

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

FIRST SESSION OF 1976-81

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 19th October, 1976.

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 12.15 p.m., o'clock.

PRESENT

His Honour W. C. B. HINDS, (Speaker); Hon. L. S. CRAIG, (Minister of Labour, Welfare, Youth Affairs and Sport); Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, M.A., (Prime Minister and Minister of Finance and Planning); Hon. C. L. BOLDEN, LL.B., (Minister of Agriculture, Food and Consumer Affairs); Hon. F. G. SMITH, Q.C., S.C., B.A., (Leader of the Opposition); Dr. R. B. CADDLE; Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD, M.A.; Mr. E. E. GREAVES, B.A., Ed.M.; Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS, LL.M.; Hon. B. A. MILLER, (Minister of Health and National Insurance); Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE, (Minister of Communications and Works); Mr. J. G. ODLE, (Chairman of Committees); Mr. M. C. C. WARD; Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN, (Deputy Prime Minister, Minister of Caribbean Affairs, External Trade, Industry and Tourism and Leader of the House); Mr. V. L. JOHNSON, B.A., M.A.; Mr. B. M. TAITT, M.A.; Hon. L. R. TULL, M.A., (Minister of Education and Community Development); Mr. DeL. O. BRADSHAW; Mr. L. L. SISNETT; Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM, M.Sc. (Econ.); and His Honour E. E. ALLEYNE, LL.M., (Deputy Speaker).

Prayers were read.

CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minutes of the Meeting for Tuesday, 12th October, 1976, have been duly circulated.

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: I beg to move that those Minutes be taken as read and confirmed.

Mr. SIMMONS: I beg to second that.

Mr. SPEAKER: There being no objection these Minutes are hereby taken as read and confirmed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY HIS HONOUR THE SPEAKER

I have received a copy of the Statement of Accounts for the month of July, 1976 as prepared by the Accountant General.

PAPER PRESENTED

Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to lay the Public Officers Loan and Travelling Allowances Regulations, 1976.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a

Resolution to grant the sum of \$890,150 out of the Consolidated Fund and place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1976-77, Part I - Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1976-77, No. 18, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

I also beg to give notice of a Bill to amend the Caribbean Investment Corporation Act, 1974.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Bill to provide for the establishment and administration of a Student Revolving Loan Fund and for related matters.

FIRST READING OF BILLS

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to amend the Caribbean Investment Corporation Act 1974, be now read a first time.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: I beg to second that.

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

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to provide for the establishment and administration of a Student Revolving Loan Fund and for related matters be now read a first time.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: I beg to second that.

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

OBITUARY SPEECHES RE THE LATE
GOVERNOR-GENERAL SIR WINSTON
SCOTT GCMG, GCVO

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I had intended at the last meeting to speak under this Head of obituary speeches. I had anticipated that the Government would be the one to move a Resolution which I will duly move in paying tribute to our revered and distinguished Governor-General. Seeing that the Government so far has taken no steps under this Head I deem it my duty as a matter of respect and as a member of this Honourable Chamber that I should move this Resolution in due course on this matter.

Mr. Speaker, on the 11th August this year Parliament was dissolved on the advice of the then Prime Minister. Regrettably some time later in the day our first native Governor General, Sir Winston Arleigh Scott passed away. At that time technically there was no Parliament; only the Ministers remained to continue the Government during the interim. This Parliament is now in being having been opened by the Acting Governor General on the 6th October, 1976. In this Parliament there are quite a few members who were in the old Parliament but apart from that, in this Parliament are all who I should hope would be proud of the fact that in Sir Winston Scott we produced our first native Governor General. I feel that this Chamber, Parliament generally, should for the record and history state in no uncertain terms its appreciation of the dedication, the sacrifice and the commitment to duty as displayed by our distinguished Head of State. That is why I waited for the Government to take the initiative and they having not done so I deem it my duty as Leader of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition to move such a Resolution in due course.

I cannot add very much, Mr. Speaker, to the encomiums, the eulogies and the tributes that have been paid to our late Governor General.
12.25 p.m.

I am more than particularly pleased to be able to do that, because it was my particular fortune not only to be a member of the same Church as our late Governor General, but to have preached at the service at James Street Methodist Church on occasions when he did attend the 9 o'clock morning service. It was a pleasure of mine — a personal pleasure and privilege to escort him from the pulpit out of the church at the end of the Benediction. So in that we are common in that we share a common faith, a common belief in God; and to that extent I am proud to know that at least one capacity I shared with our distinguished Governor General, an abiding faith in God.

He served his country well, not only in his capacity as a medical practitioner, but he was called shortly after Independence, some time in May, 1967, to serve his country in an office which hitherto had been the privilege of English and ex-patriates. Anyone who knew him at the time would have known that the high hopes and aspirations which we all held for him in the new office would have been more than justified.

Throughout his years in that distinguished office he showed a concern and a humanity and a love for his country and his people which certainly those of us who have the honour to represent people could with pride emulate; and even to the very end he was serving his country not only in varying out a constitutional function, which was delegated to him, but shortly before it was his duty to receive a foreign ambassador accredited to this country.

To many people it may be considered that the office of Governor General is a sinecure, but there are certain functions enshrined in that office which can either bring honour or disgrace to one's community; and I think that Sir Winston Scott must have died with the knowledge that he had served his country well and that he was likely to be received into the halls of the Everlasting with the Almighty's admonition and welcome "well done, thou good and faithful servant; enter thou into the joy of thy Lord." He served his country well. May he rest in peace and may light perpetual shine upon him.

And now, Mr. Speaker, it is my solemn duty and privilege to move the following Resolution:—

Whereas our beloved and revered Governor General, Sir Winston Arleigh Scott, G.C.M.G., G.C.V.O., died on the 11th day of August, 1976;

And Whereas Parliament was dissolved on the very same day;

And Whereas Sir Winston Scott was Barbados' first native Governor General;

And Whereas the Legislature of this Island by virtue of the dissolution was not able to pay tribute to this most distinguished son of the soil;

Be It Resolved that this House of Assembly places on record its appreciation for the outstanding service, dedication and sacrifice of this distinguished Head of State.

Further be it resolved that this House of Assembly extend to Lady Scott and his sorrowing relatives its sincerest condolences and its deep felt sympathy.

As Your Honour pleases.

Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, in rising to second this Resolution I can but regret that the Leader of the Opposition did not draw what he perhaps on reflection will characterise as no more than an oversight, not on the part indeed necessarily of the Government, but of the officials of the House, to the necessity during an early meeting of the new House for a Resolution such as this, and it gives me in the circumstances some consolation that I am afforded the opportunity of seconding it where indeed I accept that it is more usual that such Resolutions be moved from the Government side.

It gives me not only as Prime Minister, but as an individual particular pleasure that I have this opportunity of speaking on this Resolution of condolence. Sir Winston Arleigh Scott — Arleigh as he was known — was a companion of my father during his boyhood, indeed my grandfather was Arleigh Scott's godfather. The two families lived close together, in My Lord's Hill and Howell's Cross Road. The various youths attended Harrison College in their boyhood. Then I think we found that my father and various of his uncles — various of his brothers — my uncles — and Arleigh Scott travelled abroad as school boy teams to Guyana and Trinidad. When the day came for Arleigh Scott to choose a wife I believe I am right in saying that my parents introduced the then Arleigh Scott to Rosita Hynam. Without going too far into family details, my parents were indeed married from the house of Lady Scott's parents where my mother then lived at that particular period of her existence.

So you will appreciate, Mr. Speaker, that there is a long, close family association between that of the late Governor General and my own family. In March 1938 at a meeting indeed at which Grantley Adams, as he then was, was not even present, Arleigh Scott was one of the founders of the Barbados Labour Party. He attended the first two meetings. It is true that his political paths diverged from ours, but never was there any diminution in family feeling at that level, or in respect at political level, where the Barbados Labour Party and the Adamses in particular were concerned.

Arleigh Scott entered the Legislative Council of this Island and later the Senate. His contributions were always heard with respect and pleasure by persons from all sides of the political spectrum; and when he was appointed Governor General in May, 1967, his appointment was greeted with general approbation, as I recall it, from all three political parties in Barbados at that time.

He served as Governor General without criticism, and again, as I recall it, criticism even within the private ranks of the party which was in opposition at the time of his appointment, and which so continued until September 2nd, 1976.

I last had an opportunity of extensive conversation with the Governor General, I think the then Governor General, in May of this year; and alas to my judgment, not being the judgment of a doctor, I was impressed by the recovery he appeared to have made at that time from his earlier illness.

I am sure that had he remained in office, he would have handled the transition between Governments with the same fine skill and impartiality which he brought to bear on all his decisions as Governor General and the entire administration of that high office during his tenure. All hon. members of the House will welcome this Resolution, and I am sure that Lady Scott with whom indeed I have been in correspondence this week will be happy to know that the House of Assembly although necessarily belatedly, has recognised the contribution which Sir Winston Arleigh Scott had made to the development of our country during the first decade of its independence.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to second the Resolution.
12.35 p.m.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I rise to associate myself with this Resolution which has been stated would have the approbation of all members in the Chamber. I wish to say that the late Governor-General, Sir Winston Arleigh Scott, was a man of deep tenderness, compassion and generosity. It is well known in the annals of this country his work in the healing profession, of bringing care and comfort to those who were sick in body and indeed in mind, and in this respect generations of Barbadians are indebted to him.

I wish in particular to speak of him and his interest in education, because it is not generally known that he had a deep and abiding commitment to the progress of this country through education, and through education not merely in the narrow sense of within the framework of the classroom, but those broader and deeper qualities which go to make the men and women who have contributed to Barbados as a thriving democratic society. On many occasions I have had the privilege of welcoming him at institutions in this country and always his knowledge of what went on in those institutions and his concern for the future development and improvement of those institutions were always very revealing and very helpful to me while I held the portfolio of Minister of Education.

He had a deep and abiding interest in the need for increasing agricultural education in this country and on a number of occasions it was my privilege to discuss with him this whole question distilled from his experience from travels as far afield as Australia, and his insights in this regard as I indicated were very helpful to me in trying to formulate programmes in this regard.

If we reflect upon his services as a member of our distinguished Parliament in the Other Place, we will see from his speeches that he was always on the side of progress and development, always making points which would lead to the improvement of the affairs of this country and always humane and generous in his approach to matters.

With those remarks, I wish, as I indicated, to support this Resolution and also to join in extending my condolences to his widow Lady Scott and his sorrowing relatives.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, it is not the length of the speech which will indicate the deep sorrow which persons feel for the passing of Sir Winston Scott. There are many things which have been written about him and many things which have been said about him and therefore, Sir, I do

not intend to detain this Honourable House by repeating a number of truisms which have already been uttered, But Sir, I could not let this occasion pass without going on record as associating myself with this Resolution and reminding hon. members of the role which Sir Winston and his dear Lady played over the ten years which we have had the pleasure and privilege of having them in Government House.

I remember, Mr. Speaker, some time in 1969 or 1970, I believe, when Sir Winston and Lady Scott came back to New York as it were, the number of persons who turned out to see them, and above all, persons who had gone to school with Sir Winston, persons who had, as it were, summered and wintered with him, and all felt that Barbados could not have done itself more pride than to have two gracious persons in their positions of the Government and the State, and indeed Mr. Speaker, my tribute will be that having seen representation of Barbados in many forms, having seen many persons working for Barbados outside of Barbados, I have seen none who has graced the office with such dignity, none who has represented the country overseas even on a very short visit with such majesty as did Sir Winston and Lady Scott on the occasions on which I saw them outside of Barbados.

As I have said, I do not intend to lengthen this tribute by speaking at length, and so, Sir, I wish merely to associate myself with this Resolution.

Mr. SPEAKER: I too beg to associate myself with the sentiments expressed by both sides of this Honourable House in that this Resolution touches very deeply, I must say, the soul of each and every one of us Barbadians when we remember how great a son of the soil the late Sir Winston Arleigh Scott has proven himself to be throughout his term of office and in his earlier years in private practice as a medical practitioner.

I do not propose putting this Resolution to the vote, but I will ask hon. members to show their assent to the passing by standing in their places in silence for one minute as a mark of respect.

Hon. Members stood in their places in silence for one minute.

And so this Resolution is now passed.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 1 stands in the name of the Hon. Leader of the House, to move the House into Committee of Supply.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. ODLE in the Chair.
12.45 p.m.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1976-77
No. 12

Head 4(2) – Establishments – was called.

Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution is one which was before the previous House of Assembly and died at the dissolution thereof. It is a Resolution proposing to make a nonpensionable allowance at the rate of \$50 a month to Secretaries who are assigned to Ministers, and we are seeking with this Resolution for it to be back-dated to 1st April, 1976.

The principle of this Resolution was accepted by the former Government and has been approved by the Cabinet and now comes before the House.

I beg to move that Head 4(2) stand part.

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: I beg to second that.

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

Head 6(1) – Prime Minister's Office – Direction and Policy Formulation – was called.

Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, although this Resolution stands in my name it forms really a part of the Civil Aviation Division which has been transferred to the Ministry of the Deputy Prime Minister. Nonetheless, this was prepared in the office of the former Prime Minister and it relates to the purchase of a refrigerator.

The need for the purchase arose because the refrigerator which was in use by public officers employed in the Civil Aviation Division apparently belonged to the Port Department and was taken away making some difficulty and creating some inconvenience for public officers employed in that Division.

This again, Sir, is a matter which was approved by the former Cabinet and has been approved by the current Cabinet. I beg to move that Head 6(1) stand part; it is for the sum of \$978.

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: I beg to second that.

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

Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the Resolution for the sum of \$9,978 do now pass.

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: I beg to second that.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1976-77
No. 14

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution is in respect of a sum of money to complete the building to house the Barbados National Standards Institution, together with a further sum for the purchase of Fume Cupboards, and an additional sum for a fire alarm system.

The total sum is \$276,541, although part of that sum is a revote from the \$430,000 which was included in the Capital Estimates for the year 1975-76.

I now move that the Resolution do now pass.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: I beg to second that.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to oppose this Resolution because I am very glad to see that the Government agrees that we need to have a National Standards Institution. I must confess that at one point during the recent fracas I wondered whether the Standards Institution would suffer the same fate as a number of other things which were destined, according to the statements, to be eliminated – things like the Coast Guard and that sort of thing – but I hope that the Minister in paying attention to the standards in Barbados will come eventually, and I believe he will, to understand that having proper standards in Barbados, especially for those things which are used by the consumers of Barbados and as you know, Mr. Chairman, we are all at some time consumers, I hope that you will come to understand that the Standards Institution is only part of what must be a comprehensive

policy in the area of consumer affairs to improve the quality of life of the people in this country.

This Standards Institution should have been completed two years ago, but as you know, Sir, within the governmental structure there are many bureaucratic conditions which defy simple and sometimes complex logic. This Standards Institution was conceived many years ago and we went to the United Nations Development Fund and we got assistance for the establishment of the laboratory and other ancillary services for the Standards Institution. You will probably not believe it, Mr. Chairman, but for over a year a number of instruments and other paraphernalia which will be used in the laboratory, which is what this money is for, had to remain on the docks or pushed about in various buildings because of what can only be described as bureaucracy, and the Minister will discover that with the best will in the world, when the bureaucratic system starts to put you in a vortex that you can only sometimes hope that you get out.

Mr. Chairman, standards in Barbados as I said form part and must form part of a comprehensive policy.
12.55 p.m.

It must — and the Minister will discover — be related to the policy of importation. It must also be related to the policy of prices. Recently I read in the local Press where the Minister is alleged to have indicated that he does not wish anyone to come before him in order to get a licence to import anything into this country. The implication of that statement — and I keep hoping that is not a statement the Minister made — was that, in the previous administration, persons had to go before the Minister in order to get a licence.

Mr. Chairman, you yourself, Sir, are aware of the system which obtained in the then Ministry of Trade, Industry and Commerce, and you know that, if there was one thing that was fairly done in that Ministry, it was the allocation of licences. I go further, Sir, I put it to the Ministers who are now looking after the allocation of licences and that kind of policy — I understand that there are two of them, and one has to report to the other. I do not know, Mr. Chairman, I have been told that they have one Minister reporting to the other, but that is neither here nor there. When they read the files of the Ministry, they are bound to find that the system that was used was a system that was fair. You, Mr. Chairman yourself, having had some experience with this Ministry in the

allocation of licences, can confirm that this is so.

I go further and say that the Barbados Labour Party, during the campaign, indicated that they were going to remove licences and they made a big thing of it. Of course, Mr. Chairman, people all over the world are known for not reading the fine print, and the promise made in their manifesto did have some fine print which said something to the effect, or to the extent, that it was consistent with the CARICOM obligations. Now that they have taken their first step, I hope, what can we find? We find that they have removed licences from the First Schedule. That is a ban on Socialists countries, I believe, and I have no quarrel about that because it is neither here nor there. But what they will find out is that the question of how much money you spend on certain items will not be discovered by the Statistical Department because, Sir, in some ways that is not a Statistical Department; it is more like a Department of Archives. The only reason why we retained a number of those things on licence was that we should have up-to-date information of the amount of money being spent from this country with other nations. For example, you will find...

Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. There is a rule of the House that the discussion must be relevant to the matter under consideration. I am very respectfully submitting to Your Honour that what is being discussed now about licences, Japan and the Soviet Union really cannot have anything to do with the Barbados National Standards Institution. I am submitting that he is irrelevant.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Chair accepts that the hon. member has strayed somewhat. Please desist, and continue with your speech.

