear, is not interested in the education of these people and is just fooling the masses.

We have created at Cave Hill an institution to which any aspiring youngster can go and we will assist him to reach a standard whereby if he is ambitious — now, you can take a cow to water but you cannot make him drink; the Government can only create the institution, to use an expression

and hope that the youngsters will have the ambition to go and avail themselves of the opportunity — but we have created at Cave Hill at the cost of millions of dollars to people an institution to which people can go and get education and obtain a degree, very often in useless subjects, but at least, like the Barbados Union of Teachers they can parade a B.A. behind their names and then demand of society a reward for which this little degree, they think, entitles them. Such a Government, we hear, is not interested in the education of the people.

We have built the Community College, and we hope in September to start, when the funds have been granted by the bank to do it, a Community College which not only teaches science and technology and "A" Levels but to enter into other areas in which the people of this country need to be equipped to serve their country. Such a Government, we hear, is not interested in the education of the people.

We are to build a Polytechnic in Constitution Road, moving it from the Harbour which is to be extended, in order to create more places and to equip our young people for the opportunity to serve their country. Such a Government, we hear, is not interested in educating the masses of this country.

The Minister of Education was looking at the possibility of establishing youth training centres to which young school leavers can go in order to improve not only their own skills but to be able to make a more meaningful contribution to this country. A Government not interested in the education of the masses. We are spending more on education than on any other service in this country.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I could go on and point out the areas in which this Government is making a contribution because we, as a Government made up of intelligent people, are satisfied that if we are called to Glory tomorrow our greatest contribution to Barbados is that we have left behind an intelligent, educated people, and we can rest in peace in the knowledge that we have left people in whose hands the country we love and adore will be well managed because they have been educated by our concern for them; and I could go on Mr. Deputy Speaker, unlimited.

I have prefaced my remarks by saying that everyone of us in this Parliament, all 24 of us, can constitute himself an authority on education. Every parent can tell you what is his ambition for his child. In this continuous evolving process of education, there can always be areas of criticism,

because there is no country in the world, developed or developing, that has evolved a perfect system of education, because economic conditions change, cultural and social patterns change and there is mobility between social groups, and the working classes become middle classes and the middle classes become upper classes and their tastes and their ambitions and their aspirations for their children alter, so that an educational system at any point of time is always subject to criticism that it is not meeting the needs of the present generation.

3.20 p.m.

All that the Minister has done in his necessary introduction, not an unnecessarily long introduction, is to indicate to the public of Barbados that the time has come after having tried over a period of time certain systems which had to be tried; because you do not experiment with human minds. You try to utilise human minds and guide them and get them to give the best of their development and contribution. You do not start an experiment in education as in a laboratory with a Bunsen burner, heat it and it gives gas. You can change that tomorrow morning if you do not get the right reaction.

The human mind is the most delicate mechanism that God has created for the furtherance of his work on earth and for the technological advancement of mankind; and therefore, whether it is in Medicine, in Soyuz 11 or Apollo, in whatever area a human has got to work, it is not something that you can switch off like a radio. You have to experiment with its development to the point where you find that this human mind is a delicate mechanism. You know that they say that the difference between madness and genius is a very fine line.

I am only mentioning this to indicate that the field of education is one which deals with the minds of children. Children's minds are as plastic as putty, and can be moulded into whatever form we need. Education has got to be cleverly thought out. It cannot be tampered with, because in tampering with it either too early or too late you can create an imbalance in human behaviour and in social life which can either be for the good or for the detriment of your country.

I will finally deal with one brief point. I am amazed that you get a B.A. in something and suddenly you are a genius in education. You get a fellow with a B.A. in Theology and he suddenly tells you that there is no God. You

get a fellow with a B.A. in Economics and he suddenly tells you that the whole world system of economics is wrong. Among Barbadians this is a very faulty trait because of our high and long reputation for literacy. Because of that we assume that John Brown B.A. is a special breed of animal and therefore he has now acquired a status which not only puts him apart from his working class people, but which empowers him to be an authority on anything which comes before the country or the world.

In dealing with education and the commitment of teachers in the past, I would like to go on record as saying that I am most perturbed at the attitude of the teachers organisations in Barbados in dealing with this Bill. When an organisation can ask for a boycott of a meeting of which the President was a member, a meeting of this curriculum seminar — the teachers have more sense than he has because they turned up in numbers. Thank God. I still have hope for the profession. When he could ask for a boycott before he knew the final form that the Bill would take, and asked the teachers to stay away and refuse their voluntary services because in his high and mighty presidency he feels that he is a big political McGuffey, I begin to wonder what is going to happen in this country.

The Minister is no teacher. The Opposition has come in here and criticised us about a number of students getting nought, and 10 students getting six. That is not the Minister's fault. I would like to see the Teachers Association analysing why this happened. It is a question of teaching. We are concerned and the Minister is concerned, but the teachers organisation from whose hands the pupils get nought and ten and 20 out of 200, if they are earning their money, should be the ones to do a statistical and educational analysis.

What are they quarrelling about? We did not have the final Bill. The Government has got to govern. The moment we abdicate our position to teachers organisations or to the Barbados Workers' Union or to the Employers Association then we cease to be the Government. If the organisations, the Workers' Union, the Teachers' Union, the NUPW are to be dissatisfied with the Government's position on any point then they know what to do, and especially the General Secretary of the BWU, the member for St. Michael West, knows what to do; but because he objects to something that we do should not prevent us as a Government from taking what action we are satisfied is in the interest of the people.

If the General Secretary of the union, the NUPW, is right and the people go with him we are through the eddoes. That is the price that you pay for being in political life. If the contention of the Barbados Union of Teachers and the others is right, tell them to draft a Bill and send it to the Minister and he will bring it in here. The Government is responsible to the people. When I heard the Shadow Minister talking about power concentrated in the Minister's hands, when I heard him say that this Bill is about power, who is facing the electorate next year? The Chief Education Officer? The Permanent Secretary in the Ministry of Education? Who is facing the people?

My consolation is that they argue as if they will never have this Bill to administer. It is too much power for us and they will never have it to administer; so that alone is a consolation because they have accepted the principle that for another five years the Minister, whoever he is, will have too much power.

They do not realise that in another year it could be the Shadow Minister — God forbid. I would not like to see my child have to undergo any system over which he presides because he has not come forward with one original idea, with one original criticism. He has not said one way in which he would revolutionise education in Barbados so that Barbadians will get another system.

I would like to warn the Barbados Union of Teachers to keep politics out of Education. We are concerned with children. There is all of this political posturing, all of this boycotting. Elections are coming up, and I have never seen so many organisation taking up positions against the Government. Every day that I open my paper I see an organisation taking up a position against the Government — the BUT, the BSUT and everything. Election is around the corner.

I would ask all of them, whatever their political views are, whether they consider us to be the most wicked Government in the world to let us not have political expediency in teaching, I feel very strongly, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I feel that you will pardon a personal reference that my family as far as Education in this country is concerned can be satisfied that it has very dedicated teachers and therefore we have reached where we have reached.

3.30 p.m.

Let us not on the altar of political expediency, ambition or power adopt attitudes or policies which can interfere with the

education of the smallest child, because Christ himself said suffer the little children to come unto me and forbid them not, for of such is the kingdom of Heaven. On another occasion he said in as much as you have done it to the least of these you have done it unto me. so from a Christian and from an educational point of view the future of our young children is a sacred trust. We are bound as representatives of the people to carry out that trust to the best of our ability and let us not for political advantage or for any other reason try to create political points which in any way can destroy that trust which is ours and for which one day we will have to answer.

As I said, I am very disappointed in the shadow Minister for Education. I have listened to him, I have admired him as a parliamentarian but I certainly have no admiration for him as a shadow Minister of Education, and I hope that the public will read his emotional outburst when the Gazette is printed — and I am sorry that it will not be printed tomorrow — because when they read the Minister's speech and compare it with the Shadow Minister's I do not think he could go up in Bay Land and talk because the people will then be able to see the quality of his speech.

I would just like to say in closing that we should all in the interest of the children of this country and for the future of this country put aside partisan views and let us hear if the Opposition has any further contribution to make. Let us hear it not as a criticism of the Minister personally or of his Ministry, but let the public of Barbados know, if they ever have the opportunity to run the country, how they will eradicate or alter the proposals put forward so well and so lucidly by the present Minister of Education.

Mrs. EASTMOND: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think it is about time I said a few words. The last two speakers have put the Government's case very well indeed and at this point I will not repeat what has been said by them, but I must first of all give credit to the Minister for bringing this Bill before the House. Indeed it is about time, and someone has to make a bold step. The Government has done a lot to help the people of this country and when we look at education, it is very important in any society especially in a developing society such as ours. We, over the years, have had systems of education which related to the British systems, and I can see that the Minister is trying to move away from this and I thank God for this, because I wondered when the time would come

that this country would be saved, because there is very little hope for this country unless we change its educational system. As much as we have a new Bill before the House and the Minister has been given powers to deal with certain issues, yet there are people, teachers and other people, who would be responsible to make sure that this Bill functions. The Minister has a Herculean task and I wonder if I were in his shoes how I would feel, but he has come a long way and there is no point getting the jitters at this stage.

Reflecting over the past years what we have to do for the society is what has been given to us through the educational system, and even as a girl looking at the society then I wondered when it would change and I knew that change could only be effected through the correct procedures of education. We still have some more drastic measures and steps to take because the society as it stands today still discriminates greatly. It starts first in the schools, that is where I found it as a child. I should say firstly in my home as a child because children get their education first from their parents, and when you were brought up as some of us have been to look at some people as being superior and to look at others as being inferior, and you hear it from the home and when you go into the school and find the same situation existing, a child that I was at the time wondered what was the use of French, Algebra, Geometry and all those things. I think human relationships were what mattered more than anything.

I hope that in this new system teachers will teach the children human relationships because this is very vital to a growing society. In this society the people who had the basic education, that is, to a third standard or seventh standard degree, are looked upon as social misfits. They are not supposed to rank with the people who had university degrees, but some of these people had understanding and common sense. Most of them learned to use their hands and had wonderful skills, but not many of them are recognised. We should be able in this society to let our children be taught by some of these masters. They were not masters who went to universities or secondary schools but they were masters at their crafts and their arts, and these are things that form the foundation of any country and are sadly lacking in my country today. Today we are still looking at the academic side of education as well as the technical side. It is good to see that technical education has come into its own, but I wonder if we need all these grandiose schemes. It costs

a lot of money to taxpayers to build more schools, to have better equipment, but I say that these children as well as the adults need the education. We need to be educated as to what our national role should be. In this country a lot of grownups do not even know about being nationalistic, they do not know what really relates to education. I see here in section 3(e) it states that one of the functions of the Minister shall be to contribute towards spiritual, moral, mental, physical, social and economic development of the community. When we look at the spiritual side, how much spiritual development is really being given to the children and to the people of this country?

3.40 p.m.

What kind of spiritual development do they have? The word "spiritual" is a big word with a lot of meaning. When it is said that the education system in this country was started by the Churches, I suppose that is why a lot of us are so ignorant, because we have not been taught the truth. A lot of us are still searching for the truth, and the only way to learn the truth is through the educational system. This Government have to put their finger on the problem and decide what sort of society we want. Do we want a society that still discriminates, and who will look at the people working in the field and think that they are nothing? Do we want a society that will look at lawyers, doctors, dentists and people with great qualifications and think that they are the only important people in the community? All people contribute to making this country a country. We have to recognize everybody in this country and not only those people who have a scrap of paper in their hands. We also have to recognize those who have commonsense and some knowledge and can teach this generation how to be better citizens.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we have to learn a lot. Are we prepared to learn? I often wonder if we are prepared to learn. We may be prepared to come in here and learn what some members carry on with, because there are a lot of members who come in here to show how long they can talk and how they can out-talk others. This is not necessary. What is necessary is to show what great thinkers we are. If we can put our thoughts in the right direction and get the things that are good and healthy for us we will be doing something. Are we teaching the children to know themselves spiritually and to understand themselves? We can come in here every day or every week, as it suits us, and pass laws. All of the laws that we pass are man-made laws. People will still be bad; there will still be

crimes, and all sorts of things in this society will never get any better until we can teach human beings how to battle with themselves, to understand their true identity, to work under the universal power, to understand that they have a mind of their own and to use that mind and not to pattern themselves after other people's pattern. Just go on and be yourselves.

As far as I can see, the elderly people in this society need to go back to school. We need teachers not only with dedication to teach from the textbooks and the various syllabuses, but we need teachers who have an understanding of metaphysics, who know something about the universe and its powers, who know something about their inner selves, and who can teach us that, unless we recognise the laws of God, we are not going anywhere or doing anything. All the money we have, all the seats that Government may have, and all the positions that various people may hold in the society will crumble and will fall. There is one thing that is lasting and it is the soul of man. That is why we have so much trouble in this country. You have people stealing; you have the Ministry of Health making headlines, the Ministry of Housing making headlines, the Ministry of Trade making headlines and so on. There will always be headlines. The Ministers are human beings. They will say what should be done, but there are other people who will have to carry out their instructions. Are our people fitted to carry out these instructions? We have to fit them first with the necessary qualifications to know that to steal is wrong and so on. We have a conscience. Let us deal with the conscience we have.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have been to private school, elementary school, and then to a secondary school. Even as a child I looked at the system and I realised that it was not what I wanted. I wanted relationship with people and with human beings. How many of us can have that? If we could have the right education injected into the schools, we would have no need for abortion laws. We would not even talk about illegitimacy. If a man and a woman wanted to have a child, they would have it and be blessed in the sight of God. All of these things we would not have to worry about because we would have adhered to the God-given laws. How many children know about God-given laws? They know about all the laws that we are making here in the House of Assembly. Very often I wonder if it is not sometimes a waste of paper. Look at the amount of work we have to put into it. We have to put a lot of energy into it.

Now, I know that the Minister is a human. I do not expect him to implement certain things. He can try because he has common sense, and he knows what I am talking about. I am dealing here with the spiritual side of man. When I say man, I mean everybody. The Minister has to look at the type of people who must teach this to the children. I hope to see the day when people of all ages will sit together in classrooms and relate things to one another. This is necessary. We have to forget age and do not put a stigma on it. It is a matter of mind development. Each and every person does not develop at the same-time. Some people develop late in life. It will be good for us to see some day a classroom where there are children, adolescents, and adults sitting together and reasoning together. This society needs a very, very radical change. As I have said before, someone has taken hold of things, but I hope he will get a bit more power and handle these things as well as possible, because spiritual development can tell on your mental ability.

We have in our society several mental cases. People are confused, and they do not know where they are. They get the education, but they cannot get a job. They get the education, but they are not fitted for the job. Education must be made to suit the people of this country, and we must fit the people to make their society a better society. I have dealt with the social needs. The social society, as it stands now, needs purging because what you will get is a society from the educational system is just a sectorial group: people getting together and talking about others. They do not think that other people are important. They do not think of educating themselves. The time they waste talking on telephones or to people around the corner about somebody's name could be better spent on talking or doing something educational. When we leave this world and go on, we are going on for a further education. That is how I feel. We were sent here on this earth to be educated. Are some of us educating ourselves? No. We are wasting God's good time that he gave us here.

3.50 p.m.

People are always anxious to feel that something is happening, and they have a belief that something should happen. This is what we find in this so-called society because of the educational system. I am not saying that we did not have great educators in the past, but you can look at your society and tell what sort of education it had, and from my looking at the society and examining its people too much time is wasted. People have no concept

whatsoever about time. They have work to do but they do not understand that work is necessary and important. This has to be taught in the schools.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, children must learn that some of us will use our brains and minds and others must use their hands. The person who stays idle just get into mischief, and if we continue in the stream in which we are going of turning out university graduates who become limers and cannot do certain jobs, we will be in for a very rude awakening, because these people are educating their minds and not using them. They may become mentally ill after a time and thus become social liabilities. A lot of people open their mouths and criticise this Government on the things that are being done, but the people of this country should get before a mirror and examine themselves and ask themselves what they are doing for the good of Barbadian society.

Looking at the economic side of the matter, naturally, if we work we should be remunerated, but there are some who want money but do not want to work for it. There are others who would like to work but cannot get a job, so we have to realise that the economic development of this country depends heavily on every able-bodied Barbadian. It is not the amount of money we work for, it is the pride with which we work. I often wonder if democracy is really the answer for a developing country. When you look at socialism you wonder if that, too, is the answer. To me the answer is in people finding the truth within themselves, because whether under democracy or socialism, if people are not educated to understand themselves, they are lost. You can change this Government and put in another Government, but no matter how many Governments you put in, until the educational system is wrestled with and handled effectively and efficiently to meet the needs of everyone, the system will break down.

Going back on something I said earlier, when you look at mothers educating their babies, you can see from that alone that the mothers need to be educated in the right way. They try to be too protective. I know about it because I am a mother. We do not have confidence in the great One who put us here. We try to tell the children all sorts of baby talk. We should understand from the crib we are educating the children and we should speak to them in perfect English or in Bajan and tell them their names and what they are; but we prattle to them and eventually we find some of the

children prattling back to us, and when they get in the schools, the children are confused. The adults need to be educated so that in turn they can relate the type of education they had to their children and know how to deal with them.

In the Day Nurseries we need the type of education so that when the children are put in the grammar schools they would know exactly who they are, what they are, and where they are going. The only way we can get somewhere fast is by looking at the spiritual, moral, mental, physical, social and economic development of not only the children but the adults in this society.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think the Hon. Minister requires some support, and you have been very patient all day with a debate like this. I do not know if education in itself is a subject in Barbados because all Barbadians have a certain amount of conceit about education, so whenever the subject is raised it provokes a lot of discussion.