Mr. TAITT: Certainly, Sir. The opportunity will present itself later. As you will recall, Sir, I indicated that the question of a policy of Standards is related to the policy of licensing, because the only way you can control the quality of a product, which is brought into this country, is if you have some mechanism by which you can stop a particular item from coming in. As you know, Sir, if you take some of the pig food: the various meats that were brought into this country, they may pass the health test, but that is all they could stand. They barely pass the health test, and on a number of occasions in the past items were allowed into this country which would not have

been sold anywhere else for human consumption. There are persons who, for example, will tell you that they were certain kinds of salted fish brought into this country which in other countries, certainly in North America, would have been used for making dog food.

It was the Licensing policy, when I came to the Ministry, which stopped the people in Roebuck Street from bringing what, in essence, was dog food. The quality of salt fish in this country, if you will recall, Mr. Chairman, went back up. It had reached a point where it could hardly be described as food fit for human consumption. As I said, I hope that the construction of the Standards Institution will come to any early conclusion. It has been going up for a long time, and I believe that the people in this community are entitled to have standards, not only because they cannot look at all of the items critically, but because it is their due and their right to have proper standards. I am very glad to hear that the Minister intends to let the Standards Institution continue. I hope that, within the next few weeks we will hear that the Standards Institution laboratory has been completed and it will be opened. It has been promised for over a year now, and I look forward to hearing that the Standards Institution will soon be completed.

Mr. E. E. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, in rising to make my contribution to this Resolution, which is before the Chamber, I would like to pay tribute particularly to those people who, in the early days when the idea of this Institution was conceived, were able to develop it and take it along to a point where we are now seeing an idea becoming a reality. It is true that the Institution has been functioning in some ways for some time now, but today we are approving of a Resolution which will see the further operation and implementation of the Standards Institute and what is hopefully designed to serve in this country.

Naturally, this idea is one which was conceived by the Democratic Labour Party, and I think the people of this country will recognise this and will recognise the very important contribution which this Institution will be able to make towards the establishment of proper standards in Barbados. My colleague, who has just sat down, the member for St. Michael South West, in his contribution made reference to the way in which the Standards Institution could function effectively on an internal basis. I think that the point should be made about the

very important role that a Standards Institution can play as far as the external situation is concerned.

We are in Barbados, moving gradually into the field of industrialisation. It has been established that the local market is unable to absorb all of the goods we produce and which can be produced in Barbados. We, therefore, have to think in terms of export. Markets must, therefore, be found for the goods which are produced in this country. If we are going to be able to compete effectively on the world market, then it is fairly obvious that we will have to conform to a certain accepted standard as far as external marketing is concerned.

1.05 p.m.

This is where I find and see that this issue can play a vital role because I do not think that we would want to be in a position where when goods are produced in this country and they are exported, that they are turned down or they are rejected. You know, in some countries and particularly in the United States of America – in New York – you go into stores and there are sections which are set aside for rejects or seconds. I do not think that we would want to have our goods produced in Barbados to fall into this kind of category. We as a young developing country aim to establish and to develop as high standards as possible in anything which we produce and which we would want to market; and this is not only for the purposes of export but as the hon. member for St. Michael South West indicated, for internal purposes, because we consider that our people deserve also the highest possible standards.

The people who are consumers in this country deserve the highest possible standards. So that I, as I said, would like to once more underline the importance and the important role which the institution can play and I would want to re emphasise the fact that it was an institution which was nurtured and which was brought to birth by the Democratic Labour Party.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, it is indeed strange to see members on the other side get up and pretend that the creation of the National Standards Institution was the brain child of the Democratic Labour Party. If they would take a few minutes to check the Manifesto of the Barbados Labour Party for 1966 they will note that it was our idea of having a National Standards Institution in Barbados because you embarked on industrialization, and if you wanted to acquire world-wide markets you must conform to standards – standards which are acceptable all over the world.

The second point I must make is this. When the hon. member for St. Michael South West spoke about a Standards Institution for playing the game fair he is trying to draw me out at this point on licensing but I am not yet ready to disclose the things I have found in the files; so he must not start appealing for light so soon. Let him wait. (*Aside*) I know you want to know what I have found.

The Standards Institution, as much as you hear so much from the other side, Mr. Chairman, stands in a very peculiar position today. In the first place it was delayed for quite a long time in getting off the ground because when certain proposals were put forward to the last Government they ignored the proposals. The reason why the supplemental has come at this time is nothing to do with what the member for St. Michael South West talked about the elimination of certain projects. This Government will eliminate wasteful projects which were created by the Democratic Labour Party, to finance certain of their friends, but when there are projects that are worthwhile to the community at large they will be pursued by this present Government.

Under the same Barbados National Standards Institution, Mr. Chairman, one of the things that one will notice here is that there is serious duplication of equipment between the National Standards Institution and the Agricultural Department – the Government Lab. I am at the moment working on a plan to amalgamate the system whereby the Institution and the analyst will have good equipment and do more work than they are doing at the moment.

The question of the building. In Barbados you find that there are at least three Government Institutions dealing with food technology. I am also working on a plan to amalgamate the whole scientific operation of the Government into one of two places and therefore save triplication and all the duplication that went on under the other Government. So the question of the Resolution is only the beginning of a process which you will notice over the next coming year and which will certainly eliminate things but it will save money to the taxpayers of this country, and there will be progression much faster than what happened under the other Government.

So let the member for St. Michael South West sit and stew for the time being on licences. The National Institution was nothing to do with licences. He talked about substandard articles which were brought in in Roebuck Street. What about the substandard backs and necks and the

substandard turkey wings, if you want me to tell you about them, that you allowed in here. You issued the licenses....

Mr. TAITT: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. He must know that he was sitting on the Committee which agreed to allow backs and necks to come into this country; the same Minister. He cannot get in here and try to give people the impression that somebody allowed backs and necks. He sat on the Committee. The same man speaking.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Would the Minister continue.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, if he wants to start the fight let me tell you what happened. The hon. member should know full well that the Ministry of Agriculture dealt with the production and the Ministry of Trade dealt with the issuing of licences which competed against the agriculturalist in this country, and he would know the friends to whom licences were issued for the importation of the very commodities.....

Mr. TAITT: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. The Minister is misleading this House. He knows that the only person or company in this country that was allowed to import chicken for a very long time was the Barbados Marketing Corporation. He further knows, Sir, that there was a Committee in the Ministry of Agriculture which liaised with the Committee of which he was an arch member, which told the Ministry of Trade how many backs and necks to allow at any given time, and he can check the files and he can bring them here and he can tell the people of Barbados that each time a licence was issued he knew about it because the Ministry of Agriculture Committee used to take the information to him. Let him deny that.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, that is untrue because.....

Mr. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. Let him bring the files and prove that it is untrue. I say that it is true.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: To the Chair this appears to be a lot of cross talk which really has nothing to do with the issue and I am asking the hon. member for St. Michael South West to take his seat, and the Hon. Minister, the hon. member for St. Joseph, please continue in accordance with the subject under discussion.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, I am dealing with the National Standards Institution, I would not like to get involved in any cross talk to give Your Honour any difficulties in ruling, but the hon. member must not make accusations which he cannot substantiate because I will produce the files to this Chamber.

This morning before I came here I had a meeting with members complaining of how they applied for licences for certain commodities; they did not get them but other people got the licences. I am not afraid. Ask him who issued the licences to bring whole chickens that are down at the Port now to be sold out, because I refused to issue licences to bring whole chickens into this country now.

1.15 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, the National Standards Institute will be encouraged. It is an organisation which has part of its funding...

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. The hon. Minister of Agriculture has a contract with the Barbados Marketing Corporation, and he should declare his interest. He has a contract with the B.M.C. for processing chicken.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. member for St. Michael South Central please take his seat. That is not a point of order. Will the hon. member please continue with the debate. (*Asides*).

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, I am not ready to answer that group over there as yet. If the Hon. Leader of the Opposition will go home and check his brains he will realise that this member does not have any contract with the B.M.C., but a company with which I was connected...

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Declare your interest.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, the National Standards Institute is at the moment funded in three ways, part Government, part private enterprise and from the United Nations. I can assure this hon. Chamber that as far as the Institute is concerned, this Government will make sure that it functions far better than it functioned under the last Government.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1976-77 No. 16

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution seeks to acquire \$165,000 as the first step in the implementation of the plan to re-absorb 14 year old children in the new Comprehensive Schools. At the end of the last school year over 2,000 children were turned out of the new Comprehensive Schools.

This is part of the plan of this Government that they should be re-absorbed into the system at the very earliest opportunity. To this end we must have equipment and we must have extensions to existing buildings and other capital equipment. This Resolution seeks only to acquire that equipment to carry out the necessary renovations and extensions to existing buildings.

I beg to move that the Resolution do now pass.

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, I have the greatest pleasure in seconding this Resolution, and I want to congratulate the hon. member for St. George South for the speed and efficiency with which he acted to provide consolation in a matter which hurt many members of this community for many years. He has displayed an ability which the other side was devoid of; and I hope that the other side will have the courage to get up and let their hearts speak and join with us in congratulating the hon. member. (*cheers*).

For a long period of time we on this side felt that the policy of the Democratic Labour Party was going in the wrong direction. We always felt that they had concentrated on school buildings and placed little emphasis on refashioning a curriculum which was suitable to the general mass of school children of this country. And not only did they perpetuate a curriculum which was devised for a different society and for a different purpose, but it was narrow in academic content.

I welcome this opportunity to challenge the other side because they departed from what they found when they came, and it is time to put the historical record right. For too long the record of the old Barbados Labour Party has been distorted by the propagandists of the other side in relation to Education. We have now the opportunity as we look back upon it to let the facts speak.

The position is that when the Labour Party came into power in this country a newer type of education as envisaged in the Comprehensive Schools like Princess Margaret, St. Leonards' Boys

and Girls' and West St. Joseph and such schools was already laid. I well recall that the Minister of Education was Mr. Jordan and we went on radio in Barbados to try to persuade the people that they should get around to the view that the type of education....

Hon. F. G. SMITH: On a point of order. Barbados has never had a Minister of Education called Jordan.

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: When the hon. member was away in Jamaica, having run from Barbados...

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, do not mind where I ran. What I am dealing with now....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order. I cannot have two hon. members on their feet.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I am trying to put the record straight. Barbados never had a Minister of Education called Mr. Jordan. To tell us that Barbados had a Minister of Education called Mr. Jordan and to tell us that that is history....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. member sit.

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: He does not even rise on a point of order. That is not a point of order. I am dealing with the position when the hon. member was in Jamaica after he wrote a letter to Dr. Cummins begging to be Speaker, and the ex-Prime Minister told the D.L.P. that he was entirely untrustworthy because he wanted to run with the hares and hunt with the hounds. The hon. member must not interrupt me because I am perfectly capable of dealing with the hon. member.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I am on my feet and I am on a point of order. I have never written a letter to anybody asking to be Speaker. I got into the House of Assembly in 1956 when there was a row in your party between Husbands and Dr. Cummins. So how could I write a letter asking to be Speaker before I went to Jamaica in 1958?

In any case, what I am saying is that Barbados has never had a Minister of Education called Mr. Jordan as the Leader of the House has said. If he was not so hot headed and stupid he would know that he probably means the Chief Education Officer.

Mr. SIMMONS: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. He cannot come here and call any member stupid. That is casting aspersions on the personalities of members on this side. Let him withdraw that.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. The dictionary is very clear on what stupidity is. If we see stupidity, it is stupidity.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. member please resume.

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Do not mind the Hon. Leader of the Opposition. Everytime he speaks he creates a situation because of the nonsense that he talks which brings more votes to the Barbados Labour Party. The basic point is that when the Democratic Labour Party came into power in 1961 the programme of education for what were then called the newer secondary schools or the Comprehensive Schools was laid out, a programme in which greater emphasis would have been placed on non-academic subjects.
1.25 p.m.

A programme was laid out in which greater emphasis would have been placed upon non-academic subjects, but because the Hon. Minister of Education at that time, Cameron Tudor, thought in his weakness that he could not sell that programme and wanted to differentiate and manufacture a policy difference between the Barbados Labour Party and himself, he decided to try to make these newer secondary schools replicas of the grammar schools, and that is where they went wrong. In furtherance of this, I can point to evidence that the Technical Arts wings were built before the Democratic Labour Party came into power, and it was because of the introduction both in the traditional grammar schools and the newer schools of that new type of curriculum that the Barbados Labour Party was trying to sell to the public of Barbados that it did not matter which school you went to, the question was whether the school place made available to you was the one suitable to your academic talent, they reversed and perpetuated that system until thank God in Heaven we took over to change it, and I congratulate the hon. member for his courage in having decided in his mind that he would face up to reality and let the public of Barbados know that a disservice was done to the young people of this country by forcing them into doing a type of education in academic subjects for which they were not suited, and there is no disgrace in that. (Mr. TAITT: Who says there is?) The Democratic Labour Party throughout its years has been trying to perpetuate that idea by failing to recognise it. Had they the courage over there, even the traditional secondary school would have been forced to provide alternative programmes because within these schools there are children who can benefit more from a different type of education than from the one they get, and proof of that is

right in the Shorey Report where many children who pass the 11+ examination do not get more than two G.C.E. subjects. That is a fact of life that you on that side ought to face when you are talking about a scientific enquiry and talking about coming to a conclusion thereon.

The position is quite clear. Education has been a political football in this country and the honourable record of the Barbados Labour Party has been distorted by the distortionists on the other side in trying to prove that we were against educating black people in this country. That is what they have been trying to do all these years, and I am glad I have this opportunity of putting that record straight and I challenge them to deny the facts.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution is for the sum of \$165,000, and I really am at a loss here in dealing with this particular matter because the Minister of Education was very brief in introducing this particular matter and has not given us very much information or any details. He was very short on details, so I will not deal with the Minister of Education because there is nothing to deal with. He has given this House very little information, very few facts and details on this particular matter; so I will leave him at that. I think the record will show this. We have no quarrel with the Minister on this. It has been said by the hon. member for Christ Church South Central that he has courage, and that is a quality which we all admire, and we need courage to deal with this particular matter, and that is what we have demonstrated.

We have ample examples when we were over there in courageous planning and development for the educational system in this country. I would like to assure this Chamber that we support and have always supported proposals for providing increased educational opportunities and benefits for the children of this country. No one can gainsay or deny that, so this particular proposal for the readmission as it is styled of children into the school system is nothing which we are going to oppose, because it is bringing additional facilities and educational opportunities to the young people of this country, and we have always been in favour of bringing additional opportunities to the children, but it is not the Minister that we will deal with on this particular occasion. I want to get to the hon. member for Christ Church South Central who has in a very surprising way ranted and raved on this particular matter.

Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, there is no ranting and raving in this Chamber. All hon. members make speeches and I respectfully submit on behalf of the hon. member who is now in his place that it is unparliamentary to describe the member's speech as ranting and raving, even the speech made by the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. SANDIFORD: The words could not be unparliamentary, but in order for the debate to proceed I will withdraw the words "ranting and raving" in order that we can proceed. But I shall deal with a number of points that have been made.

Now we are considering a very important matter here, that is, the readmission of a number of children who in accordance with the provisions of the educational system and certain regulations in force were called upon to leave school, and the proposal here is that they be readmitted. As I indicated, this is nothing that we will oppose because we are in favour of providing additional opportunities, but when it was said and quite untruthfully, if that is not unparliamentary, but without foundation by the hon. member for Christ Church South Central that the Democratic Labour Party Government concentrated only on school buildings, that in obviously a statement without foundation. Not only that, but the Minister, the hon. member for St. George South..... (*A Voice : And North.*) You do not have anybody up there?

Mr. SIMMONS: Is the Leader of the Opposition reflecting on the Chair? Is he suggesting that there is no representative for St. George North?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Let the hon. member continue.

Mr. SANDIFORD: The Minister in introducing this Resolution made reference to the need for refurbishing buildings and putting buildings in condition so that education can take place in them.
1.35 p.m.

I do not understand how it is that the member for Christ Church South Central can get in here and give the impression that we were concentrating on buildings when the Minister in dealing with this important matter makes the very obvious point — it is obvious to those of us who are interested in education and know about it, but obviously the member for Christ Church South Central is not too *au fait* with matters of this sort — because the Minister will know from

his files, from his advisers and from his own knowledge that in order to provide the type of education that he is talking about he must have buildings, he must have equipment and facilities, and provision must be made for these buildings through the provision of funds. The member for St. Michael South East knows that as well. (*Asides*). There is no savagery in here, you cannot eat me up, let us be civilised in here. Mr. Chairman, I have been threatened about being eaten up.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. member please continue?

Mr. SANDIFORD: Let us look at the problem that we are facing, because it is a problem facing the educational system and the society generally. In order to deal with this problem and not in any *ad hoc* manner it is going to be necessary, because this is an *ad hoc* measure to deal with a very fundamental problem in this country,.....(Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: You did not deal with it all the time).... and we would have thought that the Minister in introducing this Resolution would have told us about the size of the problem, about the facilities that would be required in order to deal with this problem, about the equipment and facilities that would be required, how many children in the category of 14 plus left school in July of 1976, what is the size of the problem. This is a basic way of dealing with this. You have to set out the facts first of all, and he must set out how this particular problem for this particular readmission is going to be dealt with because the people of this country are not going to be misled into believing that this particular measure that is before us can deal in any great measure with the problem of the early school leaver.