I should like to underline some of the things that have been said by the hon. member for St. Michael South Central because I think the Minister has been charged by the hon. member for St. Peter with things that are not really logical or true, because he spoke about power.
4.00 p.m.

The whole concept of education is to give people knowledge, and knowledge in itself is power, but within the confines of the Bill you are talking about vesting power in somebody. Under the Constitution — I do not have to be naive about this — you have to vest power in Ministers. You vest powers in Ministers in the United Kingdom. It is nothing new. England had a change made in the Education Act. They brought in a big Act in 1944 and that was regarded as a big change because you do not change these things every day.

The hon. member for St. Peter talked about 1890. There is no point talking about 1890. You are consolidating an Act that was passed in 1890. Before 1890 there were little bits of things but the first big Act was in 1890. It is just as if you go back and look at the Trade Union Act of 1871, but it does not mean that the only time you amended the Act after 1871 is now. There were a series; but if you want to consolidate it now you go right back to 1871; if nothing of a consolidating nature has been done you will say you are consolidating the 1871 Act, but it does not mean in this case that you did not touch education since 1890.

It would be farcical to believe we are dealing with an Act of only 1890, because the Education Act has been amended since 1890, but what you are doing now is, you are repealing that and consolidating. What worries me is what I hear from members of Parliament. I do not mind people outside. Prior to Ministerial Government the Governor-in-Executive Committee controlled education. The Governor-in-Executive Committee in fact was the Governor. The Governor of Barbados had more power than any Minister or the Prime Minister because there was nobody over the Governor in Barbados. The Governor was the Chairman of the Governor-in-Executive Committee and he determined when those other members would meet him; he summoned a meeting of the Governor-in-Executive Committee, he, the Governor sent bills here; and even when I hear them speak about the civil service — I sat on the Governor-in-Executive Committee. The Governor dismissed people, and the Governor was the Prime Minister, the Governor had plenipotentiary powers. There was no question of going beyond the Governor. When the Governor fired you, you could go to the Secretary of State — how many people went beyond the Governor and went to the Secretary of State and succeeded?

So the whole Constitution was, you vest the authority in the Minister. In the United Kingdom the power is vested in the Minister, but when you come to Barbados now they have this idea that you have mini-independence, that therefore you have a big independence in the big United Kingdom but when it comes to Barbados you cannot have the same kind of independence because you have a mini-Minister.

I am not going to get into the argument because I am in the trade union movement myself and I do not intend to give anybody advice freely. I am paid by the Barbados Workers' Union, and I am not paid by the Barbados Workers' Union to get up on a public platform or to negotiate for anybody in public, or to tell anybody what to do; they must be capable of knowing what to do. All I will say is, if you want to take a political stance with a politician you must be prepared to go all the way with the politician. In my own organization, if I intend to take the stance with a politician, to take on the politicians, the newspapers, all of them together at the same time — because that is what you take on when you take on people in politics — there is no point in making an industrial issue of something when you are not sure if it is a political issue.

Now the Minister made mention of a lot of organizations, and in my view we have a lot of

amorphous organizations in Barbados. I am not making any particular reference to some of the teachers organizations, but we have a lot of amorphous organizations and I believe the Government sometimes use them as a good bait when you really do not want to meet somebody.

There is the national organization of this thing, the national organization of something, just as you hear 'consumer' somebody and you cannot get past the president and the secretary, and you see a lot of big headlines in the newspapers and all this foolishness of people of a purely amorphous organization.

We were to attend a meeting with the Minister with some of these organizations but to be frank, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am loathe to go to a meeting where you get 98 people at the meeting with the Minister sitting down in the corner as the Chairman, and the Minister has his lieutenants on the other side, and you have 98 there ready to catch the Minister's eye and they are only going to jump up to talk for the Minister to ask, who is that person that says something about so and so, and the next thing you know, an application comes around next week asking you to put him on a Board, or something like that.

If you are putting me on a Committee where there are a few people about business I go for that, but a lot of these are waste of time exercises, and I do not feel and my organization does not feel it is time to take them seriously. We have told some of these people so.

There is something now on the Port with the docks. We say we are not going on any Committee where you are going to appoint a Chairman who is an employer. We will not waste time to go to that. Somebody else must go to that, send somebody who wants noticing.

Sir, I do not see anything in the Bill which you can say when you examine the Bill that, I go so far as to say I do not think the Minister has even introduced anything that is really revolutionary, because I have a revolutionary concept about some things. They talk about registering the teachers. All the schools should register, and I would close down some because some of the supposed headteachers and principals in some of these schools should be in a school to be taught, and therefore I would close them down. Some of them do not have any schools with even minimum facilities that you can say a modern society should have. The reservation I believe the Minister might have in closing them down is part of the same idea about schools, the

ignorance of parents. A parent will pay a lot of money to say that his or her child is going to a high school, and the parent does not know anything about what is happening at the school at all, because the parent has never gone to the school, but the whole community is taken up with this idea that you pay this money — some of these people are being taken for a ride but if I were a revolutionary I would take over the whole educational system, tax the whole community to provide the kind of education that you say you want, and therefore all of us would have to pay for the kind of education we have.

You have it in Russia, therefore Russia can compete with the United States of America and they can send two people up in the air to dock together. It takes a lot of education to be able to do that. You cannot send people up there to do that kind of business merely by hearing that the Americans sent one and because you are a big Russian you are going to send one too. Next thing you know, you let go up there and you never come back down; you are up there like a butterfly or some piece of paper and never come back.

I think the hon. member for St. Lucy spoke on the point that you cannot in one breadth say that you are going to blame the Minister. They want a Minister for this, a Minister for that, and to that extent they are having, what? A Shadow Minister. Now is not this nonsense? Shadowboxing? You have a Shadow Minister. You go to the extent that you have six members, so you have six Shadow Ministers. Now if you over there are a Shadow Minister, what you call me over here? They are Shadow Ministers over there and I am a backbencher, like, when you call them Shadow Ministers you give them status that is more important; because the newspapers would come with their ignorance to write about a Shadow Minister and a backbencher. So when you talk about a Minister, this is a Minister shadowing, and this is a backbencher sitting down over here. This is the sort of thing you need for a pantomime; This is a sort of global ignorance.

You call a man a Shadow Minister and he is going to get up and talk for three hours; on what? Saying that a Minister should not have power and in the same breath saying 'yes he should have power because I am going to blame him! Now I heard one Member blame a Minister for some things but let me say this. The system of education in Barbados — and this is a question from which everybody is shying away — why is it that the system of education in Barbados has caused Ministers, members of the Government, as

well as members of the Opposition not to send their children to primary schools?

4.10 p.m.

I have heard everybody shying from it. It has absolutely nothing to do with Education as much. It has something to do with affluence. All of them have more money and there is an innate tendency in that the type of education that we have inherited is a class system of education, and we have imbibed it so long that we do not realise it. It was a system of English education that was predicated on class. Do you know that the first thing that somebody will tell you if they want to insult you is that you have no education? Well. I do not argue with people like that. The reason why you have this situation is that you are copying a system and you can only do what you know.

Unfortunately the Barbados system is what those people left for us to take over. Therefore you could not come the next day, the Minister taking over could not say that he is going to abandon the educational system that you had. Abandon it and do what? Do not send anybody to school?

The important thing is the teachers that you have. You do not make a teacher in a day or in a night or in five years. Teachers are constitutionally conservative, because whatever they know they feel that it is the best to know, and it takes a long time for a teacher who knows this to depart from that system. Teachers are not revolutionary people. They are conservative, so all the methods of teaching must go through the democratic process as long as the child is growing. It does not take a child eternity to go through a school career. You only have a certain number of years at school, so I do not think that this Bill in itself will create any real division.

What I believe is that you will have to get down to what are the practical applications of this Bill, what are the wastages. I spotted one about the private secondary schools and hon. members should be aware of this. You make a man pay a licence to open a rum shop. You say that a man can get drunk as he likes any time; but you say that the man who will cause him to get drunk has to pay a licence. You say that you can let anybody at any time open a school. The man cannot spell Ada backwards and he can open a school and he can be the Principal of the school.

There must be some checks on that. You cannot say that you are undemocratic because

you compel children to go to school. I do not think that it can be said that you are undemocratic because you compel children to learn. Now the danger about that in the past was that you forced the State. Those people who were in power were never prepared to tax themselves because they would have to pay more taxes. It was this idea of telling people that all are not going to absorb it. All are not going to absorb all of the good things and all are not going to absorb all of the bad things; but when it comes to basic things like Education it must be available to all.

I will give you an example. There are those who talk about Africa. I have been to Africa and I know Africa a little better than some people who talk about Africa. The reason why you had so many military governments in Africa is because they had to resort to the gun and to the military because they did not have enough money spent on Education throughout the community and therefore they could not raise enough people to run their own country.

They had to do it in Latin America. When the Spaniards left Latin America they left them with the Roman Catholic Church and a lot of people. The lady member of the House spoke about the Church. I have my reservations about them. When you have Roman Catholicism you get a lot of ignorance in children because they tell you that the Lord gives you a child and therefore if you believe that the Lord gave you a child you cannot get between anybody and God. That is a very difficult thing to get between; but what I do know is that they left a lot of ignorance around. If you are afraid to say so, if you are afraid to meet this issue, you cannot deal with it.

Barbados has been able to meet independence. Why? Barbados has been able to deal with its own services. Why? It is because there are more Barbadians capable in Barbados, and this idea of not being able to get the job or take up a job — I have had to warn my own people against this nonsense. I have been living long enough. This same ignorance was preached many years ago. Why educate the Barbadians? Where are you going to put them when sugar and sugar cane was predominant? The idea was why educate so many people when you could send them into the cane fields.

So, in education itself a man was not a human being. He did not enjoy anything other than cutting cane blades; but for the way that we have educated them 25 or 30 years ago you would find that Barbadians would not be able today to hold any of the positions which they

now hold because you would not have had the education at the roots. They would be like some of the places in Africa. They have more population than we have — millions, but there are millions of illiterates. You think of Barbados with 250,000 people, smaller than Coventry. The way I sometimes hear Barbadians talk is as if we are bigger than Russia. We talk in those big terms. Do you know why? It is because every Barbadian feels independent enough to deal with it.

I am satisfied in my own mind that no educational system is the best. Education is a process of change because Education deals with time and people; and as time changes and people change you have to change your educational system. I am not worried about the Minister having power. You change power with the system you have.

Hon. members on the Other Side should understand. Look at times past when the Labour Party was in power. I do not think that you have to be a constitutional lawyer to know that the Constitution vesting power in the hands of Ministers is not doing anything more than was done before there were Ministers. That was preached in here since 1954 on the introduction of Ministerial Government. I was never a Minister. I was on the Other Side; but some of the members even on this side had this fear about Ministerial power; but power, so far as a Minister is concerned, is something that you have to vest in them.

Now, when it comes to industrial relations, I do not enter into these matters until they reach the appropriate stage because I feel that if the Minister is meeting people and the teachers have to work for the Government, and the teachers have a profession and have organised themselves as a group of professional people and have put their proposals to the Minister in such a form, the Minister would understand a reasonable case when it is put to him.

4.20 p.m.

I do not subscribe to the view that because you have a registration system — and the hon. member also spoke about the terms of conditions of service — that it is a bad thing. Are these new terms and conditions adverse? There is nothing wrong with changing terms or conditions if changing them makes them better. If you are giving a man two weeks' vacation with pay and you can write into his terms of conditions four weeks instead of two there is nothing wrong with that, so it just depends on what the terms of conditions are. If you deprive

a man of something that he has entitled to before then you have to discuss it with him because you are taking away something you had given him by legislation. I do not advise the teachers what to do, but the teachers cannot find a common identity, they cannot find a common denominator, they cannot find a common source around which to rally and identify themselves as a professional group of workers, but they have to take the unfortunate role of being different republics within a small area. If they prefer to be independent republics then they have to pay the price for these multifarious organisations that would split up instead of becoming consolidated. I feel for that reason the various organisations should not fight on the outside but should get on the inside and carry out their negotiations with the Minister on any area that they consider vital to the interest of the workers they are serving. I feel that if you take a political stance, and this applies to any trade unionist, you have to be prepared to fight on political grounds because there is no point taking a political stance and then crying out for industrial quarter.

I feel, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the Bill as a whole is necessary, and everybody agrees with that, and I think that every Government, even the Opposition if it becomes the Government tomorrow, will have a different view about education. I do not make any boast about it, but I was on the Executive Committee which decided that there should be more than one Barbados Scholarship, but I do not want any credit for that because it was logical to me because you had about 100 boys and girls in the sixth forms and I thought it was nonsense to have just one Barbados Scholarship. That was my view in 1948. I had to fight with that because there was a system that if a bright boy or girl won a scholarship and went to a university all that the State was willing to provide was the amount of money for the first degree and the student had to come back home if his parents did not have enough money without getting the Ph.D. or any higher degree. I never subscribed to that because there was always a disadvantage. A girl or boy would spend seven years to do medicine, but if somebody was doing Arts he would take three or four years to get a degree, when five years will give you a second degree and they would not permit you to get it. These are the little things but they are not things that I can come out and say I would resign on or anything like that. I do not think there is anything against the interest of the teachers in the Bill, I think the Minister should be able to see that the Bill is flexible and that is where you give the

Minister power to carry out changes within the structure of the Bill without having to make amendments to an Act every time you want to do something.

We have reached the stage of independence and have given the Minister power. It is in Parliament where you will tell the other side what you expect the Minister to do and he will not be able to make any excuses for not doing anything and he will be able to do it much more expeditiously. It is an Education Act that comes from the United Kingdom Parliament of Westminster, but this is not a big thing any more in England because the teachers today are more belligerent than they were before. There are more people coming out of university now than before, so therefore the whole concept has changed and there has to be a change in the whole education pattern because the whole spectrum of education has changed over the years and will continue to change. The persons who are being educated now are not the same kind of persons as were educated in the past, and some people will believe that this is responsible for the revolution in university students but I believe it is more the spirit of the age, and sometimes people at the university can only be a reflection of people in other places.

I do not think that this Bill makes the Minister a dictator so that he can take away powers, because you cannot survive in a society like ours where so many people can read and write, dictators cannot survive in this sort of society, dictators can survive in a society where people find it difficult to understand what is going on. After the last election any man who wanted to be a dictator with 18 seats could have been a dictator because he could have made many amendments. There is no one on this side who feels that the six people over there should not be able to talk, which is a good thing for democracy, but anyhow they can go around the country and talk whatever they like and as often as they like.

4.30 p.m.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: If I may reply briefly to this debate, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I will refer specifically to the points which have been made during the debate. There was one made by the member for St. Peter in respect of the Registration Board and the authority given to the Minister to empower the Board to register persons or to permit them to teach in the schools even though they do not have the prescribed qualifications. Clause 56(5) states:

"The Minister may after consultation with the Chairman of the Registration Board direct the Registration Board in writing to register, for such period not exceeding six years as the Minister shall specify, any person who would otherwise be liable to be refused registration as a teacher on the ground that he does not possess the prescribed qualifications, and the Registraion Board shall give effect to such direction."

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this was precisely in relation to a position where the prescribed qualifications are — let us take the present position — 4 "O" levels, including English, in the appointment of a teacher, but there are persons in the Teaching Service who do not possess these qualifications although they are performing this service towards the children in the system. This particular Clause is meant to take care of that particular case. It specifically says:

"....any person who would otherwise be liable to be refused as a teacher...."

But there is no fullstop there. That is the particular condition.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, there was one other matter in which it was claimed that the Boards of Management of Schools were being placed above the law. Reference was made to Section 26(3) which states:

"Where a Board of Management is required to or authorised by or under this Act to exercise any function in accordance with the advice of the Teaching Service Commission the question whether the Board has so exercised that function shall not be inquired into by any court."

That is merely following the type of protection given to Commissions, which is found in the Constitution of Barbados which states:

"Any Commission established by this Section that validly performs any function vested in it by or under this Section —

(b) Any person who validly performs any function designated to him in pursuance of the provisions...."

The Sections are stated.

"...shall not be inquired into by any court."

This is a provision which is enshrined in the Constitution in respect of Commissions, and this merely keeps us in line with the constitution.

There was some talk about the Teaching Service Commission. With regard to the Teaching Service Commission, I would like to make it clear that the first draft we produced did not include provision for the Teaching Service Commission because there were problems involved. It was recognised that there need to be a constitutional amendment in order to give effect to the establishment of a Teaching Service Commission. In the first draft we were cautious not to include any such provision. Both teachers organisations called for a Teaching Service Commission. Indeed, it was one of the platforms, as far as I can remember, of matters being called for, I believe, by the Opposition Labour Party as well. I believe I am right, but, if I am wrong on that, I can be corrected. On the recommendation of the Union, we included the Teaching Service Commission, but there is a sense in which the hon. member for St. Michael West is correct.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, there are areas where this Bill does not go far enough. We are not making any claim that it is the perfect Bill or anything like that. We would like to see situations in which if you have six qualified teachers in a particular subject in one school, and you do not have any graduate or qualified teachers in another school, you would be able to transfer some of those teachers. Now, we have to safeguard the rights of every existing teacher. They are very jealous of their rights, and we have scrupulously tried to safeguard their rights. That is why we have proposed a Clause relating to appointments, transfers and promotions in the Secondary School Teaching Service as we have done.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not wish to spend very long in reply. Many of the points which have been made have been taken and rebutted. I merely wish to make it clear that this Government does not introduce legislation for the glorification of any particular individual. If we make provision for education, or bring in measures relating to education, such measure or measures will relate to the growth and development of the children of the people of this country. That is what, as Minister of Education, I am interested in; and that is what this Government is interested in: the growth and development of the children in this country. This particular measure is made to arrange educational matters in this country, and that is why we have introduced it.