It is a massive problem and I am saying here and now that this problem can only be solved — and I can give some advice — this problem can only be solved by the provision of additional places and places of the right type, not only having classrooms and providing academic education, but the other type of education which is even more expensive than the traditional academic type of education, by providing the type of vocational and skills training and so on, but it can only be provided through the provision of additional school places for these children. That is one method by which it can be provided.

The alternative is through the provision or through increased equalisation of existing school buildings, that is, extending the use of the existing schools either through a programme of afternoon studies or through a shift system.

Those are the only two ways. There are two ways of dealing with this particular problem. (Mr. BRADSHAW: I told you so.) The Baron from Chelsea Road said he gave me advice, perhaps from Kays Academy.

Mr. Chairman, I want to be serious on this Resolution because it is a very important matter, and we are willing to assist and cooperate in any way possible which will mean an improved and enhanced educational facilities for the children of this country and in the interest of educational development, because that is what we are interested in but we are not going to allow our record to be distorted as the hon. member for Christ Church South Central tried to do, and I invite members of this Hon. Chamber to reflect on the position in this country as far as 14 year olds were concerned in the years 1960 and 1961. Thousands more children were sent out of school at the age of 14 than happened under the regime of the Democratic Labour Party, because even though we have a larger school population, in the dim, distant past when the Barbados Labour Party held the reins of Government the 14 year olds could not be accommodated in the schools because there was not an aggressive school building programme, and if we are dealing with the children 11 years and over the only way they can be accommodated in an adequate five year programme catering to their all-round needs for social, economic, cultural and academic development, the only way they can be provided for is through the provision of schools and facilities that would offer the type of training and education that they should get. That is why we built the Springer Memorial School, Ellerslie Secondary School, the St. Lucy Secondary School, the St. George Secondary School and the Garrison Secondary School, and I invite members to contemplate what would have been the situation in this country if those schools were not provided, because they were not there before 1961 and all of them have children between the ages of 14 and 16 or 17, and these would have been children, were it not for the Democratic Labour Party, who were not provided other educational facilities.

There were many more children of 14 plus who were not provided with educational opportunities under their regime than under the Democratic Labour Party regime, and it was our particular problem and our particular task and contribution to educational development in this country to provide increased accommodation at the secondary level because, I repeat, the only way this problem can be solved effectively is through the construction of secondary schools, because there is a deficit in the number of school

places required at the secondary level, and nobody can deny that. There is overcrowding in the existing secondary schools, particularly the newer secondary schools, and that overcrowding is not going to be removed by any waving of the wand or in terms of any talk about courage or talk about distortion. The Principals of the newer secondary schools have always been complaining about facilities not being adequate to deal with the number of children they have to deal with, and the problem has been that we have had to make provision for the 11 year olds coming into the schools by asking those who are 14 years or over to leave school.

1.45 p.m.

The only solution to this problem is the provision of additional school places. I am saying here and now that unless that particular method is adopted, or the alternative of trying to make greater use of the existing school buildings through a programme of afternoon studies — I made that proposal and left it in the Ministry for each Secondary School. Each Secondary School should be responsible for a programme of extension education. These are the only two ways in which that problem is going to be solved, but this is essentially and *ad hoc* manner. While we recognise that it is some small step towards dealing with the problem, I warn that this is not going to be the solution to the problem. He has to gather up even more courage. I am going to tell you that they are clapping you now, but the educational service in this country is not cheap. When you go to the Minister of Finance, it is there that you are going to have your battles.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You have one minute more, please.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Let me clear up this matter once and for all, because you are going to have to find provision for, at least, four additional secondary schools together with extensions to existing secondary schools, and it is going to cost money. The Hon. Minister of Health will find that problem also, because the social and educational services are not cheap. If you are going to provide all of these things and accommodate everybody, then you are going to be up against the other services in the country and it will be a question of allocation of the resources. Already we are spending almost 25% of the Budget on educational services. While I conclude here, let me clear up one other point here.

Now, the member for Christ Church South Central — I wish he would stick to Cubana and Civil Aviation and those matters. (*Asides.*) I am

not even certain of his competence in those areas, but, when he comes into the area of education, I do hope he would leave it to the members for St. George South and North. I mean you, Mr. Chairman, and the baron from Chelsea Road. Let us get on with this particular matter, because this idea that the Democratic Labour Party was interested only in school buildings is far from the truth. There is a School Building Programme which must go hand in hand with curriculum development, and it was this Government of the Democratic Labour Party which established a National Curriculum Development Council some two years ago to review the curriculum, or whatever it is called in the schools, and we are going to give you the terms and references of that Curriculum Development Council, which is supposed to review the entire curriculum. It is this Government which set up the Polytechnic, which set up the Division of Technology, which revamped the programme in the Government Secondary Schools and all of these things, and we are not going to allow you to distort the facts. (*Asides.*) I will have another 15 minutes, or another 20 minutes, on this matter because it is in relation to the... (*Asides.*) Fifteen minutes? I wish I could be advised how much time I have, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You have overstayed your time now. It is 15 minutes.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Is it not half an hour?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: It is 15 minutes.

Mr. GREAVES: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. member for St. Lucy take his seat, please.

Mr. SANDIFORD: I am really asking for your guidance, Mr. Chairman. I would like you to guide me about the length of time that I have for speaking.

Mr. GREAVES: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. Can you give this side any indication as to how long the hon. member for St. Michael South has been speaking?

Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, on the assumption that the hon.....

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, my speech is not yet concluded. I am awaiting your ruling, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am hearing the Hon. Prime Minister.

Mr. SANDIFORD: I have given way on a point of order.

Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, it is not the part of any hon. member's duty to draw to the attention of another hon. member what are the Rules of the House, but if he will look at Order 30, Rule 6, and he still knows what 1 and 5 mean, then he will read that a speech does not exceed 15 minutes in Committee. Mr. Chairman, having heard the hon. member for St. Michael South speaking on the subject of education, I have at long last understood why he had to be dismissed so summarily from the portfolio of education, which he held in the previous Government. For a number of years he stood in here. (*Asides.*) Did I hear the Leader of the Opposition use an obscene term in here?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I heard "foolishness." Order, please. You may continue.

Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I really was trying to make a quiet speech, but hon. members seem to have forgotten some of the Rules of the House. I would ask the Leader of the Opposition to bear in mind that Your Honour...

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I am not presiding; you are presiding. What is he asking me anything for? I do not want him to ask me anything.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will you sit, please!

Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I would ask the Leader of the Opposition and all hon. members to bear Order 40, Rule 3, in mind, and bear in mind Your Honour's powers to deal with people who commit the offence of disregarding the authority of the Chair, or of persistently and wilfully obstructing the business of the House.

Mr. SANDIFORD: I do not understand what is going on in here.

Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, having heard the hon. member for St. Michael South, I understand only too well why, after so many years, his colleagues were no longer able to put up with him as Minister of Education, because he has sat in here all of these years and I do not think we have ever heard as much about education from the hon. member as we have heard in these 18½ or 19 minutes that he has spoken today. But I will tell him this.....

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. The statement by the hon. member for

St. Thomas is, obviously, untrue, and the records of this House will show it.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: No point of order! Please go on.

Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The hon. member, Sir, is so bewildered by the seven or twelve, or however many votes it is, that he has lost his comprehension of the nuance of the English language. A man may make 100 speeches and say nothing, and he may then make one speech and reveal much even if much of what he reveals is ignorance.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. The Leader of the Opposition knows that because he has done that many times.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Leader of the Opposition? Will the hon. member continue. Order, please!

Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I congratulate the hon. member on his percipience of the quality of the speeches of the Leader of the Opposition, but I would also tell the hon. member that, because he is out of power and temporarily unemployed, he must not think in here is a joke place. We are in here to do the people's business.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. Under the Rules, he cannot make insulting remarks like that. Temporarily unemployed what? He is expected to set a better standard now he has moved over there. He is looking at another hon. member and.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Are you addressing the Chair? I will insist that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition addresses his remarks to the Chair.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I am addressing the Chair. He ought to have a better sense of decency now that he has moved over there. I am going to read the Rules to you. He now has a job as Prime Minister. Let me read the contents of speeches.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Chair rules that the word "unemployed" is not out of order.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: No member — I am reading this to you, Sir. I am quoting the Rule to you, Sir. I am not challenging your ruling, but you have not yet heard me cite the Standing Order to which I am referring.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Chair rules that the remarks were not insulting or offensive. Will you, please, take your seat.
1.55 p.m.

Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: If the hon. member for St. Michael South would prefer, I would say temporarily without occupation, for lack of occupation creates frivolity and he is behaving in a frivolous way in here. That is what I am saying; and hon. members on that side should adopt perhaps the seriousness – it is not for me to tell anybody to behave – but the public are looking to this House of Assembly for certain standards of behaviour, and those standards of behaviour must not, in my very respectful submission to you, Sir, in the Chair, and all hon. members, either border on frivolity on the one hand or upon ruffianism on the other. (*Asides*) Eric Sealy is your man.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please continue.

Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The hon. member for St. Michael South has spoken about educational policies of the past. The technical details will be dealt with by the Minister of Education but I am appealing to him in particular as an hon. member who by virtue, one believes of his qualifications and the respect which was accorded to him for a long time as Minister of Education, to be abundantly clear, Sir, not to in any way say something which will mislead the House.

The hon. member got up and made a very impassioned speech about education, a speech that I have never heard made before but contained in this speech are so many inconsistencies as to make me really worry about the quality of the Opposition that we are going to get this session.

At the start of his speech he said the only way of dealing with the problem of raising the school leaving age to sixteen was by.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I must interrupt the hon. member to report progress.

Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I beg that Your Honour do now report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: I beg to second that.

The Question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. CHAIRMAN reported to Mr. SPEAKER who resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. SPEAKER: The time is now 2 p.m., and this Sitting stands suspended until 2.45 p.m.
2 p.m.

On Resumption

Mr. SPEAKER: There being no questions it is now Private Members Time.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I beg to propose that Item 1 under Private Members Business standing in my name be the instant Order of the day.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 1 under Private Members Business is the instant Order of the day.

When the time for Private Members Business had expired on the last occasion the hon. member for St. Michael South Central was addressing the Chair. He may continue to do so now.

RESOLUTION RE THE NOTING OF THE SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, on the last occasion I regretted the absence of the Honourable Prime Minister. I do not see him in his seat at this point of time. I am sure if he is still in the dining room he would hear that I regret his absence.

Sir, one has begun to wonder. I said last time that the Prime Minister in making his speech before the United Nations has shown no new foreign affairs initiatives and it was really pathetic to hear him in answer to a reporter who was interviewing him, not only coupled the Leader of the Opposition with some reasonable political activist, but, to quote as an example of his new foreign affairs initiative that he has spoken about women's rights in the United Nations. I cannot for the love of me, Mr. Speaker, understand how talking about women – apart from the fact that I cannot see how the United Nations have heard about women and about women's rights for the first time from him – how that could be considered to any rational or sensible person, a foreign affairs initiative. He spoke about women and what his government had intended to do and internationally what they plan to do. Well, to the gullible it would seem as if it was something new but nobody with any degree of a knowledge of what foreign affairs connote, can it be said that speaking about women in a speech – and it is good that there was something else he could talk about, namely, terrorism, I wonder what his speech would have been; but all I was saying and I still maintain is that after a month in Government he has said nothing new to show that he differed or in any way had planned or decided to change from what the Democratic Labour Party had done in his foreign affairs policy. That is all I am saying.

What surprises me, as I say, is that this unfortunate calamity on the 6th October worries me a bit, and I should not go into this in any detail because I will have a lot more to say on this — except to say a few brief and superficial things to this extent that in no time did the Government of Barbados if they felt as sorry as the Minister for Civil Aviation felt — the flags of Barbados as far as I know were never officially at half mast. Well, that is a matter for the Government.

May be, and this is where the argument comes in, that no Barbadians were on the plane, and I think that this is where the Government is being taken to task, that because no Barbadians were on the plane the Government of Barbados as at present constituted, is doing nothing to show any sorrow or any sympathy — and the flags of Barbados even although there were big ceremonies, in Cuba and in Guyana — and I see where the Prime Minister said that he is going to establish relations with Korea, I do not know if it is North or South or what — yet Barbados on whose territory this calamity took place, did not even indicate either on some day when the bodies were leaving, or in some form, any sympathy with relatives of the decease who had perished in this unfortunate calamity.

2.55 p.m.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: On a point of order. As I understand it, the Leader of the Opposition is debating the Throne Speech. There is absolutely nothing in the Throne Speech that relates to a Cubana Airline plane going down off Barbados. I am requesting you to direct the hon. member to stick to the Resolution which refers to the Governor General's Throne Speech. If a Cubana Airline plane did not come down on this occasion he would have had absolutely nothing to say.

Mr. SPEAKER: That might be appreciated, but he is entitled to debate Barbados' foreign policy.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: As I was saying, we have shown in Barbados no obvious, visible signs of sympathy except utterances either by half mast or otherwise of our Flag.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: If you do not mind, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: State your point.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: He is saying that we have showed no obvious sympathy. What would he like us to do? Kiss Burnham or Castro or kiss you?

Mr. SPEAKER: No point of order.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: What do you want us to do?

Mr. SPEAKER: Please take your seat.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: What I am particularly worried about is that in the Press in the Caribbean — I just want to tell the Minister this, and I hope that the Prime Minister will take the appropriate legal steps — there are references to the Prime Minister as an international agent. I am not dealing with the amount of money that it is said the Labour Party received to overthrow the Barrow Government.

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The hon. member is not entitled to refer to publications or documents which are not on the floor of this House; and this is a nasty vicious and deliberate attempt to discredit and give currency to something which the hon. member himself knows that he dares not repeat outside the floor of this place. Only a coward would do that.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I am not repeating. All that I am saying is that in view of the fact that it is getting currency throughout the Caribbean that the Prime Minister should take the appropriate steps to clear his name. I did not write it. I am saying that the people of Barbados are reading it.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: On a point of order. Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is seeking at this stage to draw out of the Government what steps they intend to take; and he full well knows the rules of the House that every newspaper is entitled to make its comment; but any responsible Government is entitled in due course to put the position right. As a past Cabinet member, he should know better than that. He himself had been excluded from the Cabinet and did not know what the last Government was doing. Thank God that we on this side have a united Cabinet.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, there were circulated in Barbados papers making statements about the Prime Minister on which I am hoping that the Prime Minister will take the necessary legal measures. I did not circulate them.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us get on.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I did not write in the Bomb. I did not write the Canadian newspapers or the West Indian World. All that I am saying is that with these slurs and implications and

insinuations the Prime Minister owes it to the country and to himself to take appropriate action for his personal character; but that is a matter for the Prime Minister.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Prime Minister owes it to himself.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: That is what I am saying. It is what I have read, and what the people in Barbados and in the Caribbean are reading.

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: On a point of order. The hon. member is not entitled under the Rules of this House to refer in this debate to anything which has been published in the newspapers. It is against the Rules of this House. He is referring to what Mr. Burnham said. He is not entitled to refer to matters published in a newspaper.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member may continue.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: The Leader of the House referred to what was printed in a newspaper in making a policy statement to clear up what is happening, but the Leader of the Opposition is stymied from referring to what was written in a newspaper.

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: On a point of order. The hon. member is misleading and is definitely wrong. At no time during the course of this or any debate have I referred to anything published in a newspaper.

Mr. SIMMONS: On a point of order. Just for the benefit of the Leader of the Opposition, Rule 28 says: "A member may not read his speech, but he may read extracts from books or papers other than newspapers in support of his argument."

Mr. SPEAKER: The point of the hon. member for St. Philip North is well taken, but the hon. member for St. Michael South Central is not attempting to read from any newspaper; and he would know better when this hon. member is in the Chair.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: All that I am saying is that I do regret that this unfortunate incident seems to be creating a rift in our Caribbean situation; and I am hoping that the Government will in its duty to this House and to the public of Barbados take the appropriate steps to make Barbados' position clear on this particular incident; and the Opposition will have a lot more to say on it in due course of time. I am just mentioning these matters on the surface because

as a responsible Opposition we realise that there are rumours going through the Caribbean about the Prime Minister about which I hope that he himself — (*Asides*) Am I responsible for the murder or for the bomb?

Mr. Speaker, also on the last occasion I dealt with the question of the manner in which this Government handled the overseas representatives that they conceived were democratic, and how discourteous, summarily and inhumanly they behaved.

I am going to make a record of this Parliament the letter written to me in my capacity as Leader of the Opposition by the former representative to the United Nations which was also written to the Prime Minister. I will read it and make it a document of this House. It reads:—

"Mr. J. M. G. M. Adams,
Prime Minister's Office,
Government Headquarters,
Bay Street,
ST. MICHAEL.

Dear Prime Minister:

On September 15, 1976 I received the following telex message from the Ministry of External Affairs:

"The Governor-General has terminated your appointment under Section 100 of the Constitution with effect from today September 15, 1976. Letter follows in bag."

My authority as Barbados' Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the U.S.A. and Permanent Representative to the Organization of American States had come to an abrupt end. There were approximately six working hours left on September 15, when I received that telex.
3.05 p.m.

As Barbados' Ambassador, my term as Chairman of the Permanent Council of the O.A.S. would have expired fifteen days later on September 30. I could not complete that obligation. I had to withdraw rather unceremoniously from presiding at two official O.A.S. functions on September 16 and 17, to which I had been committed as Chairman of the Permanent Council of the Organization. The O.A.S. had to make arrangements for receiving the credentials of a newly arrived O.A.S. Ambassador. That duty too, had fallen to me by virtue of my Chairmanship.