I do not wish to recite the many measures that have been taken by this Government since it assumed power in 1961. The hon. member

for St. Michael South Central gave a list. It was by no means a full list, but we have to refute and rebut directly any charge that the period from 1961 until today has been what is described as a "slumber period". That has nothing at all to do with the facts of the case. The people of this country know that it has been one in which there has been great activity and development as far as education is concerned.

There was one reference by the member for St. Lucy in relation to the Higher Education Loan Fund. On that, I would merely like to say that he has asked for more loans. We would, of course, wish to grant more loans. It was established as a revolving fund, and from the time that it was set up in the 1950's until this day the number of loans made to students wishing to pursue tertiary level education has borne a direct relationship with the repayments under that particular loan fund.

4.40 p.m.

It is a source of deep regret and concern that the large number of persons who have benefited from loans under this Higher Education Loan Fund have not been paying back the money. Under the regulations they are granted a grace period of five or six months. They are very eager to get the loans because it is a pressing thing. They want to improve themselves, to gain higher qualifications to advance in their profession, but when they get the money, they have attained their degree, they have attained their particular professional qualifications, yet they have not been very active in meeting their obligations by making repayments under the Loan Fund and this is causing hardship upon other persons who would wish to benefit in like manner to those who have been given loans. In other words, they are given loans, they come back and assume their positions, the grace period expires, and they do not start repaying the loan, or if they start, they do it very fitfully and then they cease to make payments and this means that the young people who come to apply for loans cannot get (a) either any sum at all or (b) the full amount that they require; and Heaven knows in these days of escalating costs the maximum amount permissible is small anyhow. We will be getting in touch with the defaulters, or rather I should say that this is the time when there is the fullest consultation.

Mr. HINDS: On a point of order, I just want to draw to the Minister's attention that there have been occasions where teachers applied for loans to go overseas. They applied to their respective Boards for leave, the leave was not granted but the loan was granted.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Well, they should take the matter up. I do not have power in that area. I do not grant leave and indeed I do not grant loans. There is a Committee established called the Higher Education Loan Fund Committee and that is what I am dealing with. That Committee is established by Act of Parliament and I do not grant leave; so that is not a matter of Ministerial power as far as the Minister is concerned.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not think I would wish to detain this Honourable Chamber any longer on this particular Bill.

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

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

Parts I to IX inclusive were called and passed.

The First Schedule was called and passed.

The Second Schedule was called and passed.

The Third Schedule was called and passed.

The Fourth Schedule was called.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, in the Fourth Schedule at Clause II(I) in lines 2 and 3 the words "Part II" are to be deleted and similarly in Clause 12(i) the third line from the bottom of that Clause the words "Part II" are to be deleted. Also on page 90 after sub-paragraph 2(i) the next paragraph should be sub-paragraph (2).

I beg to move that the Fourth Schedule as amended stand part.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE: I beg to second that.

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

The Fifth Schedule was called and passed.

The Sixth Schedule was called and passed.

On the motion of Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill with amendments and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

4.50 p.m.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill be now read a third time.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE: I beg to second that.

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the next Item with which the Government proposes to deal is a Resolution that the sum of seventy-five thousand dollars be granted from the Consolidated Fund and placed at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1975-76 Part II — Capital as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1975-76 No. 2 which form the Schedule to this Resolution.

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

Hon. A. MORRISON: I beg to second that.

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

RESOLUTION RE SUCTION DREDGER FOR COAST GUARD STATION

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, as the addendum sets out, this amount is required for the purchase of one suction dredger, for dredging the docking area at the Coast Guard Station at Oistins. This twelve-inch suction dredger is needed for clearing of the sand which accumulates from time to time in the docking area of the Coast Guard Station at Oistins, and that same bit of equipment will be used in the carenage and the deep water harbour.

The price is regarded as being reasonable by the experts who examined the dredger. The project manager at Seawell Airport Development project and the mechanical engineer of the Ministry of Communications and Works have both examined the dredger and they feel that the price is reasonable and the equipment is up-to-date and suitable for the purpose for which it is being acquired.

Sir, I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. A. MORRISON: I beg to second that.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, it is surprising that Government has got to come to the House to ask for money to purchase a dredger, when we were told that the reason for siting the Coast Guard Station in that area was because of the depth of water which would have been available for the docking area. It is no secret that Government has again gone wrong in the siting of that station, or, I believe they did not carry out the necessary evaluation of the tides around that area to see whether or not the drawing would cause land to accumulate or whether it would have protected what was then a reasonable deep area of water.

What it would appear to me has happened is, that they are now creating a beach along that side of the coast and one would have a perpetual task of taking sand from the docking area. I raised the question some time ago in here about the volume of sand which has been removed from the very area and was thrown all along Welches Road down on the beach.

Now it would appear that Parliament would be asked from time to time to boot this Bill for keeping the coast guard station clear. I would hope this is not going to be one of those recurrent expenditures for a project which was badly done.

I believe Government should have made some sort of statement on this project. After prodding and poking for a long time we have heard the Prime Minister come in here and criticise the engineers and all those people who worked on the cemetery at Warrens, but I would like to hear something about the coast guard station because it is costing us a lot of money, and I heard the Minister in introducing this Resolution speak about the use of the dredger in the carenage. He did not say whether the carenage had a dredger before and what they used to do in those circumstances, but certainly I cannot agree at this stage without more information coming from the Minister, to vote for \$75,000 for this project. I certainly cannot agree on that, Mr. Minister, because I figure we have never been given the full facts of the coast guard station. We have never been told how and why it came to be put in that position, we have never been told what works were carried out in order to evaluate tide movement, movement of sand, depth of water and all these various things.

What I see has happened, they have upped the value of the land in that area because I remember — I know in fact — I think it is Roman Apartments which suddenly changed their

sign, to Roman Apartments on Sea, as a result of the building of the coast guard station.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I believe that if I were to ask every member of the Government party individually if they believe that a coast guard for Barbados at this present time in its economic development is a priority, and promise them that I would not betray their confidence, I am confident they would say 'no'. I see the Minister even nodding his head in agreement. I know they would say 'yes' because of party ties but if I promise them that I would not betray their confidence, they would say privately to me 'Craig, I agree with you; it is not a priority at this present time in our country's economic development.'

I can assure you, Sir, that if you went into the street and asked every single Barbadian out there if they agreed with the Government providing Barbados with a coast guard at this time, they would also say 'no'. I would challenge any member of the Government to go down in the courtyard now and take a poll of a dozen persons out there, except Hinds — Hinds is the only person who would say 'yes I agree with it.' But you could not kill a man like Hinds because there is a famous joke on Hinds. It is alleged that the Prime Minister got into his car and the Prime Minister's wife was about to get in and Hinds jumped in before the Prime Minister's wife, sat down beside the Prime Minister and told Mrs. Barrow 'you come in next.'

Sir, I do not think we on this side can support a Resolution of this nature after hearing the Leader of the House almost giving us the assurance in here that it would not cost Barbados another cent apart from the emoluments they would have to pay the staff. That is what the Leader of the House said in here when they came in here asking for additional money.

5.00 p.m.

This is what the Leader of the House said when they came asking for additional money. He said that it would not cost a single cent more, but now today they are asking the House to support a Resolution for \$75,000 to bring down a dredge to take out more sand to put on the road.

It is true that sometimes I get tired and bored listening to the hon. Member for St. Michael West. He has had international exposure, and sometimes I wonder if he could not do a little better. I would like to hear him on this. If he was in the Opposition I would think that the member for St. Michael West in that half baked

approach that he has, thinking that he is still Mr. Somebody, when he is nobody, would be attacking this Resolution today.

We heard him today talking about a Shadow Minister. We all know that the Member for St. Michael West is only a shadow of himself. Is this out of the sugar workers' money again? Do you really believe that this is fair? I am almost sure that if I go outside and ask you if you agree with this Resolution that you will tell me no. This is a vicious Resolution — coming here and again draining the taxpayers of this country.

You will hear just now from the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance that he was ill-advised. We heard the Member for St. Michael West on a platform in 1961 saying that the harbour was put in the wrong place I am no engineer. What I know is that Barbados is not yet ready for this, and this is something that the Government has pushed down the throats of the Opposition because of the numbers that they have. I know that they will get it through because of the numbers. That is the democratic society of which the lady member of this House spoke here today. I am sorry that she did not speak all evening because she put some licks on the Government. I saw the member for St. Michael West trying to tell her to come down just as my colleague here told Louis Tull one night "take him down quick."

I heard the member talk about democracy. This is where democracy is on trial now because if they did not have the numbers over there this Resolution could not get through this evening. This is the danger in democracy. You are dealing with \$75,000 to throw into the sea. That is exactly what you are going to do. You are going to bring a dredger from England and bring somebody from England to accompany it. As we have seen here recently, we have a Coast Guard. You spent the taxpayers' money putting down a station and bringing down boats and then you brought Coast Guards from Trinidad to train the fellows here on how to operate the boats. That is after you had it here for months.

I would not be surprised if you did not come back here and ask for another \$20,000 to bring down a man from England because Commander Phillips will not be able to handle it. This is what you call window dressing. I will hold the hon. Member when I will deal with him on window dressing; because his son window dressed me, not the father. I accept that. I will hold the member for St. Michael West in a good corner when I know that he cannot get out. If he is

playing to the gallery I will play to it too. I am glad to know that the son has window dressed me. He has dressed me up. Not the father. The father is dead and gone. I believe that the father dressed up a lot of people.

With those few comments, Mr. Chairman, I want to show my disapproval. The Government came with this today. They said they wanted it done. I just spoke to my colleague, the Leader of the Opposition, and I told him in no uncertain terms that I could not support this, that I have been a strong critic of it on the outside and I am not going to support it here.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Member said that he was going to bait me in dealing with this matter. That was the technique that he used. I will not begin to talk about this idea of being a shadow of myself. The hon. Member said something worse than that during the last election campaign, but the surprising thing is that I am here with him. The hon. Member does not seem to understand that whatever he can say in his way I can say also, but when it comes to parliamentary methods he has to be able to match with me too, not only match on the platform, but match in here.

The hon. Member said that he would like to hear the hon. Member for St. Michael West on this. If he was doing his parliamentary work properly he would know that when the question of the Coast Guard Station came before this House I spoke on it and I said that I had my reservations. My reservations were not about the place where it would be put because that was a technical matter, but on principle. I was not dealing with the technical aspects of it. I said that I had my reservations about a coast guard. There was no hide and seek about it because I said that in these small communities I have my reservations about para-military organisations. I said so because you have to be more than careful in small communities because these para-military organisations sometimes tend to believe that they are more important than the civilian authorities.

I am not concerned about putting it at Oistins or St. Lucy. I was not dealing with the technical aspect of it. The hon. Member for St. Joseph has spoken of problems when it comes to the sea and the siting of certain things. We went through a lot of similar problems with the deep water harbour. Some engineers said that the deep water harbour should be further north. Some said that it should be further south going up by the Aquatic Club. Therefore it came midway between north and south and it ended

up at Pelican Island; but since 1890 they were quibbling as to whether we should have a deep water or not.

I do not quibble about the location of these things. I am dealing with principle. We have already established the principle. It is not a question of if you are going to have a coast-guard station. You already have one. So it is no point having the boats and if they are running aground saying that you are not going to buy a dredger to dredge them out.

The hon. Member seems to be thinking that the side that a man is on in politics is a question of philosophy. It has nothing to do with his thinking on a particular issue. I may have my own views about a coast guard, but you must understand that you are a member of a political party. There is not every thing that you agree on in a political party, nor every issue that you disregard but you do not say that you have to bring down the heavens on these issues. It is always going to be the question of somebody's judgment.

5.10 p.m.

The question of a Coast Guard is always going to be a question of somebody's judgement, and my judgement is that I say I do not believe in para-military things in these small societies and I feel you should be able to control them from the point of view of the police and the other means of operating a society on a good basis. I think that the hon. member will have to agree that you have as a fact a Coast Guard Service with you, and even if what the hon. member for St. Joseph said is true, that it is sited in the wrong place, it means you had wrong advice and the hon. member need not worry about the advice being good, bad or wrong because all Governments are exposed to good or bad advice. When you get good advice you get the credit for doing something excellent, and when you get bad advice you have to take lashes. I say that the main issue whether the advice is good or bad is that it was given in good faith, and if it is given in good faith that is all right. Barbados is a small community and does not have sometimes the best engineers in the world. I am not an engineer, but I do not consider that I would spend so much money in operating so many things in this way. There should be another way of disposal of the dead. When you have a small place like Barbados you have to make up your mind if you are going to have more burial ground for the dead than you have space for the living. We know we have some oranges and lemons in our services who give the Government bad advice. I know that all

Governments get bad advice from time to time, but if the policy is that we will have a Coast Guard Service we will have one.

The hon. member spoke about the sand drift and the tide and this is all right, lots of people know all these things when the tide begins to behave. Some time ago a man said that Barbados, being a coral rock, is sinking on the east side and the Atlantic is coming in, and somebody else said he had a plan to push back the Atlantic. Sometimes you get these crazy things going on, however, you have already committed yourself to a Coast Guard Service and you cannot sell the ships now, you cannot make them pleasure ships like the Jolly Roger for people to sail about in, therefore you have to utilise them to the best of your ability.

Mr. ADAMS: Hon. members, Mr. Chairman, have heard so much about the Coast Guard in the last few years that I think they are treating the whole episode somewhat light-heartedly. It is something like if you tell a big lie often enough it sometimes gets believed. One of the truest statements made in here during this debate has been that if you ask the members of the Government privately and get honest answers, politics being what it is, about the desirability of a Coast Guard it is extremely doubtful whether anybody would say it was desirable, and we should not allow the fact that there has been so much criticism to enure us of that criticism and to conceal from us the obvious truth that the Coast Guard was one of the major pieces of massive misjudgement and mismanagement by the Prime Minister of the economy of Barbados in the last few years. He dismissed casually a statement which I made at a public meeting at Eagle Hall that Barbados was facing its worst economic situation since 1937. He embarked upon a subject like the Coast Guard which is costing Barbados millions, he embarked upon CARICOM without an understanding of what it would mean not only on the cost of living but Government revenue in this Island, and then found himself all through 1973 borrowing from abroad, in 1974 at home and in 1975 no longer borrowing but levying on the backs of those who can least afford it.

We must look at this Resolution against this background of three solid years of mismanagement and destruction of the Barbados economy from above. A remark, I believe, was made by the Prime Minister that the Opposition had prevented people from investing money in this country, but at a time when people were investing money in this country nobody said the Opposition was causing them to invest it because

we were making the same statements then as we are making now. We have attacked the Government over the years but now we are to be attacked for not getting investments when the investment is not coming. It is time that the scales fall from the eyes of hon. members opposite, it is nothing that the Opposition has done to destroy the economy of Barbados, it is Resolutions such as this and what they stand for that destroy the economy of Barbados and the ability of the Government to manage the affairs of this country properly. Last November in my absence the Prime Minister was very abusive upon the fact that I pointed out that in the previous August as much money was spent on repaying the debts of this island as was spent on education. What will he say now when he reads in the latest report — he is Minister of Finance and he should know — that over \$6 million has had to be spent in one month in charges of debt and repayment when only \$2.3 million was spent on education? Hon. members can judge the validity of his criticisms in the light of more recent figures, and these figures are highly relevant today, because in a country where you have borrowed so much money to create a Coast Guard that you have to find \$6 million to repay debt, how can you come even for \$75,000? To be more specific, it has been clear from any examination or any observation of the Coast Guard base in recent months, that the policy of dredging has been a failure. This is why I was shocked and surprised beyond imagination when the hon. member for St. James showed me this Resolution. The dredger driven or owned by Mr. Gorte has been dredging at the Coast Guard harbour and it dredged away the sand. The boats began to go back in the harbour, but drive down there now and you find all the boats anchored in Oistin's Bay, in other words the dredging has been a failure. I can only presume that the harbour cannot carry out its function to accommodate the vessels properly even after this dredging. This dredging is only throwing good money after bad.

5.20 p.m.

It is throwing good money after bad. You cannot maintain an artificial harbour — that is what it is — upon the basis of a permanent dredge. The carenage in Bridgetown, in the days when it was constantly used, had to be dredged because it was draining a lot of mud. Mud comes from down St. Michael into the carenage and it had to be dredged. Harbours all over the world which have admirable, natural features, namely, their inlets protected from weather, often have to be dredged. The lagoon at Venice has to be kept clear, just to take an example. All over the world these places have to be dredged because they may

provide natural anchorages, and the entrances to the harbour may not be safe for modern ships.

Rotterdam has to be dredged, not because anything is wrong with it for 95% of the vessels in the world, but because oil tankers are beginning to draught 100 feet of water, and the English Channel, and the North Sea, have not previously seen vessels with that draught. As soon as you have built an artificial harbour which turns out to have been put in the wrong place, so that it becomes a sand track — that is a sand track. That harbour is suitable for the Land Ship and not the Coast Guard. That place is a sand track, and you will have to think of some means other than dredging.

Sir, already this year I went down there with my 8-year old son, and we walked and swam outside of the breakwater. He is a little child. Mr. Phillips will know him well because I remember one day Mr. Phillips was warning him not to go into the harbour because he might drown. He climbed down and played on the beach, but I can only presume that Mr. Phillips did not know he was there. He thought it was a harbour, and it turned out to be a beach.