Clearly Mr. Prime Minister, your action showed no concern for our country's international obligations and the sensitivities of the Representatives of member countries in our regional organization.

The following comments of diplomatic colleagues are significant, and should not be ignored.

"What's wrong with your people? Barbadians are known as a sober, responsible and reasonable people. What has gone wrong?"

Another O.A.S. Diplomat remarked:

"Your appointment must have been one of the key issues of the election campaign."

And yet another unbelieving Latin:

"You must have had a military coup in Barbados."

A Caribbean colleague volunteered:

"Obviously this is intended to insult and embarrass you. You bear the personal insult and humiliation with dignity. But what is your Government doing to your country's image?"

Mr. Prime Minister, the Constitution of Barbados gives you the right to choose Ambassadors who are appointed or terminated by the Governor-General acting on your advice. This is a constitutional provision with which I entirely agree. I feel strongly that a Prime Minister should always have the right and a free hand to dispose of the appointments of Ambassadors as he wishes. So that I had no real quarrel with you, when, on September 3, the day following the General Election the Ministry of External Affairs by telex requested me to offer my resignation to Government. The instruction came with indecent haste, I thought, but maybe you saw the need to act, and had a reason for acting, swiftly. The record will show that I promptly replied informing the Ministry of External Affairs that I had forthwith addressed a letter to the Governor-General which read, in part:

"Due to the change of Government as a result of the General Elections held on September 2, 1976 and following on telex No. 955 dated September 3, 1976 from the Permanent Secretary, Ministry of External Affairs requesting me to

"place my appointment at the disposal of the Prime Minister," I hereby tender my resignation from the office of Ambassador of Barbados to the United States of America and Permanent Representative to the Organization of American States to take effect at such time as you designate appropriate for the termination of my appointment acting in accordance with the advice of the Prime Minister pursuant to the provisions of Section 100 of the Constitution of Barbados."

Having placed my appointment at your disposal as requested, I expected that you would have advised a termination date that would have allowed me reasonable notice of termination of my appointment. Furthermore the Embassy had a staff of five foreign service officers. Of these the three most senior had been transferred from Washington effective August 31, 1976. Two new officers including the most senior officer who would have to act in place of the Ambassador had assumed duty on September 1, 1976. The remaining two foreign service officers were at the Embassy for less than two years.

For myself, I can tolerate the personal inconvenience of a summary dismissal, of being required at six hours notice to pack up my belongings and to remove my wife and two children, aged six and eight years old, and attending school. I live with the personal insult. But for my country and its image I am embarrassed. I consider that to advise the summary termination of any Ambassador's appointment in these circumstances is a mean and inconsiderate act, lacking in common decency and unworthy of the leader of a Government."

I beg to say, as Leader of the Opposition, that I support that sentiment.

"It is ironic, that when I received notice of forthwith termination, I promptly had to give my household staff two weeks notice of termination of their employment.

To add insult to injury, a later telex from the Ministry of External Affairs stated:

"Minister has authorized you to remain for a period not exceeding further ten days in order that you may bid farewell and attend to any personal business."

This apparent ten days grace was at my expense, since I received no salary after September 15. I am at a loss to understand this

indulgence. But maybe the Minister of External Affairs in his infinite wisdom has an explanation.

Mr. Prime Minister, in defending your Government's actions towards workers laid off at the Transport Board and at the Parks and Beaches Commission, you challenged your accusers to question your Government's actions in a Court of Law. You may invoke the same challenge in the case of your actions towards the country's politically appointed diplomats whose appointments you have advised to be summarily terminated. You know only too well that what is legal and what is just is not always synonymous. In essence, what should matter to you, as a political leader is, that your actions result in social justice rather than in the legal justice of Shylock.

In view of the public importance of the issues involved, I am sending a copy of this letter to the Leader of the Opposition with my request that he ventilate this matter fully in Parliament at the earliest possible opportunity.

I am sending a copy also to the Minister of External Affairs as the issues directly relate to his port-folio."

I have no regret whatsoever, Mr. Speaker, in raising this matter on the floor of this House, because from this letter you would have thought that the Government was dealing with somebody who was not a Barbadian, who was not appointed in due course by a proper Government, and even although they have five years, one begins to wonder whether this is any part of their vindictive approach to the running of a Government that on the day following elections they can demand the resignation, and on the day that he received the telex he should be fired summarily.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: On a point of order, I have a handkerchief. Let the Leader of the Opposition wipe the corner of his mouth. He is still fuming.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: You see what I mean! What are you going to do with him? I have two handkerchiefs, not one, and both are clean.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the hon. member for St. Michael South Central continue with his debate.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: As Your Honour pleases. In any new Government which is being formed, one is not quarrelling with the Prime Minister's right to ask for the resignation or terminate an appointment. What the Opposition

is arguing is that in taking this action one considers the country's image abroad, one considers human feelings and one takes care to make sure that the country's image does not suffer.

3.15 p.m.

I want to warn the Prime Minister that if he thinks that by this action the image of Barbados abroad even among our Latin American and Caribbean natives is being enhanced he has another thing coming, because people are beginning to wonder in the forum of the United Nations as well as in the forum of the Latin American countries whether this type of action is the action of a responsible Government that they can look at an accredited representative and dismiss him by a telex message on the very day to that effect with six hours to go. I want to enter with no apologies to anybody into the record of this House, because people must be aware and you are aware that in this type of change-over of Government people are always even before the votes are counted ready to slaughter others.

Now this is a representative of Barbados, this is a man who represented the image of Barbados, and I submit with respect that even if the Foreign Affairs Ministry has taken time to discover what position he held as Chairman of the Organisation of American States, the man of whom he complains. I say it is vindictive and it is certainly not in keeping with the best practice. Here is a man with two small children at school in Washington, they have no regard for his children and no regard for his personal life at all, they are concerned that they have 17, we have seven and out goes him, as if they are dealing with the representative of the Grenadian Government, who is a Columbian. I would understand if Gairy treated the Columbian like this, but I could never be satisfied with the treatment meted out to this particular officer, and if the people of this country are satisfied with this type of action.....(Hon. L. S. CRAIG: We had to accept Waldo Ramsay). I will tell you this that the former Barbados Government gave him three months.

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: On a point of order, Sir, not even two hours notice. He was unceremoniously dismissed and then he put in a claim and it cost the Barbados Government \$42,000.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: He got \$42,000, according to the Leader of the House, but this officer was asked to stay on for 10 days after his appointment was terminated within six hours and he has not got 42 cents.

Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: If the hon. member will give way, the hon. member is forcing me to anticipate my reply to Mr. King, but he should know and I believe he does know that the question of compensation for Mr. King in respect of 10 days and one or two other matters in which he has been out of pocket is now being considered in the Ministry of External Affairs with a view to modification.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I am dealing with a letter which apart from whatever money he gets shows an inhuman approach. It is inhuman to ask the man to take his children out of school in the middle of term because there is a change of Government.

Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order, the hon. member is misleading the House if he suggests that there is something unusual about either Ambassadors having young children or there being some threat of their having to remove their young children from school. Every man when he is Ambassador knows his appointment may be terminated whether he has young children or not.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Having children is no unusual experience, being asked to change from one station to another is not unusual, what I am saying is that at the time in addition to this he was our representative as Chairman of the Permanent Council of the Organisation of American States, and what I am asking the Prime Minister to tell this House — it is true the Deputy Leader has indicated that Barbados is going to pull out of the Organisation of American States — but I am asking the Prime Minister in view of his foreign policy statement in his party's Manifesto to tell this country within a short time when his Government proposes to pull out of the Organisation of American States. This is what the Manifesto states:

"The Party is not yet convinced that continued association with the O.A.S. is bringing any tangible benefits. The Party is however interested in promoting a wider Latin American and Caribbean grouping. It will critically and thoroughly examine Barbados' relationship with the O.A.S. in an effort to determine our future association with that body."

I am asking the Prime Minister to speedily and hurriedly make up his assessment as soon as possible, just as he now comes out and says that in spite of the Throne Speech he is not going to lump the Central Bank and the other Banks together. I want him to come early with this like

he did with the Central Bank and say to us that Barbados is leaving the Organisation of American States on such and such a date. I was very relieved to see that the Prime Minister is still amenable to reason even if his initial financial consideration and advice were not what he put into the Manifesto, because you will remember, Mr. Speaker, that in the Manifesto the Prime Minister did say, on financial institutions, that the Central Bank and everything lock, stock and barrel would be lumped together, but I was very relieved yesterday when I saw it on TV, and this is something I want the Prime Minister to tell me early too. What is his policy towards the Opposition using the Caribbean Broadcasting Station, because you had a lot to say when you were in Opposition and now it is not CBC, it is ABC.

I want to put the question now, and I will bring the speeches in here and quote from all the time. The Prime Minister, the Minister of Foreign Affairs, the Minister of Health, all of them had something to say and I want the Prime Minister when he is looking at the Organisation of American States to let the public know what time opportunities the Opposition will have to use the broadcasting station which he for the last ten or twelve years had criticised. I have said in here that he has a good brain, he thinks politics, he sleeps politics, and if you will notice from the allocation of portfolios as proposed by the Governor-General on the advice of the Prime Minister, the Prime Minister keeps the Electoral Section, the Representation of the People Section, the Public Relations Section and the Information Section. I really have to admire him, he is a giant, the Prime Minister is nobody's fool and if we in this House under-estimate the Prime Minister we are making a big mistake. I have always sat down over there when I was in the Government and I could see the brain ticking over and I knew what he was coming with, whether it was a googly or a yorker, but I can tell you that the Prime Minister is prepared to use the organs of information for the best use of his party. Nobody is quarrelling with that.
3.25 p.m.

But what I am saying, Mr. Speaker, is that, when in opposition, he criticised the Democratic Labour Party along with his colleagues over the use of the news media in this country, I expect the Prime Minister, in view of his criticism, which I will read in here if it takes me a week, to show that he is prepared to be democratic, he is prepared to give the Opposition time and the use of the C.B.C. as he has been using it now for his own Party's image. You only have to talk about the Minister of Labour and Sport, and his picture

will appear. I am not quarrelling with that. He does not have to say, or do anything, he only has to wear a clean shirt jac, and he will appear.

Now, I want the Opposition, since this is basic to your criticism of the Government – I see nothing in the Throne Speech about the democratization of C.B.C., or the Opposition having any use of it. I would like the Prime Minister very early to let the public know that, as he used to say, the Democratic Labour Party used the C.B.C. and the news media for their own benefit and propaganda, but I am going to turn a new leaf. The Opposition can have it twice a week, or once a week, for whatever purposes they want to talk to the people. I do not mind how he uses it. I want a policy. I hope that you will bring down a policy, otherwise I will put it in a question. (*Asides.*)

Mr. SPEAKER: I am appealing to all hon. members. When a member is addressing the Chair, he must be heard in perfect silence. You may continue.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, what I am asking is that...

Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member will give way on the point he has just raised, the Government's policy on broadcasting is being worked out and will be published; but in the meantime, I would ask the Leader of the Opposition, if at any time he wishes to make a statement on C.B.C.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Does the Prime Minister not realise that he has an opportunity to address the Chair on this matter?

Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Sir, I have asked him to give way so that it can be dealt with quickly as an interim matter so that we would not have to have the asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: Well, make your point succinctly.

Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member has anything he wants to say, and he has any difficulty in getting it said on C.B.C., please let him ring me. As far as I know the courtesy, which was never extended to me as Leader of the Opposition of always having the cameras around when I had something to say, has been fully extended to the Leader of the Opposition. Whether he had something useful to say or not, he has had the cameras and every opportunity of saying it.

Mr. SPEAKER: Your point is well taken.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I would not dispute that. I do not remember having the cameras since I have been Leader of the Opposition in a month more than once, so I do not know everywhere he is talking about. We will have a special debate on that. I just want to alert him that I would have expected, on a vital issue like this, that he would have indicated early what was his Government's policy, especially as he has kept to himself the vital areas of future elections in terms of propaganda, in terms of use of the news media, in terms of the Representation of the People Act in the case of the electoral system, etc., I would have expected him to let the people of this country know that, in these vital areas for democracy, he was prepared to practise democracy by letting the Opposition have an opportunity to put their views before the people.

I will only mention one or two things which the Prime Minister did not hear, and it might be some time before he gets the debates. Last week I mentioned that....

Mr. SPEAKER: I take it that the hon. member will not be repeating himself except for emphasis.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I will not be repeating myself for emphasis. I am just saying that I want the Prime Minister to tell me if he is reopening negotiations with the teachers and the civil servants in view of what he said when he was in the Opposition that the collective bargaining process was not adhered to. Now that he has the General Secretary, or the former General Secretary, of the Union who quarrelled with the progress, that he will now...

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the House is just repeating himself. We have heard this repeatedly on the last occasion.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: You may have, but not the Prime Minister, and he would not hear unless he got second-hand hearsay.

Mr. SPEAKER: Please continue with the debate.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate your point, and I am not quarrelling with your ruling. You will appreciate that when the Leader of the Opposition is discussing the Throne Speech in the absence of the Prime Minister, unless I know that you intend to have

the debates printed early, it makes it difficult for the person who has to reply to the Leader of the Opposition, or to wind up the debates, to know exactly what has transpired second hand. His colleagues can only scribble down certain things, and the Prime Minister will not know exactly what has happened.

Mr. Speaker, I am deeply grateful to you for the indulgence which you have given me. I have certainly endeavoured to deal with aspects of the Throne Speech which fall under my Shadow Ministry, except that I want to hear something from the Leader, although it is not mentioned in the Throne Speech, and it is not mentioned finally in his reply, or his contribution, to the debates. Nowhere in the Throne Speech do I see that the Minister of Labour and Welfare is minded to remove the means test for old age pensioners, Inasmuch as the hullabaloo and the shouting about giving old age pensioners \$25.00, I do not see in the Throne Speech, or even in their Manifesto that, instead of the limit of \$15.00 a week, where old age pensioners cannot get old age pensions.

That is nowhere in the Barbados Labour Party's Manifesto. It is in the Democratic Labour Party's Manifesto, but in your Manifesto you do not tell the people of this country that \$15.00 a week is too low, but from which point you cannot get a pension. Do not care if you raise it to \$20.00 or \$25.00 a week, anybody who gets \$25.00 a week is not entitled to a pension. You do not have it in your Manifesto that you intend to remove the means test, whereas the Democratic Labour Party had planned that if they were returned to power they would have removed the means test. It is no sense bringing it down to 65. If you bring it from 68 to 65 to 60, unless you remove the means test, it will mean that nobody who is getting \$15.00 a week, as the means test now stands, will get a pension. Do not get up now and say that you are going to do it, because it is not in your Manifesto and it is not in your Throne Speech. You can say that you are going to do it. (Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Next week.) That is wonderful. I would like them to get it this week. If you bring it down next week, I would like to assure you that you have the wholehearted support of the Opposition. If you bring down a Bill to abolish all taxes, we will not have any argument in here. The Opposition will vote for it, lock, stock and barrel.

All I am saying, Mr. Speaker, is that I am deeply grateful to you personally, for your firm rulings and your patient hearing you have given me, even although I have been interrupted from time to time. This is my contribution in a speech

about Government's policy in which I have pointed out some very serious omissions, if the Government's Party is supposed to represent the interest of the masses.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I rise to second this Resolution, and in doing so I would like to refer to certain aspects of the Speech from the Throne which was given by His Excellency the Acting Governor General. You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that, in the Acting Governor General's Speech, no mention was made of the critical problem of unemployment which faces this country.

3.35 p.m.

As a matter of fact the Manifesto of the Democratic Labour Party indicated that they would be creating 3,600 jobs in order to relieve the unemployment situation, and I can assure you that this is an outline of the policy of the new Government also for the next five years. No mention has been made of the way in which the present Government proposes to relieve the unemployment problem in this country. I am sure that they are aware, Mr. Speaker, that one of the very serious problems facing countries in the Caribbean and facing Barbados is this question of unemployment.

The measure which the present Government has indicated that it would be embarking upon to attempt to ease this unemployment situation are measures which have already been initiated by the Democratic Labour Party. You will realize that they have been talking about extension of the Bridgetown Port. This is a development which was organized by the Democratic Labour Party, for which funds were already secured, and indeed the project has already got underway.

You will also realize, Mr. Speaker, that they have referred to some of the other projects which have been initiated by the Democratic Labour Party, as for example the extension of Seawell International Airport. These are fundamental issues. There is no doubt that the Government would try to push in the background the preparation and work which was enounced by the Democratic Labour Party in order to assist in solving the unemployment situation in this country.

When one examines the speech from the Throne one sees no mention made of the way in which the Government proposes to deal with the issue. I do not know, Mr. Speaker, whether the dismissal of over 250 workers from the Parks and Beaches Commission is a way of providing jobs for people. One would have thought that any

Government faced with a situation which they obviously recognize — the situation of unemployment — that they would be looking for ways and means of keeping people employed, and indeed creating additional avenues for employment. However one of the very first acts which was done by this Government was to put people out of work rather than finding work for people. I challenge any member of the Government to deny this.....

Mr. BRADSHAW: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The hon. member is insinuating that it is the Government that has dismissed 258 workers. I want the hon. member to understand that it was the Democratic Labour Party that refused to vote the money which would have employed the 258 workers.

Mr. SPEAKER: Your point is well taken. Let the hon. member for St. Lucy continue.

Mr. GREAVES: Thank you very much. You will notice, Mr. Speaker, that I deliberately avoided mentioning the number, and now we have heard from the Government benches the number of persons who were dismissed by the Barbados Labour Party. There is absolutely no doubt that this is a fact, and furthermore Mr. Speaker, it would seem to me in reading the Throne Speech that there is a further attempt to get rid of some of these people and indeed there is a threat to dismiss and to get rid of some of these people. Just look at the section dealing with the School meals programme; I am saying that there is a considerable amount of uneasiness among workers in the school meals programme because the Government has given such an indication and already the people are getting the feeling that the Government would certainly do away with the number of people who are at present employed in the school meals scheme. A statement in the Throne Speech is to the effect that there are inefficiencies in the system which would have to be corrected. If that is not a real threat then what is? When we are talking in terms of a Government which is concerned about creating employment for the people one must wonder whether this present Government as a Government would let this threat become a reality.

We can now move on to a vital area relative to the workers in this country in respect of national insurance. There are a number of people who contribute to this scheme. Under the International Labour Convention on which our national insurance scheme is based there are nine basic provisions and as you will realize and appreciate the Democratic Labour Party have

made preparations for the extension of this scheme. I want to make this point, that is, that people who work and who are self-employed, they are also working too and they contribute towards the scheme; they make their contributions to the scheme as well. Now you must recognize that there are occasions when people will be put out of work, and we have a very clear example of this situation over the last week-end when about 120 workers were employed by Oran Limited and today they are in a very difficult position so far as their future is concerned. Now this is a serious matter because it touches on the bread and butter of people and those people from Oran Limited are out of work and their contributions to the National Insurance Scheme is no benefit to them because there is no provision under this scheme which means that although they have made contributions to this scheme there will not be any immediate benefit to them.

I would like to see and I hope that the Government would make it possible for people who lose their jobs in this way that they receive some benefit in the same way as it is done for people who go on sick leave as they can draw their national insurance benefits for a period of six weeks.

3.45 p.m.

I am talking particularly about people who are contributing towards the scheme, because it must mean something to people rather than one or two of the six areas for which we have already made provision. This is fundamental, and I am sure that people who profess to have some kind of concern will see the point and will obviously try to make some kind of provision.

What is of concern, Mr. Speaker, to me, and of concern to the Opposition is the way in which the Government seems to depend on using the funds of the National Insurance Scheme. You will realise that this is money which has been put there by you and me and the workers of this country. We all contribute towards this scheme — those who are working. We contribute towards our pensions and towards other benefits.

I am really concerned, Mr. Speaker, at what seems to be the intention of the Government to utilise these funds and to incorporate the provisions which are not ordinarily incorporated in a national insurance scheme. So that what has recently happened is that we have a situation by which in the long run many people who suffer disabilities from which they hope for relief under the National Insurance Scheme will find a depleted national insurance fund.

At present I think it stands at \$80,000 to \$84,000. That may sound in our terms like a lot of money; but in truth and in fact you have to recognise that this is a contribution of over 1,000 people who have been contributing since 1967. We have to be very careful about what we are doing in this vital area of concern to workers; and I hope that the Government will be able to allay whatever fears there are. I can assure you that the fears are going daily about what seems to be the Government's intention as far as the utilisation of these funds is concerned.

Mr. Speaker, sometimes when I read the Speech from the Throne I get a bit hot because I have had some arguments with my colleagues over here because this Government does not really say definitely what will be done in a whole series of cases. In a number of areas the Government has expressed uncertainty. It has been playing with words and it has been in fact setting out in no firm way what it proposes to do in a number of areas. You get for example a part in the Throne Speech which talks about the necessary examination being given. That is no commitment. All that they are saying is that there will be an examination. Then you further hear that it is proposed to give early consideration to the feasibility. These are very imprecise terms. They are not commitments.

When the Government speaks in terms of, for example, introducing a national minimum wage, I would have hoped that the Government would have come out stronger on this matter; and I am sure that the Government would get the support of the Opposition on the principle of establishing a minimum wage in this country. This is something which no doubt is needed; but to talk about the feasibility of this means nothing.

Now, let us look at the other areas relating to labour. You will see, Mr. Speaker, that the Government proposes to introduce or to provide for a comprehensive labour code. I see in this, Mr. Speaker, an attempt — particularly when one looks at the kind of labour codes which have been introduced in the Caribbean — that this is a dire attempt to muzzle the trade union movement in this country; and I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that certainly the trade union movement in this country as represented by the Barbados Workers Union will not be muzzled and will certainly fight tooth and nail against the implementation of any kind of comprehensive labour code of the type which we see being established in a number of Caribbean countries.

We have to be very clear about what we are doing and what the position will be in a number of these cases, because we recognise that there are going to be a number of difficulties and a number of problems. There will obviously be attempts to control a powerful organisation like the Barbados Workers Union; but we will not allow this to take place.

On the question of workers' participation as mentioned in the Throne Speech, again these are words which are thrown around, and which we, those of us who have had the opportunity to work closely with workers and indeed to be associated with the development of workers' involvement in enterprise will know what we are talking about, and we have got to be careful. We are told that it is the policy of the Government to expand workers participation, but having said that, Mr. Speaker, we have now to examine very carefully what is meant.

3.55 p.m.

What you or what another person might mean by worker participation may not necessarily meet with general acceptance by the Trade Union movement: so that this is something which I consider has got to be looked at very carefully, and I want to assure you, Mr. Speaker, that this will be looked at as critically as possible.

On the question of the severance payment scheme, you know, Mr. Speaker, as well as those hon. members on the Government side and those of us who were in here for some time, the stand which I have taken on this matter of severance pay, and I note that the Throne Speech makes reference to the review and simplification of the severance payment scheme. You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that some time ago this was the basis of a Resolution which I moved in this Chamber and which was accepted by this Chamber, and the terms of which were included in our manifesto when we went to the country in the last general elections. I would say that it met with the approval of both sides, and I would have hoped to see in this particular revision, and I happen to know that months ago the National Insurance Board was looking at this matter and looking at ways and means of (1) improving, (2) extending and (3) simplifying the severance payment legislation.

You will recall that part of the Resolution which I moved in this Chamber called for the payment of severance pay to workers within a specified period, and if the money was not paid within that specified period, then any amount of money that is due and owing to the worker who

is entitled should be paid along with interest thereon, and this part was contained in the manifesto of the Democratic Labour Party. I would hope that the Barbados Labour Party, the new Government, would see fit, in spite of the fact that it was an idea which emanated from our side, in the interest of the workers of this country, to incorporate these provisions in the review which they hope to carry out on the severance payment scheme. This is very important; I think it is fundamental because this is not anything which I think one party should try to do the other party in on once it is in the interest of the workers and the majority of people in this country.

I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, when we come to the Labour Department, about what is said. You know, a number of strictures over the years have been levelled at the Labour Department and at the quality of personnel who man that vital department. That department is concerned with intervening, from time to time in industrial disputes whether there is a threatened strike or whether it is to provide services to assist in the solution of a particular negotiating point.....

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has two minutes more during which he may conclude his speech.

Mr. GREAVES: I would have thought that some serious consideration would have been given to the upgrading of this vital department of Government, but we see no mention being made of that. I am also concerned with the absence of any statement on the provision of safety measures and the implementation of the recommendations which the Committee which sat made to the Government for improving safety to workers in the various factories and work places in this country. No mention at all was made of this, and I would hope that the Government would be concerned and would try to do something about this.

On the question of emigration, we have heard about unemployment but yet we have heard the Government talking about loosening up its emigration policy to allow people to come in. Is this going to make unemployment more difficult in this country of ours? I would hope that very serious thought and consideration would be given to these matters.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot of talk about what the Government proposes to do, what it will investigate the possibility of doing, and what it will examine; but we have not heard one word about where the money for all these

projects will be coming from. You will very well remember that when you went to the country you indicated that the Democratic Labour Party had practically broken this country by the loans it had raised and an outstanding \$200 million national debt; but yet you are hearing a lot about these measures and about these policies and these projects. The Opposition is demanding the Government to tell the people of this country where the money will come from, whether they will borrow or whether they will not borrow. As a matter of fact, the Hon. Prime Minister the day after elections when he was interviewed said that there is nothing wrong with the national debt.

Mr. SPEAKER: The time is now against the hon. member.

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I regret that I have to make a statement in the course of this speech in reply to something which was said by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition with reference to the unfortunate disaster which took place in Barbados, now known as the Cubana Affair. So long as I am a member of this Government, I will not allow the good name of Barbados to be sullied or tarnished or its position in this matter to be misrepresented whether from inside Barbados or abroad.

The hon. member made reference to a speech made in another place. As a person who has recently been a member of the legal profession, I will not, like others, use any opportunity to make comments which can only be calculated to interfere with and prejudice a trial. We in Barbados have a long tradition and our concept of a free trial is well known. It is not the habit or it never will be the habit of any member of this Government to make any statement which attempts to prejudge an issue. As I said previously, the Barbados Government from the very beginning, from the date of this disaster has done everything in its power to see that those responsible are brought to justice before a court that has jurisdiction. The Barbados Government has never at any stage through any of its spokesmen ever made any statement with respect to whether or not it had jurisdiction.
4.05 p.m.

This Barbados Government and the previous Government subscribed to the Montreal Convention, and I well remember when it was moved in the Other Place by a former Attorney General. By the mere accession to that Treaty and by the mere implementation of the legislation in our internal law which gives jurisdiction in extended circumstances, the Barbados Government, both the previous Government and

this Government, by those Acts indicated to all and sundry its contempt for those who indulge in these acts. So that is a matter of great regret that today I have to make this statement because it is obvious that for reasons best known to themselves there are some people who wish to make statements which are calculated to damage the image of Barbados. The image of Barbados will not be damaged by these people because our position is an honourable position, we believe in the rule of law and we are satisfied that our police officers and our legal advisers are fully apprised of what comes under jurisdiction in Barbados and are fully experienced to investigate this matter which after all has always been treated as a case of murder by the police of Barbados.

Mr. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, I would like to feel that my presence in this Chamber at least indirectly underscores the Government's dedication to the continuance of the Trade Union Movement in Barbados. The hon. member for St. Lucy who has just sat down has been talking at some great length about trade union policies, but the Barbados Labour Party set out a summons and I think the words "*veni, vidi, vici*" are appropriate, "I came, I saw, I conquered," and as a consequence the workers of Barbados now have a full time Trade Union boss and the people of St. Michael West now have a full time representative in the House of Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, the Barbados Labour Party Government programme is enunciated in the Throne Speech and is a document that sets forth in infinite detail what this Government intends to do in respect of the problems associated with unemployment, with social and economic deprivation of our people and so on and so forth but, Sir, I understand and I know that it is a matter of some difficulty for some members on the other side to comprehend the insinuations that we have put into this document. Unless we spell it out and say W - I - N - D, wind, I suspect that they will not know it is blowing.

When the Government set forth its document in the Throne Speech it set forth a document that was laid out in two important respects. It set forth broad economic policy for the revitalisation of our economy and it set forth a social programme for the upliftment of the underprivileged in Barbados, and we must confess that it will be a difficult task before the depth of despair to which conditions in Barbados have sunk under the Democratic Labour Party will not be an easy matter for us to rectify even though we are infinitely capable of rectifying it. It is a tribute more to the competence of this side than

to the shallowness of the well in which Barbados has fallen. We will relieve the suffering of the masses through a programme that will set forth in the first instance to solve problems of unemployment. We have not said that tomorrow morning at 6.30 there will be so many people working, our document spells it out for the next five years.

We have managed to get off to a good start and within the first 30 days of the existence of this Government we have been able to set in motion some programmes that eluded the other side for the past 15 years. That is what I call imaginative Government, that is a Government that comes with a thorough understanding of the complexities of the problems, and it is a Government that has resources to deal with those problems.

Speaking about the infinite details of that programme, members will have heard the Prime Minister on Monday on the occasion when he was talking with the public at the Central Bank say that the banks of Barbados, the Savings Bank as well as the Agricultural Development Bank, will be amalgamated for the better utilisation of our resources in that direction. That is an idea that eluded the Democratic Labour Party, and the immediate benefit will be that the people of Barbados will now have the ability to have a central banking institution run by Government to get improved banking services that are not now available in the commercial sector. That service is a service as important as or perhaps in some measures even more important than providing jobs, because people who are already at work will be able in due course to find money at a comfortable level of interest for things like mortgage financing and so on provided under the aegis of this institution.

The sales tax, if members were in the Other Place on the occasion of the delivery of this speech, they will have heard the exaltation outside in the courtyard when His Excellency the Acting Governor-General announced that as from the following morning the burdensome oppressive sales tax imposed by the previous Government would have been lifted. It has been lifted even though the other side has been saying repeatedly that we were not inclined to move it. The people of Barbados now know that there is no longer a sales tax in this country. The immediate point, Mr. Speaker, — and this is an elementary lesson in economics for the members on the other side — is that approximately \$6 million will be realised by the consumers of this country for discretionary spending. Instead of the Government taking that \$6 million and wasting it

on schemes like paying \$20,000 an acre for land, that money will now be in the consumers' hands so that they will be able this Christmas to go and buy a ham or whatever they want. If the consumers of Barbados do not choose to spend that \$6 million they can take it to this new central banking institution that we propose to set up and save it for future purposes.
4.15 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, I submit to you that these are measures outside of the capability and imagination of the people on the other side of this Chamber. Dealing with measures of licensing policy, the Throne Speech set forth that the Government has already eliminated 25% of the licences that were previously imposed by the other side. All of the members of this Chamber will be aware that certain gentlemen of questionable reputation were able to get hold of licenses to peddle them in the street. That has the indirect effect.....

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The only time I have ever heard of anyone attempting to peddle any licence on the street was when a member of.....

Mr. SPEAKER: No point of order! That is no point of order. Will the hon. member, please, take his seat. The hon. member for St. Michael West may continue, please.

Mr. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, I did not call any names but, obviously, the cap has a string and it has been drawn. (*Asides.*)

Mr. SPEAKER: Continue, please.

Mr. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, the point must not escape the consumers of Barbados that, when licences are available for sale out on the street, it imposes an indirect tax on the people of Barbados which they must bear. I do not know what the quantum of that tax would be, but it is a tax and it is reflected in the upward cost of goods in the market place. That, Mr. Speaker, has been eliminated and, again, the taxpayers in Barbados have that money in their pockets to dispose of discretionally.

Mr. Speaker, with respect to the Hon. Minister of External Trade and Tourism, you will recall that he returned recently from an overseas mission to Guyana and was able to return with news that the tax imposed on humble fishermen of Oistin, Speightstown and Silver Sands was removed under the new terms negotiated by the Hon. Minister. This, Mr. Speaker, was accomplished within a relatively short space of a

few days. Again, Sir, this is another situation that eluded the Government when it was run by the people on the other side.

Mr. Chairman,.....

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. Michael West must remember that it is "Mr. Speaker".

Mr. JOHNSON: I am very sorry, Mr. Speaker, but I am new in this place, and I will learn in due course. Those are only some of the economic considerations set forth in the Throne Speech, which the hon. members on the other side would have us believe are bereft of any new ideas and which did not break any new ground. But we will mention a few others that relate to the generation of employment. We mentioned earlier, Sir, that there are some elements in the Speech which are couched in eloquent language which was described as vague. The word, perhaps, is abstract, and it takes some imagination and, indeed, some comprehension to be able to find them. When the hon. member for St. Lucy got up and said that it had nothing at all with respect to the generation of employment, it can only reveal his ignorance with respect to comprehending documents of this kind and of this nature.

This document, Sir, said that road work and housing would be immediately set in motion. Mr. Speaker, road works and housing works cannot be set in motion without, at the same time, generating new employment. When they are asking, where will the employment come from? We submit to them that the employment will come from the generation of new activities in the area of the Ministry of Communications and Works and in the area of housing.

The Hon. Leader of the Opposition had a great deal of difficulty activating the Ministry of Communications and Works for productive output. We do not like to compliment too often, but we will compliment the hon. member for St. Michael North Central who said he was able to come even though he is a physician by training, and find ways of generating employment in the Ministry of Communications and Works. We will pay tribute when tribute is due, but we have over here, Sir, a Minister of Communications and Works of infinite energy who has already gone out into the various constituencies to locate roads that need immediate fixing. This will have two effects: it will have the effect of putting people to work, and it will have the subsidiary effect of providing a service which was not provided during the tenure of the Democratic Labour Party. Mr.

Speaker, I submit to you that with respect to economics, the Throne Speech is replete with examples of what the present Government intends to do in order to uplift the standard of economic living for the people of Barbados.

We turn now, Sir, for a brief moment, to matters which some people might not regard as terribly significant, but which I feel are very, very significant. I speak now as a sociologist, and I am pointing particularly to the second enactment which this Government put into force when it came into power. That was the renaming of the institution formerly called Seawell International Airport after the most able, most eminent statesman of this sector, and I make reference, Sir, to the late Sir Grantley Adams. There are a lot of people who for a lot of years — 15 years to be precise — have witnessed a systematic attempt on the part of the previous Government to liquidate the memory of that great statesman. But fortresses are hard to demolish, and the memory of the late Sir Grantley Adams is a fortress which will stand in the Caribbean for time immemorial and no vandalistic Opposition Government, or Opposition group, will be able to eradicate the memory of the great man. This present Government, Mr. Speaker, has renamed the most important communications point in Barbados after the memory of that great man. It benefits him in retrospect, and it benefits all of us who believe in the cultural survival of our nation.