Now, it was dredged, and I believe that, after it was dredged, I might have had difficulty getting around the point. I walked around on the last occasion. I would guarantee that I could go there this afternoon, if the light holds, and walk around the edge with little children. What is the sense in dredging it any more? What is the utility of dredging it? The Government must try to get United Nations assistance. Certainly they should have a plan. The Government should try to fill in the area between the Harbour, the Infirmary and the District Hospital, create some additional land to put to some use; accept the fact that they have created a massive new beach — congratulate themselves on it if they like — put another pier out to sea nearer to Oistins, or do something else. So many difficulties have resulted to the people at Oistins due to this Harbour, because the beach is not a sufficient amenity to make up for the difficulties. The sand is blocked off from reaching Oistins and Welches Beaches, which have been very drastically and deleteriously affected, as a result of the Coast Guard Harbour. Fishing boats cannot be hauled up so easily because there is more exposed reef and less sand, and their bottoms get scraped when they are coming in. Even Moses, I understand, are getting scraped when they have to be dragged in at Oistins.

These are problems the Government should be looking to spend \$75,000 on. Oistins needs drainage, it still needs a by-pass road, and it

needs something in substitution for the Harbour. You cannot throw good money after bad. Sir, we voted \$923,000 for the recurrent expenditure on that Harbour. That is a lot of money. \$900,000 for what, Sir? What has been the utility to Barbados of the Coast Guard? How many millions have been spent on it? \$2 million to buy the boats and set it up, \$900,000 a year and two years in existence. It is probably \$4 million or more than that. The Leader of the House would have these figures. Nothing has been gained out of spending this money.

They had difficulties in staffing the Coast Guard Service. I understand that seamen have had to be dismissed for negligence. We have had the unfortunate spectacle of one of the boats going aground when it should have been either training for or taking part in a ceremonial sail past. We have had situations of the Coast Guard going to all conceivable lengths to obtain publicity by the fact that they arrested one yacht that could not find an Immigration Officer on Christmas Day, or to rescue one fishing boat that, presumably, preferred to use the Coast Guard than a fellow fishing boat in the circumstances. Even the few dollars they have received could never pay back for what it has cost the people of Barbados to have this Coast Guard. Enough is enough, Sir. I can never vote for this Resolution. If they need a dredger, they can ask Mr. Gorte to come back and do some more dredging.

I would remind hon. members, finally, Sir, that my major criticisms are general and particular. The general criticisms are that the Coast Guard has cost too much money. It was embarked upon at a time when the Prime Minister could not understand that times were bad, and it has cost us millions of dollars. Never forget, Sir, that at the end of last year, just as at the end of 1973, current expenditure in Barbados exceeded current revenue. There was \$119 million in expenditure at the end of 1974, and \$118 million in revenue. In 1973 there was also a gap between current expenditure and revenue.

As I have reminded you, Sir, we have had in one month already this year to pay back over \$6 million in interest and the repayment of debt. The Coast Guard is doing nothing. It is in the wrong place; it was put there in the wrong place at the wrong time, for the wrong reason. It was put there to aggrandize the Prime Minister's feeling of power that Barbados must have a navy. Very soon he is going to give us an airforce, Sir, if he is not stopped.

He should instead be trying to understand what Caricom has done to this Island in reducing

Government revenue; and trying to understand that the investment climate for Barbados is bad because foreign investors have no confidence in the Prime Minister — they have no confidence in him. If they did not have confidence in me, they would have been giving the Prime Minister money. If they did not have confidence in the Opposition, they would have been helping the Government. It is known that they have more confidence in the Opposition than in the Government, and they have stopped investing. That is the whole point, Sir. I have never yet heard of people not investing in a country because they did not have confidence in the Opposition. When the foreign investors says to you: "Enough is enough", then, the people also should say to you: "Enough is enough", and enough is enough for the people of Barbados on this Resolution.

The question that the Resolution in the sum of \$75,000 do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative, the Committee dividing as follows:

Ayes: Hon. C. E. TALMA; Hon. A. MORRISON; Hon. F. G. SMITH; Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE; Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD; Mr. WALCOTT; Mrs. EASTMOND, and Mr. WEEKES — 8.

Noes: Mr. ADAMS; Mr. CRAIG; Mr. MOTTLEY; Mr. HINDS and Mr. BOLDEN — 5.
5.30 p.m.

On motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. A. MORRISON, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Resolution in Committee of Supply and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On the motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. A. MORRISON, the Resolution was read a first time.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to move that the Resolution be now read a second time.

Hon. A. MORRISON: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:—

Ayes: Hon. C. E. TALMA, Hon. A. MORRISON; Hon. F. G. SMITH; Mr. LOWE; Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE; Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD; Mr. WALCOTT; Mrs. EASTMOND and Mr. WEEKES — 9.

Noes: Mr. ADAMS; Mr. CRAIG; Mr. MOTTLEY; Mr. HINDS and Mr. BOLDEN, — 5.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that the Resolution be now agreed to.

Hon. A. MORRISON: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative the House dividing as follows:—

Ayes: Hon. C. E. TALMA, Hon. A. MORRISON; Hon. F. G. SMITH; Mr. LOWE; Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE; Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD; Mr. WALCOTT; Mrs. EASTMOND and Mr. WEEKES — 9.

Noes: Mr. ADAMS; Mr. CRAIG; Mr. MOTTLEY; Mr. HINDS and Mr. BOLDEN — 5.

THE DEVELOPMENT (CANADIAN LOAN) (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1975.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the next matter which the Government proposes to deal with is a Bill to amend the Development (Canadian Loan) Act, 1970.

As the Objects and Reasons set out, this Bill would amend the Development (Canadian Loan) Act, 1970, in order to increase the amounts which the Government may borrow under the Act.

Under Section 2 of the Act the Government of Barbados is authorised to borrow a sum not exceeding \$Can. 2.6 million for the purchase of materials and equipment in connection with the development of the water resources and water supply of Barbados. It is felt that the next phase has been reached for the development of the potable water resources in Barbados and the Government has received word to the effect that the Canadian Ministerial authorities have given consent to conclude the loan on concessionary terms for the financing of Canadian source equipment and materials required for use in this phase of the programme and the amount is not to exceed \$Can 3.1 million. The project will consist of general improvement of water supplies to various parts of the Island and a continuation of the over all development programme as outlined in the reports of comprehensive proposals for the development and distribution of public water supplies in Barbados, and more specifically covering (1) the East Coast area (2) Alleyndale system (3) Bridgetown system (4) Castle Grant system (5) Hampton system (6)

Warleigh system (7) Miscellaneous General improvements.

As far as the design for the project is concerned, that will be undertaken by the Waterworks Department and the construction will be done by local labour under Barbadian direction. The supply of equipment from Canada shall include pipes, fittings, electrical equipment, steel tanks and other miscellaneous items including reinforced steel for reservoir constructions, meters, radio communicating sets etc. This list which I gave may be revised by mutual consent provided the total cost of the service material and equipment, freight and insurance financed under the agreement does not exceed \$Can. 3.1 million.

This is just the second phase of carrying through the expansion of our water resource programme for the further development of our water resources in Barbados and something which we should be very pleased to hear about it.

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

Hon. A. MORRISON: I beg to second that.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am not opposed to the amendment to the Act, but what I want to draw attention to is that the last time I spoke on water supply in this country, I think there was a remark made by the Minister, I do not remember if it was published or not, but I can say that I have personal experience of some of the material which was brought in from Canada where it has been in use, and it has been erupting time after time.

5.40 p.m.

I am afraid I have to be very personal, because I constructed my house in 1968 and I would like to tell the Minister now — I am sorry he is outside but his Parliamentary Secretary can check this — from the time the pipe line has been connected to my house until this day it has been leaking in the road. They have changed it about seven times, and if you go and look at it now you would see it is leaking in the road, and I was told it is inferior material brought in from Canada. I would hope that the material that will come in this time will be of a better quality. (Asides) Check it out. If you went around Boarded Hall and checked last year, there used to be a burst pipe along the Boarded Hall road every day, and when I enquired I was told it was the material we brought in from Canada.

Now I want to come down to another fundamental. The Minister is outlining the

number of areas which would benefit from this new loan, made mention of Castle Grant. I want to say here and now, that within the last three or four months I have been pestered morning, noon and night by the people in the Spa Hill and St. Joseph areas that they are not getting water. Now, I made personal enquiries and I was told that the reservoir at Castle Grant was dry and nothing could be done about it.

Sir, I am not the type of politician who is going to come in the House and ask unnecessary questions for the constituents to believe that you are doing a good job. If the rain is not falling and the reservoir has gone dry, that is an Act of God which no man on earth can remedy, so therefore I am not quarrelling about that. I have told the people that the reservoir is dry and nothing can be done about it; but what I am worried about is that in the Spa Hill — Mellowes Hill area people who have been asking for water mains cannot get water mains, and every time I ask about it I am told they are waiting on Soil Conservation; but they are waiting on Soil Conservation to such an extent that they have even withdrawn the lorry that used to carry water into the same areas.