Speaking now, Sir, on matters which touch upon social development, I make mention of the National Insurance Scheme. The National Insurance Scheme set forth in the Throne Speech is another document which sets forth the importance of the delivery of health services in Barbados. It is my submission, Sir, that under the previous Government and even under the administration of a medical practitioner, the Queen Elizabeth Hospital was not able to deliver health services in the way in which it was intended. Throughout the length and breadth of this nation there are people who are hobbling around on one foot, or on no foot at all, as a direct consequence of their inability to get quality medical attention when they needed it. I am reliably informed that one of the primary reasons for this situation is the fact that the incidence of diabetes in Barbados is exceedingly high, and that poor people, by virtue of the fact that they cannot get access to cheap medical services, must permit diabetic situations to continue, circulatory problems to set in, gangrene to set in, and ultimately the amputation of an arm, or a leg. In most cases it is a leg.

I have asked, during the course of the campaign just concluded, Mr. Speaker, why is it that one sees only the poor of our nation hobbling around on crutches in this pitiful condition? Why is it that only the poor of this nation are pushing themselves around with variously contrived wheel chairs because they have no legs on which to get around? I submit, Sir, that it is because the previous Government has not been able sufficiently to marshal the resources available to make medical service something which all of us can be proud of. Under the able and dynamic programme set forth by the present Minister of Health, we expect to see, in due course, a Medical Health Programme that would be available to all Barbadians without respect of their economic situation, and we will, hopefully, be able to eradicate this incidence of this crippling disease among our poor, so that this nation can be proud of the medical services which it offers.

4.25 p.m.

That Sir, is the programme in the area of health.

Speaking further, Mr. Speaker, I will deal with the area of education. I happened to have been in the audience at the Ellerslie School when the present Minister of Education enunciated a programme for the alleviation of a problem which was facing our country. Under the then present Minister of Education, children in Barbados fourteen to sixteen years of age were summarily dismissed from schools because they were regarded as slow learners or no learners at all. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recommend to the Minister of Education some documents on Education published by people like Herbert Cole and others who have done studies, and I am sure that all members of this Chamber are aware of the studies that indicate that certain students are slow learners not because anything is particularly wrong with their capacity to comprehend or their capacity to learn, but something is wrong with their social environment in which that learning is to take place.

This present Minister of Education, in a show of strength which will not be easily forgotten in Barbados, got up and enunciated a bold programme that very near in the future — I am told now that it will be from the 1st November — students dismissed by the past Minister of Education will have to be back in school by the 1st November. That is a social measure which also has economic implications because at one stroke he sent students back to

school to discover their true capacity to learn. He unfolds a bold new policy of learning in new directions, that is not the traditional emphasis upon purely academic discipline but youthful discipline that can serve this community. It has a further benefit, and that benefit is that those students will no longer be on the rolls of those whom we consider unemployed, will not be along side the streets playing dominoes as in a few very unfortunate circumstances further extending the unemployment and the crippling social conditions by reproduction of children for which there has been no proper provision in our society.

Mr. Speaker, that programme has the additional benefit of recalling a number of eminent educators who were retired, a number of bright students who were unable under the old programme to find employment. They are now gainfully employed. That is another issue that has escaped the examination of members on the other side, but which none the less gave the lie to their repeated assertions that our programme as enunciated in the Throne Speech is anaemic.

Mr. Speaker, another measure for which the member for St. Michael South Central when he was education Minister was unable to find a solution to — we have been hearing repeatedly that it was not possible to extend the school meals programme because of the number of spurious reasons advanced by the then Government, but our present Minister of Education in a few short days in office has been able to extend the school meals programme to cover all the schools in Barbados, including some private schools.

I am putting confidence in my Minister and I do not wish to cause any questioning. He said it is in effect and if he says it is in effect, it is in effect for me. All you have to do is to ask the additional people who will find places in the school meals programme whether it is in effect, and hear what they will tell you. Ask the people whose children have had to go to school and come back hungry whether it is in effect, and they will give you the answer.

Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to be exhaustive on this topic because other members will certainly have a contribution to make; but a gentleman on the other side is asking us to be ashamed of this document which

Mr. SPEAKER: There are no gentlemen; there are all hon. members.

Mr. JOHNSON: Sorry, Sir. The hon. members on that side are asking us to be ashamed of this document, and I am asking Sir, in summary, are we to be ashamed if our Minister of Education has been able to put children back to school who had no business out in the first place? And all within the first thirty days in office? Are we to be ashamed of a programme in which the school meals programme has been extended to cover all the schools in Barbados within the first thirty days? Are we to be ashamed when \$6 million have been put back into the hands of the taxpayers within the first thirty days? Are we to be ashamed when the Airport has been renamed after the greatest Statesman of this century in this section of the world in the first thirty days? Mr. Speaker, are we to be ashamed when the Ministry of Communications and Works have undertaken a programme in the first thirty days; that escaped then in their fifteen years? Are we to be ashamed of these measures?

Mr. Speaker, far from being ashamed I would like to dissociate myself from their Resolution and to move an amendment to their Resolution, and that amendment, Sir, reads as follows: "Whereas the Government of Barbados through the medium of the Throne Speech has outlined a bold and imaginative programme for the economic and social advancement of our nation, and Whereas such a programme is based upon modern management principles that will permit maximum benefit for the maximum public goods from our limited resources, Be it Resolved that this Honourable House congratulate the Government for its intelligent and imminently feasible blueprint progress."

Mr. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I rise to second the amended Resolution by the member for St. Michael West and I reserve my right to speak.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I will just deal briefly with the last reference that was made to the extension of the school meals programme, and I would not like this House to be misled in any way. The Leader of this Honourable Chamber spoke about distortion, and we certainly would not like in this Chamber for there to be any distortion of the course of history either in terms of previous years when the Barbados Labour Party held the Government or the Democratic Labour Party held the Government; and I do not think that even the present Minister of Education will claim that in thirty short days he was able to extend the school meals programme to include all of the children in this country.

It is well known that the ground work, the plans, the facilities and everything for that particular programme were laid by the Democratic Labour Party and more importantly by the member for St. Michael South Central. Indeed the speech itself said the school meals programme has now been extended to cover the entire primary school programme.

4.35 p.m.

It is well known that the groundwork as far as the facilities and everything they have in the programme was laid by the Democratic Labour Party, and more importantly, by the member for St. Michael South Central. The School Meals Programme has now been extended to cover the entire primary school programme. What I heard the member for St. George South saying, as I understand it, is that the facilities have been extended to all schools, but in his opinion there were certain inefficiencies. I am sure that the member for St. Michael West will take that and acknowledge the correction.

I offer all congratulations to him on his maiden speech; but I would like at the outset to deal with a different problem altogether. I would like to get on to the financial and economic aspects of this whole debate. It is known to this House that the present Prime Minister, when he was Leader of the Opposition, on many occasions and at length used to criticise the then Government for the high national debt; for the high rates and the sums of money that had to be paid to bring about some amortisation of that debt, and he also criticised our burdensome taxation.

When it comes to the Throne Speech we heard references to the removal of the 5 per cent sales tax which we on this side, as the Leader of the Opposition has said, welcome. We would welcome the removal of all taxations. We on this side of the House do not glory in the imposition of taxation, but we realised that the then Minister of Finance, in order to run the country, in order to provide for the goods and services in the country had to find revenue to cover the expenditure. We have heard about the removal of the sales tax. We have heard in the Throne Speech about the provision of roads and bridges. We have heard about the housing programme. We have heard about school uniforms in another context. We have heard about a free national health service; but nowhere have the people of this country been told how the cost of these services in addition to payment for existing services will be met; and there is considerable fear and concern in

this country and outside as to how these additional services are to be financed together with the existing services.

This is a matter which the Minister of Finance must pay immediate attention to, because the concern and the fears must be allayed. When you criticise the previous Government for high expenditures, for a deficit on account, and for a high national debt, you come in addition and promise the people of this country many more high and attractive packages; and not only that, but the people fall for it; but you have not told them how these things are going to be paid for.

I am calling here and now on the Minister of Finance and Prime Minister, the hon. member for St. Thomas, to bring to this Hon. Chamber a special budget and explain to the country how these particular measures are to be financed. There are problems in this economy. There are concerns; and this country is awaiting some statement as to how the gap between revenue and expenditure and the payment for these additional promised to this country will be financed. I am making a call for a special budget to be brought down to this Hon. Chamber to explain to the members and the public of this country how these things are to be financed because we cannot continue in this way.

I am making a very serious point, Mr. Speaker, because we started out with very serious criticisms of the economy of this country and what a bad state, what a perilous state it was in, and how the national debt was too high. How taxation was too high and had to be reduced. If you are running a country you have to pay for the goods and services and you have to try to balance in some way revenue with expenditure.

We hear about the high national debt. I believe that the Minister of External Affairs is not yet back in the country. I cannot vouch for the accuracy of newspaper reports; but I understand that he and the Prime Minister himself were out there seeking aid from some foreign country. Now I want to ask, that if the national debt is too high, and if it has taken a lot of the reserves of this country to amortize that debt, how are you going to seek to borrow additional funds, because Barbados' position in the international world does not entitle it to any free grants.

4.45 p.m.

Barbados' position in the financial world does not entitle it to any free grants. We do not fall among those 24 poorest nations who are able to benefit from grants at very generous terms, non-reimbursable grants as they are styled. We do not qualify for the window of the International Development Fund, that particular window of the World Bank.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is now the end of Private Members' Time. The hon. member may continue on the next occasion if he so desires.

We now revert to Government Business. When progress was reported, the House was in Committee of Supply. To that it now reverts.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House resumed Committee of Supply. Mr. J. G. ODLE took the Chair.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: When progress was reported, the hon. member for St. Thomas, the Hon. Prime Minister was addressing the Chair.

Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I will wind up my speech quickly. The burden of my speech really is that after all these years where it is accepted there has been wide spread educational failures under the Democratic Labour Party, where the people of this country were thoroughly fed up with the administration of the educational system, where the former Prime Minister was thoroughly fed up to the extent of having to get rid of the educational expert *par excellence* in his party, it ill behoves that former expert to come and offer of his former expertise alleged or otherwise. In the course of his speech, and this is really what I noted, he said that there are only two ways you can handle the problem of raising the school leaving age to 16 years; it can be done (a) or (b), and he said you must make better use of the existing schools or you must use the shift system. Then about 12 minutes later he said that the only way to handle this problem is to build more secondary schools. I do not mind how many "only ways" there are. That perhaps is the extent of the depth of his.....

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, on a point of explanation, if the hon. member would give way, I said there were two alternatives, and I am explaining very succinctly, one was the construction of additional schools or making better use of existing facilities.

Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: It is possible that the hon. member meant to say that. He is unaccustomed to opposition and to making cogent speeches, but I do assure all hon. members that on the first occasion when he put the alternative, he forgot the building of new schools. The two alternatives he gave were the shift system and the better use of existing schools, and why I took a particular note of that was that because if he was alert and on the ball he would well know that the hon. member for St. George South, the Minister of Education has already started to make better use of the existing schools. This is October 19 and the children have already been accommodated within the unused capacity of the existing schools, an unused capacity which was there when he was Minister of Education and sending home the children at 14 years. Go and look at St. Giles School; ask the hon. member sitting down next to you, the hon. member for St. Michael North Central. There used to be 1,000 children in St. Giles School 15 years ago; there are only just over 300 recently and we have been able to make use of some of that capacity in accommodating the children by integrating it with the facilities of the nearby secondary modern school, and to suggest that the Barbados Labour Party had some peculiar responsibility for children going home at 14 years when we were in power for 15 years and that the school leaving age was 14 years, they were in power for 15 years and the school leaving age was 14 years. According to my reckoning that was in the past; we have now made a new break. We have decided that the school leaving age must be 16 and the fact that it was 14 in the past is neither here nor there. It is to be sixteen now and that is what the hon. member has to understand. However he mis-administered the Ministry of Education we say it is to be sixteen and it is going to be sixteen. That is the understanding and we need only say it is going to be sixteen. I do not want to anticipate the speech of the Minister of Education, but we say it is going to be sixteen with an improved curriculum. He will deal with that in the fullness of time.

We hear that we have taken some small step in dealing with the problem. How many children are involved? If you read the Addendum the number of children is given. Don't you read the Addendum before you come in the House. I say to the hon. member, you are in the habit of passing Addenda that perhaps went out of the way to give no information to members of the Opposition. We are not of that habit. Read our Addenda and you will see some of the answers. Read and understand we say unto you.

Talking about the baron from Chelsea Road, nobody can deny the contribution that the hon. member for St. Michael South East has made. I never heard anybody call Joy Edwards the man from Belmont Road or Louis Lynch the man from Roebuck Street. What the hon. member has to understand is that he has never run a school; he has never made any personal effort to uplift... (Hon. F. G. SMITH: Did you run a school?) I have never run a school, nor the Leader of the Opposition, but I will say for the Leader of the Opposition that I have never heard him try to denigrate those educational entrepreneurs without whom the educational system of our country would have entirely broken down in the last 20 years. Because the Barbados Labour Party built West St. Joseph Secondary Modern School, I heard with my own ears the hon. member for St. Michael South sneering at it at a public meeting in Horse Hill, St. Joseph at the end of November 1970 when upon that occasion during that by-election campaign we had to make it clear that the system of the comprehensive schools, secondary moderns, starting with St. Leonard's, West St. Joseph, Princess Margaret was started by the Barbados Labour Party and built by them, and for many years the only secondary institutions owned by Government teaching school children and the Government Grammar Schools were schools built by the Barbados Labour Party. We can go into history too, Mr. Chairman. We can go back in history, but that is not what we are doing. I cannot understand how a man who appreciates and comprehends the use of the English language when faced with a pledge in the manifesto of a great political party that it will raise the school leaving age to sixteen and it is able in an unprecedentedly short time to carry out a pledge so major, can say it is a small step in the right direction. What would be a big step for him, to communise the schools?

We have already carried out our pledge. We said we were going to do it and we have done it and the hon. member must understand that opposition is not merely getting up and making a speech. We are off the platform; the people have rejected those arguments; the people do not want to hear those arguments.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: On a point of order, if I understand correctly the hon. member for St. Michael South said he was supporting the Resolution. All he was endeavouring to point out to the Minister was certain difficulties. We are not opposing this, so do not give the impression that we are opposing it. Be fair to the hon. member.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: No point of order. The Leader of the Opposition must take his seat.
4.55 p.m.

Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The Hon. Leader of the Opposition has made one mistake on that point of order. He should have prefaced it not with the words "Mr. Chairman" but with "Mr. Foreman" because he is trying to defend his client who is accused of incompetence in office. I appreciate the intervention on that point but it will not break this particular prosecuting attorney in this trial.

I have never been more impressed in my life by a political act than I was by the hon. member for St. George South, the Minister of Education, in bringing to the Cabinet within three weeks of taking office — and he told me privately beforehand — this comprehensive plan, this Resolution and the case for the sums of money necessary to bring back into school the children the Democratic Labour Party has turned out, and I am asking all hon. members to support this Resolution without any more wasted criticism. There is a time they have to learn to keep their mouths quiet and this is the time. (*Asides*).

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman...

Mr. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member will give way, I wish the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, now that the electioneering is finished, would refrain from coming in here and keeping it as the animal kingdom. He has now called somebody on this side a common dog. He must not say that in here.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Chair will hear from the hon. member for St. Lucy.

Mr. GREAVES: This is a Resolution which has been exercising the attention of this Chamber for some time. It is a Resolution which purports, according to the Addendum, to readmit 1,000 children to the schools. What is a little bothersome to me is to hear the Prime Minister drawing to the attention of the member of St. Michael South the contents of the Addendum, and if I remember correctly, when the hon. Minister of Education introduced the Resolution he referred to the figure 2,000, indicating that this programme was to accommodate those 2,000 children who were put out of school.

Hon. L. R. TULL: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, what I said was that over 2,000 children were turned out of school last July by that Government. That is what I said.

Mr. GREAVES: So, Mr. Chairman, in truth and in fact what the Minister of Education is now saying is completely contradictory to what the Prime Minister said, because the Prime Minister said just now that this programme was to accommodate those children who were turned out of school.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I just want to get it clear. Is the hon. member for St. Lucy speaking on this Resolution?

Mr. GREAVES: Yes, I am.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Well, proceed along those lines.

Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order, I am sorry to do this, but the hon. member must not misrepresent what I said. I never said those words he is putting to me, I merely referred the member for St. Michael South to the Addendum, I never used those words. If you look at that you will understand that 2,000 may have been turned out of school but only 1,000 want to come back. When you are very ignorant you cannot always read.

Mr. GREAVES: I think the Hon. Prime Minister has made a very important point. When we are examining this problem and he has indicated very clearly that the Barbados Labour Party Government has, as from a couple of weeks ago, instituted a programme to raise the school leaving age to 16, I would question this because there is nowhere in any statement made by the Prime Minister, by the Minister of Education or any of the releases coming out of the Ministry of Education existing in Barbados today. I am submitting that there are children in the all age schools who leave school at the age of 14 and are not accommodated in this programme, so it is misleading for anybody in the Government to say that the school leaving age as of now is 16.

Mr. Chairman, some reference was made to the fact that under the Democratic Labour Party there was no provision made for educational opportunities other than the secondary system for children over 14, 16 and what have you. The member for St. Michael South indicated quite clearly that it was the Democratic Labour Party that established the Samuel Jackman Prescod Polytechnic. There is obviously a history surrounding this in that before that we had the Technical Institute, and you know that the Technical Institute functioned in an extremely limited way in this country, because very few students were admitted to the Technical Institute

in terms of the needs of this country. When that is compared with the improvements which exist with the establishment of the Samuel Jackman Prescod Polytechnic, the number and the variety of courses which are offered there, then you will see very clearly that the Democratic Labour Party made a fundamental contribution and a move towards offering alternatives to the children of this country.

Those of us who have been in here for some time, particularly during the last Session, would recall very clearly that whensoever I had to make a contribution on matters educational I was particularly concerned with the content of our educational policy and with the fact that additional provision should be made for offering alternatives to the children of this country, and the Democratic Labour Party was making provision for this. I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that we have heard a lot about the readmission into the schools of these children.

5.05 p.m.

We have heard from the Prime Minister and from the Minister of Education about the raising of the school leaving age. What I think is of the utmost concern — and I want to say it very clearly, because this has been said by the principal spokesman from this side — is that we are not opposed to the principles of this Resolution, and we are not going to oppose it, if they have any fear about our opposing it. I want to say very clearly that nowhere has there been any detailed statement about what the curriculum will be, and I would hope that the Minister, in his reply, would have the common decency to inform this Honourable Chamber of the curriculum which will be offered during the time that these children will be taken back into the schools, so that we will get some indication as to what will be done.

Undoubtedly, there will be some provision made for vocational education. I think this is obvious. We recognised this in the Democratic Labour Party, and provision — not to cover the total extent of the problem — was made for this. We recognised the vital need for providing our young people with a variety of skilled opportunities, and this was offered at the Samuel Jackman Prescod Polytechnic and in some of the schools. (*Asides*). Even in that school some skills were offered. I would hope that this would be expanded. The point is that when we are talking in terms of providing our young people with skills and vocations. This is a laudable, but I would like to go further and to point out very clearly that we have to go even a step further than providing our young people with skills.

The provision of skills to a mass of people does not necessarily mean that it is going to solve any particular problem, or that it is going to be the panacea for any particular ill which might exist within the society. We have to go a step further and to ensure that provision is made to absorb these skills within the society so that the young people will be able to exercise these skills in a meaningful way, and a way in which they will be able to benefit. This has to go hand in hand with the development of our industrialisation programme; it has to go hand in hand with the development and the expansion of the handicraft section, or sector, for which provision was already made under the Democratic Labour Party.

I have to re-emphasise this point because when you talk in terms of making provision in one area, we have to recognise that bottlenecks can be created in other areas. We have to look at this problem in a comprehensive way, and I suspect, Mr. Chairman, that the Government is not examining this problem as comprehensively as it should be examined. I am saying that this is one measure, but we have to go further and accommodate the people who will be benefiting and who will, obviously, have skills which can be utilised in the community if the opportunity is provided for these skills to be utilised. We then have to look at the opportunity of giving assistance to people who will, hopefully, be able to develop industries in which they can make use of these skills. We have to be able to provide them.

We have dealt earlier on today, for example, with the National Standards Institute. We have to provide them with certain facilities and certain standards. We further have to provide marketing opportunities for them. If you have a situation where people have skills in which they will be able to make baskets or any of the other handicraft items which would, obviously, be involved in a programme of this nature, you will recognise, Mr. Chairman, that our small market will soon be flooded with handicraft; therefore, we must look towards opening up opportunities overseas for us to be able to take advantage of what situations exist overseas and at the same time to provide additional opportunities for our people to be able to benefit in a meaningful way, not only with the provision of skills, but that they can put these skills to work in a way that they will be able to feel some importance from the skills which they will be taught during the process of time that they will be undergoing this process of training. I want to repeat, Mr. Chairman, that we in the Opposition will be supporting this measure, and we see no reason why it should be opposed.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, as a former Minister of Education before the dissolution, I think I have a contribution to make to this debate. I shall not be very long. At least I think 15 minutes is not very long, anyhow. What I would like to state quite clearly is that we are supporting it, and we are certainly committed to the continuation of education for the people of this country. I was in the Ministry of Education for the last year, and I feel that the Minister should read my comments on education everytime he gets a file. If he is honest, he can tell this Honourable House and the public of Barbados that my minutes were always in the interest of education, of scholarship, and of everything that came before me. As I have said on speech days before, there are two inhibiting factors in education. In the social community, as the member for St. Michael West will appreciate, every mother wants little Johnny to do certain subjects and, therefore, every mother, whether little Johnny can do certain subjects or not, still wants him to try with Spanish and French, even although little Johnny cannot manage these things. Parents who have legitimate aspirations for their children, who look at their children because of the evolution of our society, would like their children to be lawyers, doctors or engineers. Even though little Johnny or little Jane cannot measure up, the parents still have these aspirations. Any inhibiting factors in the diversification, or the alteration, of education on the part of the Democratic Labour Party has been based on the fact that you have to consider these children. There is no member on that side, who has a child who is an ordinary child, but who is good with his hands and who has certain aptitudes, who will tell this House that he would like him to be a mechanic at Bulkeley, a mechanic at Andrews, or to be a mechanic at a garage in town, or to do certain things. This is human nature.

One of the good things in Barbados is, and I think it is the success of this Honourable Chamber, that most of our parents, who have never had the privilege of education, had dedicated themselves to the cause that their children: me, you, the member for St. Michael West — do not talk about the Prime Minister and the Member for Christ Church South Central. I am talking about us. I am talking about a member like the member for St. Michael North East — (Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Me.) Not you, you had money from birth.....

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I well remember the hon. member telling us that he is a descendant of Adam Waterman who had come from a plantocracy in St. George — Redland Cottage in St. George. Can

the hon. member deny that? I have traced the title for him.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: No point of order.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: The lineage was there, but the money did not filter through. If the money had filtered through, I would have been like you. I would like the money to filter through, because I hear that Redland Cottage is still there. The money did not filter through, and I think you will appreciate that. This is only an aside. What I am saying is that Barbados has certain things going for it. Parents have aspirations for their children, which is admirable and which we as a Government, whether on your side or on our side, must try to foster and to cultivate. If you look at the Democratic Labour Party's Budget, since we came into power and even before we came into power, you will see that in 1965 the total spent by this Government of education was \$8.2 million.

5.15 p.m.

In 1976 we are spending over \$48 million on Education. So there is nobody on that side who can deliberately accuse this Government of not spending money on the education of the people of this country. As a matter of fact, people have said to me since we lost the election on the 2nd September that Grantley Adams said to Barrow once — I do not know how true it is — you are making the mistake when you educate these people; they are going to turn and bite you one day. I do not know if it is true but this is what people told me, that the Prime Minister after whom you have named the airport said to the man whom he said should succeed him, you are making a mistake when you give these people too much education because they are going to turn around and kick you one day. I have not heard it said; I am telling you what old time people told me. I cannot tell you if it is true or not, but people said that this is what a former Prime Minister said to the man whom he had designated as the only man to run Barbados. This is what he said. Be that as it may we are supporting this. All we are pointing out to the Minister of Education is that this is an election promise. All we are saying — I am convinced that he has not thought through the programme thoroughly. You are saying that 2,000 people were sent out; so you are going to take back in 1,000. What is going to happen to the other 1,000? Are they to play dominoes under the street lights? They are still in the unemployed force. Whereas if you had a system and you held this system out, those thousands who were not registered and who have not indicated their desire to continue their education, they are still going

to be in the labour force at 16 without a trade, and they are the problem children.

We are not saying that you should not educate the 1,000 who have indicated their interest, but we are saying you still have another 1,000 for whom you have done nothing. So that your whole scheme, laudable as it is, is still piecemeal in its implementation because if you had a proper scheme and if you would check with the secondary schools who had put these children out, and you had proper legislation, those other 1,000 who are going to play dominoes and roam and get into trouble, should be continuing their education. So that if you extend the school leaving age to 16, all we are saying is, do not extend it to 16 by a piecemeal sort of legislation but bring down a law so that those 1,000 children who are free to do nothing, to be a burden on their parents, to get into trouble and to get joined in trouble, let them go back into school to learn a trade. That is all we are saying. We are not quarrelling with your endeavour to educate the 1,000, so when the Prime Minister gets up and scathingly speaks about the member for St. Michael South who has made a significant contribution to this level of education — we have made a significant contribution. Even in my short time as a Minister, look at the things we have done. Even the Nation, your newspaper, is saying that they must take down "Sleepy Smith" as Minister of Education from buildings that are going up.

The Minister of Education has gone to the Community College which your Government criticised and said it should never have been established, and, he is impressed.....

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. The hon. member obviously must not mislead the House. The Barbados Labour Party said that the Community College should be a college for technology and not to displace the Sixth Forms and because of our education of the public your Minister over there changed his mind.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: All right, as a lawyer, conceding but not accepting. Who build the Community College? When the Minister of Education visited it and is impressed by the magnitude of the building (*Aside*) Who built it? Did you build it? When you drive by River Road and you see Queens College prepared to take in more pupils, did you do it? When you drive by Foundation School in your own constituency, who built it? You?

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, this is for the records. The Foundation Boys and Girls Schools were built by the Barbados Labour Party. It has just been extended after repeated efforts calling upon the Minister Mr. Sandiford when he

was Minister, and you had to do something to justify your position.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Thank you; but any how it was being extended by the Democratic Labour Party; not by Sleepy Smith. It is not my money. When you go to West St. Joseph now, who did it? When he went and opened Ellerslie and was not gracious enough to pay tribute either to the Minister or the Government, did he do it? All this is an attempt by this Government to extend the Educational opportunities for the same group today, that he is coming to this House to ask permission to educate.

Let me tell you something. We have to get the records straight once and for all. This Government arranged with Cable and Wireless to buy the place at Carrington for \$250,000.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You said this Government.

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: That was the worst buy of all, Mr. Chairman, because that was fifty acres and you had no right paying more than 50 multiplied by 3, which is \$150,000, and the building was an old disused building. That was a gift to Cable and Wireless.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: All right. That was a gift; you can negotiate with them. We thought at the time, with the land values in Barbados it was a good buy. If you feel so, do not take it; negotiate and get it for nothing. I will support it in this House. However, what I am saying is \$250,000. It was not any 50 acres. It was much more than fifty acres. You have not got your facts right; it is 72. (*Aside*)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: There is too much cross talking. Please address.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: It is 72. So you better get your facts right instead of jumping up like a yoyo. I will tell you this. We were using that again to diversify education. We were going looking at again extending Dodds — technical education. We have put on courses at the Polytechnic. Our Government instituted agricultural courses and we have been in contact constantly with the principal Mr. Hercules to extend courses — hairdressing, book binding — we were working on it. We were also to build the Polytechnic to educate 2,500 children, and I want to read our plans for the people of this country because the way you get on, you get on as if you are bringing children into school who have left.

Now let me deal with this briefly. The Ministry of Education has never sent out one

single child yet — the Minister of Education — and let the public tell you this if you do not know; children having to leave school because they are not progressing educationally has been happening in this country from time immemorial.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You have two minutes more.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: This has been happening. If a child was in school and you have to take in 5,000 children with the common entrance and under the feeder school system, some have to go out for some to come in, and that is why this Government was committed to building a new school at Fernleigh Herst, to build a new school in St. James, to build a new school in Christ Church, to build the Polytechnic, to complete the Community College so that we would not have to send a single child out but that we could send the child in the area of aptitude where he would want to go. So do not come in with this crap about this Government is willing to send out children. It hurts my heart when children and mothers and relatives — and they used to come to me because I was one Minister who used to see them by the thousands and I used to say get this child back in school, he is too young to leave; but if children did not leave school there would be no way of taking in the eleven plus, and this is where you are going to run into trouble now. You say you are going to abolish the eleven plus; you have not said what you are going to substitute for it, and I am watching you like a hawk.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You have one minute more.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Because when 5,000 children in May passed, send them under a tamarind tree and under some breadfruit trees and casuarina trees to learn; and that is when your second state is going to be worse than your first.

Mr. Chairman, finally we support this. We are just pointing out to the Minister of Education he has not told us which school he is using, how many will be in any class, how many from any parish; no details; but they have the numbers. When chaos steps in — and you owe it to the House to say how many children are doing art, budgeting, whatever it is. Tell us that. We are supporting you and we hope and wish this good luck in the interest of the people's children; and anything this Opposition can do to make it a success, we are supporting you.

This whole debate, Mr. Chairman, finally is just to point out — not to criticise — to point out to the Minister that we have made a significant contribution to education even although it has been to our undoing in not being the Government. We do not regret it, and we shall continue because a blackman if he is to be a man — and my family today is a family because of education. I support this one thousand percent and all I am pointing out to the Minister is that the way the Hell is paved with good intentions. We are supporting you but we are only endeavouring to point out to you that you are honouring a pledge, but when the 5,000 come you are going to be in trouble.

So I do not want any criticism that we are against it. We are for it but we are just enabling him since he has gone in hot and sweaty and think he is going to move the world, that the world does not work that way. It is spinning and it has been spinning from the time God created it and you cannot change it. That is all, and I thank you for your indulgence, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BRADSHAW: Mr. Chairman, after listening to members of the Opposition I tend to think and feel at times that they did not understand what they were doing, the evils that they created during their terms of office. In 1971, Mr. Chairman, I made repeated calls on the Democratic Labour Party to alter the system whereby children term after term were thrown out of school.

5.25 p.m.

In 1971, Mr. Chairman, I made repeated calls on the Democratic Labour Party to alter the situation whereby children were thrown out of schools. I called on the then Minister of Education, the hon. member for St. Michael South, to do something about it. At that time I called upon him to introduce day schools. I pointed out that children were asked to leave school although they were performing well in these schools. It was only this year, leading up to general elections, that I exhibited reports where children had got some 65 per cent average in their examinations and yet were asked to leave school.

I said then that it was a burning shame that the then Government, although I had made several repeated statements to them, could not find it possible to do anything. Mr. Chairman, the Resolution before the House is not seeking to make the school leaving age 16. It is trying to allow children who between the ages of 14 and 16 are not in a position to occupy the work force to have an opportunity to learn a basic

skill. We are concerned about the 14 and 15 year olds because they cannot go and claim a job at the age of 14 or 15. We are inviting the children back into schools so as to have an opportunity of learning some basic skill.

The hon. member for St. Lucy said that we at no time were clear about what we are going to do. I will tell him now that I pointed out time and time again that children should be brought back into schools. They should not be thrown out. They should be taught hair dressing, agriculture etc. If he is not aware of it, take the Advocate-New in which the Hon. Minister of Education advertised for teachers to teach these basic skills to children who are now being readmitted to schools.

Members of the Opposition are not aware of the fact that we have been studying the situation for a very long time and we have been calling on them time and time again to do something. If the hon. member for St. Michael South has advice to give it is not to the Minister of Education on this side. He should have offered that advice to the Leader of the Opposition when he was Minister of Education; but I do not believe that he should be coming here and trying to get around our policy by saying that he will support us. We are not asking for that type of support. They are bound by their consciences to support the measures of this Government because they are for the benefit of the country.

Mr. Chairman, we must at this stage realise that the 2,000 children who were sent home from schools, were not, many of them, anxious to stay at home. I must say that at this age some of those children had shown their academic ability. It is a burning shame that three forms of the Parkinson School were asked to leave. As I said, these children did not fail their examinations.

There is a famous speech that I will always remember, a speech made by the Leader of the Opposition at the St. Barnabas School when he said do not care what you do with children, they have to leave school. He said that. I have it on tape. What we are seeking to do today is to prove to the Leader of the Opposition that the children do not have to leave school, and we are going to give them a new lease of life.

Mr. Chairman, it is the foresight of the Hon. Minister of Education who has realised that we have a problem in our community. We cannot afford to send 14 and 15 year olds to seek a living, and that is why we are seeking

today the approval of Parliament to have these children brought back into the schools so that they can have an opportunity once again.

Mr. Chairman, hon. members on that side have led this House to believe that the children who passed the 11-plus examination must be provided for and that is the reason for sending out these 14 and 15 year olds. I will give the lie to that, because, as you will see, the Minister of Education has now seen it fit to find places not used in these schools. If the Minister in the past Government had taken the time off, or if the member for St. Michael South had done himself justice and informed the Minister that room could yet be utilised in the schools we would not be faced with this situation today.

That is the way they ran the Government. Today they come here and say that they will support the Government. How will they support the Government? Are we in any need of support? Let the hon. member for St. Michael South answer this. We are no enemies of progress. In what will he support us? It is perhaps their consciences that led them at this point to say that they will lend their support to this particular commitment.

Mr. Chairman, the situation in this country where we look at these young people frustrated is because of a lack of foresight by the past Government. They put the children on the streets, and we have not got to undo a lot of the bad things that they have done.

5.35 p.m.

I want to point out, Mr. Chairman, that some of these little children who were turned out of school year after year are children who have been to private schools, schools like the Cooperative High School, the Modern High School and even my school, and they came out with four and five "O" Level certificates; but they had been discarded by the Government. They are telling you that they care about the children. Whose children go to the Comprehensive schools and are turned out? The poor people's children; yet they are going to tell someone and claim before this Chamber that they thought about the poor children and poor masses of this country. We know that these children under our Government will prove that they are or were worthy of what we are offering them. We also know, Mr. Chairman, that when these children finally pass out of the schools after going through a programme of training in basic skills like agriculture, dress making, home economics and so forth that they

will feel themselves qualified and equipped and as equal citizens of this country.