Now I want it to be made perfectly clear. If part of the money is for Castle Grant I do not want to hear the Minister say they are waiting on Soil Conservation, because in the last session the last Minister who is the sitting member for St. Andrew drew to the attention of this House that he had a road in his constituency which people asked for years to have repaired, and he was given the same answer, that they are waiting on Soil Conservation, and after he could not wait any longer he asked MCW to drop some marl fill on the road. This was done and the people were able to pass across the road without the aid of Soil Conservation.

I myself have proposed in this Chamber that they can use the system I have seen in Ghana which is also used in certain parts of St. Lucia, that you run the water via plastic line over head; even if the land slips the plastic line will bend and flex; but I say this now. There is dispute between the engineer in the Waterworks as to the use of plastic mains as against the use of the regular cast iron piping, because I asked the question on good information and when I asked whether they had investigated the use of plastic mains — plastic mains are used all over the world today because of the flexibility of the plastic, because of the cheapness of the plastic, and it is said that a three-inch plastic main will carry the volume of water of a five-inch cast iron main.

The Minister has got to get his technical officers together and get them down to specifics

and stop the argument between them as to what is to be used and what is not to be used.

I know the Minister had once told me personally a view he has about St. Joseph. I will not repeat it in here at this moment but I hope he erases that view from his brain, and as soon as the loan is acquired I hope part of it will be used — as a matter of fact I hope the Castle Grant area will be serviced first.

I see they talk about the East Coast Road area. Now there are no lot of houses on the East Coast Road, so I would like to hear exactly what they are going to do on the East Coast Road. I understand the Town Planner says you cannot build on one side of the East Coast Road, so I would like to know for what reason this great water extension will take place on the East Coast Road, not for the few houses there, although part falls in the constituency of St. Joseph. I am very clear on this. I would like to know what part of the East Coast area, because I do not want to hear that you are going to use money, you allocate part for the East Coast Area and then as happens, you supply the developments on the West Coast, down on the beach side and leave the natives lacking. As I said, I am hoping to see a proper development of the water services in St. Joseph. They have been treated the worst way; they have been the worst treated people and I would not like to hear any further any question of Soil Conservation not doing this, because at one stage you hear it will take \$30 million to \$40 million to remedy the problem in St. Joseph and St. Andrew so you cannot do much.

So if that is one side of the speech it means you will never do anything on the East Coast Road. But I would like to see St. Joseph have a proper water supply because as one man said to me last week, we pay the same water rates as anybody else and we are entitled to the same service as anybody else. I would like the Minister to know that since the water rates were increased the usage of water has increased. The people have said, my rates have gone up, I can use the water. The people have said it.

It is no question of rain not having fallen for a long time. Rain might not have fallen for a long time but the reason for the increased use of water is the increased cost the householder has had to pay, and he intends to get his pound of flesh. I would like to stress that St. Joseph is entitled to a reasonable amount of water if they are going to pay the same water rates as other people, otherwise I shall be telling the people in St. Joseph they have a good case of demanding a reduction in their monthly or quarterly service

charge if they only get a quarter of the water provided. They have a good case about it, because you should not expect them to pay a quarterly charge and get half quarter water. That is not my philosophy. There are certain areas in Bridgetown and Christ Church where the water is not cut off at all, and they pay their quarterly charge, so if you are going to cut, my view is that you will have to share it between all of us. One lot must not suffer against the other.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Sir, some people, according to the hon. member for St. Joseph, say that water rates have gone up therefore they are going to use water. Electricity has gone up; why don't those same people use more electricity? You see, where Government is involved you get this sort of ignorant thinking. Electricity rates have gone up with a fuel charge. The same people will cut down on electricity but because water is provided by the Government, the same people will say they are going to use the water. You see? Government again. The milch cow.
5.50 p.m.

So the same people will cut down, switch off lights and put in small bulbs; but as soon as it comes to the Government, if it is a question of renting a house they do not want to pay. Anybody who operates on that thinking, that because water rates have gone up they will use more water, that is the most ignorant and unpatriotic approach that I have ever come across, and they surely do not merit sharing in anything that this community offers. I say so boldly.

Mr. BOLDEN: On a point of order. The Minister cannot abuse the citizens of this country in that way. I wonder if he would care to deny that since the water rates have gone up the volume of consumption of water has also gone up.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I am saying that any citizen who adopts the approach mentioned by the Member for St. Joseph is totally unworthy of any of the benefits of the community. You are going to waste water because the rates have gone up, but the same citizen cuts down on light provided by a private company because their rates have gone up. Why does he not use more electricity? I will tell him now that instead of cutting down on the water rates, if you are not getting water put in a meter and pay for what you are getting.

Mr. BOLDEN: On a point order. Can the Minister deny that several persons have applied for meters and could not get them? He must

not make statements like that because people have applied for meters and could not get them.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Point made.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I am saying now, and I want this to go on record that water rates in Barbados are probably the cheapest in the whole wide world even at an increase of 400 per cent. Because they have been getting it so cheap for too long and because it has gone up, you hear all of this ignorance about water today. A man pays a man \$6.00 a quarter, less than 7 cents a day for water; but he goes to the shop and buys a small coke for 21 cents. That is three days supply of water, and he cannot bathe with the coke or clean his teeth with it. He will buy a beer which is about five days supply of water and you will not hear him quarrelling. The time has come when we have got to get the people of this country thinking responsibly. This programme as read out by the Leader of the House does not give any details of expansion. We are giving you a rough idea of the area. We are grateful to the Canadians for the loan.

I have just given a poor woman in St. Joseph water without one cent. She is an old age pensioner. I instructed the Chief Engineer and water was run into her house last week. Everybody around her has got water. I could call the name. I rang the Chief Engineer and told him to forget the charge. Give this old lady water, and when she can pay she can pay. Do not think that you alone feel for poor people. They went straight and put in the water without a cent being paid. She is an old age pensioner in St. Joseph. You are talking to the converted when it comes to poor people.

Mr. HINDS: I wonder if the Minister will give the assurance that old age pensioners in St. Peter will be given similar assistance or that type of treatment from the Minister.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: No point.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I am not giving that assurance. This was an old lady who had to get water from people around who stopped her from getting it. There are no standpipes and the poor old lady would have died of thirst.

I have taken steps since last year with the Ministry of Finance to make it easy for old age pensioners.

Mr. BOLDEN: I am seeking some information. I wonder if the Minister would not

agree with me that instead of spending \$50,000 or \$60,000 to put up one bath in an area, they could have used that money to run water into the houses in the very vicinity and they would have been able to pay it back better.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: The hon. Member knows that this Government has not put up a bath in two years because my Ministry is concentrating on running water so that every household can get. Anyhow, it is not a long debate. I think that members over there like the hon. Member for the City and the hon. Member for St. Peter know that when it comes to giving people services and relieving hardships I go out of my way to do it. I have taken steps about these water rates. I have taken steps to see if I can do anything. As the law stands, I have no power to remit. I meet them with tears in their eyes. If I had the power to remit I would do it; and I have already written to the Ministry of Finance in September last year about water rates for old age pensioners. This is nothing new. People come to me. You will see yours, but I, as Minister responsible for water, get them from all eleven parishes. I know what is the position and I sympathise with them. I am pursuing this matter with the Ministry of Finance to take steps to help old age pensioners in the case of water rates. This is not a detailed plan of what we are going to do; but it is just to enable us to get the money; and, as you know, if you are getting Canadian money you do not have the freedom to buy pipes here there and everywhere.

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

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

Hon. A. MORRISON: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. LOWE in the Chair.

Clauses 1 to 2 inclusive of the Bill were called and passed.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Your Honour do now report the passing of one Bill in Committee.

Hon. A. MORRISON: I beg to second that.

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

On separate motions of Hon. C. E. TALMA seconded by Hon. A. MORRISON, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: This concludes Government Business, Sir.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICES

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have spoken to you earlier today and you gave me the assurance that I could give notice of this Resolution and ask a question on behalf of the hon. Member for St. Thomas.

Sir, on behalf of the hon. Member for St. Thomas — Is the Minister satisfied that all food and medical supplies purchased on behalf of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital in the year ending April 1975 reached and were used by the hospital; and if not, what is the value of the missing article or articles that cannot be traced?

Sir, the Resolution in my name reads as follows:-

BE IT RESOLVED that this Honourable House request the Government to consider the introduction of legislation to enable all old age pensioners to obtain absolutely free of charge medical advice and attention from any medical practitioner who is registered and practising in the island, and free medicine from any pharmacist who is offering drugs for sale or drug store in the mere presentation of the old age pension card by the old age pensioner.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Bill to amend the Barbados Fire Insurance Act of 1891, and I beg to move that the Bill be read a first time.

Mr. CRAIG. I beg to second that.

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

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Deputy Speaker, this concludes Government Business, as I have said. I beg to move that the House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 29th July, 1975 at 12 o'clock noon.

Hon. A. MORRISON: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly at 6.00 p.m.