I want to point out quite clearly that that is why we have had a situation in this country where people were underpaid, because they were turned out of the schools with no qualifications, and businesses that came to this country and knew that they were not qualified were prepared to offer them low wages. For the benefit of members of the Opposition, when we would have completed our programme by educating these children and teaching them basic skills, we can assure them that the days of cheap labour will be over and efficiency in the workers will be at long last achieved.

Mr. Chairman, I rose to support this measure before this Chamber, and I want members on the other side to understand that they must on this day support this Government and support the Hon. Minister for his foresight and for the dynamic and progressive policy of the Barbados Labour Party and this Government.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, philosophically I believe that state education should be available to all the citizens of the country. I do not however believe that Barbados with its limited resources can afford a system of state education at this stage, but I do believe however, that there should be a maximum use of all existing resources and that from year to year a Government such as ours should try and make these places more and more available, and also, Mr. Chairman, it should try to devise the type of curricula and training that gear the students for meeting their needs after they leave school.

Now I have heard a lot said in the course of this debate. I do not want to be nasty, but I must answer one or two things. I heard the Leader of the Opposition say that if you read the files you would see that he supported this and that, but I would like the Hon. Leader of the Opposition to know that I do read the files and have been reading the files. I am a voracious reader and the only thing I have seen of any significance when he was Minister of Education is that he took on 100 people to work in the school meals service just before the election to serve himself and the hon. member for St. Michael South Central and the hon. member for St. Michael South. That is all I have seen of any significance because I have never in any file in the Ministry seen the Leader of the Opposition initiating a clear policy on anything.

I believe the contribution of the hon. member for St. Michael South is a little better, but I am not going to get on this side and make any attacks on people in the Opposition for the sake of making them. The hon. member for St. Michael South was Minister of Education for a number of years and whatever may be said, he is a man with some ability who tried. All that happened is that he failed. I am not doing any herculean job here. You are aware, Mr. Chairman, that over the past several months it has been driven home forcefully to me the anguish of parents of children who are turned out of school at 14 and 15 years, and it would be a poor job of starting if as Minister of Education I did not direct myself immediately to eliminate that problem. So immediately on taking over office I set about to do what the Government did not do in 15 years. I was advised that what I was doing was impossible, and I had to say it is not impossible so long as I am sitting here, so start working. I called meetings and told them to get all the facts, curricula and everything else, got the heads of the old and the newer secondary schools and put the problem to them, and I told them it was more than an educational problem; this was a social problem and like them I had seen children in the police station, I had seen them in the law courts, at Dodds, young children having problems because they were told they were rejected at any early age. I have seen these children begging to get back in the school, and I have seen their parents crying to get them back in the schools, and it was incumbent on my conscience to get them back, and I set about to put them back there. I worked out a programme.

I heard the hon. member for St. Lucy talking a lot, but I could not understand what he was saying. We have worked out a curriculum. The hon. member for St. Michael South when he was Minister of Education two years ago invited the National Development Curriculum Committee to report to him and received no curriculum. I do not work that way, Mr. Chairman. I told the people in my Ministry that I wanted a curriculum in two weeks and I had one in two weeks.

We have new curricula devised, most of them non-academic, in communication and communicating skills, in guidance, culture and recreation, home and family life, technical studies, business and distribution studies, agriculture, cottage industries, academic studies, body culture, machining and fitting, electrical wiring, masonry, carpentry, craft work, laundry,

and this is the basis on which we are working.

I want also to point out, Mr. Chairman, that we have an academic end to it, because none of the children who were turned out of school in July are below average; they are not non-achievers; they are children of average ability and if allowed to remain until sixteen would pass "O" Level certificates. I want this cleared up immediately because this misconception that all the children turned out of school at the age of 14 years last July were not learning anything and would not get into the academic stream. That is not true. A number of these children would have succeeded in academic subjects if they were allowed to remain in school.

There are other points that are not worthy of answering, but I will tell you, Mr. Chairman, that it distresses me when I hear hon. members on the other side talk about what is possible and what is not possible. There are no more school buildings in Barbados now than they were when the Democratic Labour Party was in power.

5.45 p.m.

There are no more school buildings in Barbados now than there were when the Democratic Labour Party was in power, there are no more school places available in Barbados now than there were in July when the Leader of the Opposition was Minister of Education, all that happened was that they refused to utilise the existing places. Other members spoke about schools like St. Giles which had over 1,000 pupils in it and now has 300. It means that there is room for about 600 or 700. I do not consider the school only as a building, the Springer Memorial, 150 yards across the street, turned out over 200 children at the end of last term and 150 yards down the street, St. Giles' is empty. It happened all over the place and I have been able to find well over 1,000 places in the schools in Barbados, and I am not doing anything so fantastic, I am just using the available space to accommodate those children in school.

There is something which personally I consider of great significance, that is, that the children who were turned out of school are generally of very humble backgrounds, because if they were not they would have been able to go on to the private secondary schools and pay fees of \$100 and \$200 per term — in fact \$225 is the highest I heard of — but they cannot afford it, so the system that exists is the system that discriminates against the poor people of this country, and I believe that the Leader of the

Opposition instead of jumping up and shouting should really have thought about this.

I appreciate the contribution made by the member for St. Michael South, but he has also got to realise that this situation is a situation that existed when he was Minister of Education and I have inherited the system that needs to be changed and will be changed.

If I may answer the hon. member for St. Lucy in his absence, he is a great nick picker. Instead of getting up in here and adding constructive debate to what is going on he picks nicks all the time. Just for the record I would like to say that the position is that just over 2,000 pupils were turned out of school in July, 1976 from the newer secondary schools, and it was advertised by the Ministry that all those children who were interested in returning to school should register at the school that they last attended over a period of three days. That period has passed and just over 1,100 of them have registered and will be returning to school in full by 1st November, 1976. We asked only that the ones who were interested in returning, in other words this was not compulsory, we intend to raise the school leaving age to 16 and even the dumbest wit would understand that if it was not possible for the last Government to provide places for them up to September, 1976 that the places are not immediately going to drop from Heaven, but we started out by putting 1,100 in school and by next September we have to add at least 2,000 more.

I will tell you, Mr. Chairman, for the benefit of the Leader of the Opposition, a man who if he had done his homework this would not now be necessary. Harrison College will take in some, Queen's College will take in some, St. Michael's will take in some, Alexandra will take in some, Lodge School will take in some, Combermere will take in some, and you said there were not any places.

We go on, Mr. Chairman. In addition to those secondary schools mentioned there are several other centres. The Polytechnic will come into play, the Housecraft Centre will come into play, and in addition to that there will be other schools like St. Giles', St. David's and other elementary schools with a lot of vacant places that will be used. In addition to those there will be community centres that will be used instead of just holding dances on Saturday nights.

The hon. member for St. Michael South says this is only an *ad hoc* measure, but we are dealing with the children who were sent out last

term. We envisage over a period of a year to create further places in the schools by extending buildings to place about 3,000 more, and the problem is not as acute as the members on the other side found it when they had the Government, because if they had the time, the intelligence or the initiative to ask the people in their Ministry, their advisers to work out a statistical report on the number of the school places needed over the years they would have realised that by 1981 there would be fewer children of high school age in Barbados than there are now, but Mr. Chairman, they do not bother with these things, all they are concerned about is putting 100 people into the School Meals Service just before election time so that they can get a seat. I read the files.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, if the Minister will give way, the Minister has not obviously read this particular file which has the projections for the school places in 1981 and beyond, perhaps that file has not yet reached his desk. I would like to assure him that projects had been made in the Ministry and they are on files in the Ministry.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: No point of order. Let the hon. member for St. George South continue.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, forgive me for drawing it to your attention, but there is a Standing Order which was put in by the last Cabinet. (Hon. F. G. SMITH: The Cabinet? The Cabinet does not decide on Standing Orders). After the Standing Orders were decided by a Select Committee they went to Cabinet, they were amended and the Government of the day came down here and passed them through the House as if they were original Bills. I refer to Standing Order 33(6), and I refer that to the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, there cannot be a point of order arising out of a point of order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Chair will entertain the Hon. Minister.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman.....

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Chair does not now entertain a point of order. Let the Hon. Minister speak and after that there can be a point of order. I will entertain the hon. member after that.

Mr. TAITT: The Minister was on his feet and I rose on a point of order. Am I to understand that you are not entertaining the point of order?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I will entertain the Hon. Minister of Education. Only, if he gives way will I entertain any point of order.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member for St. Michael South had had a projection on the number of school places that would be required in 1980, 1981 and onwards he would not see the problem as of great magnitude as he stated earlier. I am happy to see that he is now showing the Hon. Leader of the Opposition those figures for the first time, even though the Leader of the Opposition was the Minister of Education earlier this year.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: On a point of elucidation, the Hon. Minister of Education has a lawyer's complex.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order.
5.55 p.m.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order! Will all hon. members take their seat. Unless the Hon. Minister gives way, there will be no point of explanation. (*Asides.*) I said order, please! There will be no cross talk.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, these proposals that are being dealt with this afternoon are, obviously, short ranged and are not intended to cover the whole range of problems that will arise in the future in respect of other children coming out of school. I would, however, like to point this out because there seems to be some confusion on the other side in this area. I want to point out that when these children are put out of school at the age of 14, it does not mean that they are put out because they are not learning. As I have heard from one of the members over there, they are put out of school solely to find places for children who are 11 years old and want to get in. I heard the member for St. Michael South East point it out, and it is a fact that many forms are turned out *in toto*. Even the one who comes first in the form is put out on the street and told: "You have to get out of here because we have to find room for the ones 11 years old." What kind of system is that? While they are being put out by the Headmasters in the schools under the direction of the Minister of Education, and when the Minister of Education knows that they are being put out — the last Minister of Education knows that they are being put out and does nothing about it, then it takes some nerve for him to come in here and ask who put them out.

This is the position. There are a number of children at the age of 11 who go on to these newer secondary schools and they can hardly write their names, but they are 11 years old. The policy of the former Government was no matter whether you can read or write, as long as you are 11, you might as well go into the big school, and they were draining all of these children out of the primary schools where they could still learn something to throw them into the secondary schools where they had no chance of learning anything at all. I can tell you that it was probably a part of their plan to cut down on the School Meals Programme, because if those children remained in the elementary schools they would have had a hot free meal every day. But if they sent them to the secondary schools, they would not have got one meal. That is the only explanation I can find for leaving the elementary schools half-empty; filling up the secondary schools beyond measure, and then turning out 14 and 15-year old children who are not anxious to learn.

Let us move on to the older Grammar Schools. I hope that not too long from now I will be able to put an end to the dichotomy of older Secondary Schools and newer Secondary Schools. (*Applause.*) Two ex-Ministers of Education of less than a year ago are now thumping the Table on that. The older Secondary School as well as the newer Secondary School is the perpetuation of a snob system in Barbados that the Democratic Labour Party did not look at for 15 years. (*Asides.*)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will hon. members desist from shouting across the floor!

Hon. L. R. TULL: He does not know any better, Sir. I am hoping that we may be able to put an end to that dichotomy at some stage, and that all of the schools will be Secondary Schools in Barbados. I believe that I have answered the various bits of trivia put by members on the other side as well as one or two standard points put by one member. I do not feel like dishing out praise over there. One member made one or two good points, but the others made very trivial points. I hope that I have given the information that you have asked for. I have told you which schools will be accommodated and the type of curriculum, and that the number is 1,100 instead of 2,000. We do not propose, at this stage, to twist anybody's arm and push him through a school door if he is not interested.

We do, however, expect that, in time, children will have the type of motivation, the type of programme, and the type of curriculum

that the past Government failed to give them. We hope that they will have it this time, and that they will want to remain in school until the age of 16.

The question that the Resolution in the sum of \$165,000 do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1976-77,
No. 17

A Resolution for the sum of \$258,717 was called.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution, in effect, deals with the appointment of personal emoluments to people who will be involved in the programme of reabsorption of the children, the 14-year olds plus, who were turned out of school in July this year. You will see that the Resolution is consequential upon the last Resolution, and it involves the payment of Ministry staff, Teaching staff, Subordinate staff and so on, for the implementation of this policy.

I now move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: I beg to second that.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is that...

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, do give us an opportunity to make a very brief comment. Some of the main arguments have been advanced in the discussion of the previous Resolution, and we do not intend to delay the passing of this particular Resolution because it is for the implementation of the Government's policy. We would, however, like to point out, and I would like to do this because the Prime Minister, the hon. member for St. Thomas, made a very big point about addenda that used to be presented by the previous Government and how this Government is now presenting addenda that give information, are accurate and all of that. I am looking at the addendum, and it reads as follows:

"Recurrent

The sum of \$258,717 is required to meet the recurrent cost to the end of the financial year of the programme for re-admission of students between the ages of 13 and 15 who were required to leave school at the end of the school year 1975-76."

Now I am unaware, and this may be some of the information which the Minister may be

able to tell us, that children who are 13 years of age have been required to leave school. I believe that this should have read "14", and I am merely pointing it out because we would not like the records of this House to be inaccurate in anyway. I believe this figure should be "14" because that is the school leaving age by law at this particular time. I believe this must have been an oversight or an error on their part.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I shall not be very long, but I should like to recite the Democratic Labour Party's Programme for the people of this country on education. When I hear the Minister evangelise like the man who is preaching a gospel, even although we support him, and make so many inaccuracies — Sir, we are committed to educating the people's children. When we have moved the Budget from \$8 million in 1965 — I do not know what it was in 1961 — to \$48 million, you will understand the position. I will have to read the Democratic Labour Party's Manifesto which states:

"Over the past 15 years the Democratic Labour Party has placed major emphasis...."

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: On a point of order, Sir. Is the Hon. Leader of the Opposition going to make that paper he is reading a document of the House?

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I would love to. With pleasure, Mr. Chairman.
6.05 p.m.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. Is the Hon. Leader of the Opposition going to make that paper from which he is reading, a document of the House?

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I will have to. With pleasure, Mr. Chairman. I think the Government should have a copy.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: A copy of that paper book? I do not wish to tell Your Honour how to rule but I am sure that posterity will record the picture book which a political party put out to fool little children if it is put on the records of the House.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I will put it in. If the hon. member for St. Joseph insists, I am willing to place the Democratic Labour Party's Manifesto as a document of this House, and I will put it in after I have read from it, since he insists. The Democratic Labour Party promised the people of this country the following, Mr. Chairman:

"Over the past fifteen years, the Democratic Labour Party has placed major emphasis on educational reform in order to meet the demands for more and better education. We have provided additional schools at both Primary and Secondary level. We set up a National Curriculum Development Council to carry out a complete re-study of all subjects taught in schools. We have introduced a new Education Act. We have improved the career structure in the teaching service. We have provided text books at a nominal rental fee for secondary school students.

We commissioned a study on the performance of pupils Overseas Examinations, and have implemented a major part of the findings of that study. Performance in these examinations have substantially improved.

We commissioned a study on the operations and effects of the Common Entrance Examinations, and we have begun to implement some of the recommendations contained in the Report.

Through the establishment of the Caribbean Examinations Council, whose headquarters is in Barbados, we are playing a leading role in the creation of an examination system that will be more relevant to the needs of Caribbean students.

All of these new programmes and new ideas have resulted in substantial improvements, both qualitatively and quantitatively in our schools.

During the next five years we will keep up the momentum for educational change and improvements initiated by our Party. We will continue to introduce new curricula in our schools through the machinery of the National Curriculum Development Council in order to make school programmes more relevant to the business of living. In particular more emphasis will be placed on skills training and practical subjects." So that, with the Minister of Education we are *ad idem*.

And it goes on: "Implement fully the Education Act and the Regulations being made thereunder; provide more facilities for nursery education in Nursery Schools, in existing primary schools and in Day Nurseries; place greater emphasis on primary education in order to maintain a solid foundation for future learning experiences; provide more secondary school places, the construction of new schools and the extension of existing buildings." Now in connection with this the Nation says you should take down my name from showing that we started them.

It goes on: "Continue the process of educational reform by implementing those recommendations of the Shorey Report which have been accepted; maintain and develop excellence in our secondary schools programme. In particular, the programme to up-grade the newer secondary schools will be continued in order to minimize differences in schools." So we are with you; you are pushing an open door.

It continues: "Introduce an in-service course in school administration for senior school personnel; provide more training opportunities for teachers; revise the teacher training programmes at Erdiston Teachers' College."

It goes on "Open the new campus of the Barbados Community College and begin construction of the new Samuel Jackman Prescod Polytechnic." So you will have the pleasure of doing that, opening the new campus. I hope you will pay tribute to us. You also praised the Barbados Community College as being impressive. As regards the Polytechnic you are reviewing that. So you see we have so many areas of common approach that really I do not see why education should be bi-partisan.

It goes on to say: "award Association Degrees to students successfully completing the designated courses at the Barbados Community College and seek recognition for that Degree from institutions of higher learning both in the Caribbean and beyond; continue to support the University of the West Indies as a regional institution within the context of greater localization."

Mr. SIMMONS: On a point of order....

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Greater localization.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: There is a point of order. Please let me entertain the hon. member for St. Philip North.

Mr. SIMMONS: Sir, the Leader of the Opposition must really be relevant to the Resolution and if he is not going to be relevant let us short circuit the debate, and I move that this Manifesto do now pass.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: No point of order.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: You see Mr. Chairman, your Minister of Agriculture gave me the opening. Now this is where the Minister of Education will understand that we are not quarrelling; that is why we will support it because we said this and the member for St. Michael South said this also.

It continues: "provide continuing education for early school leavers and adults in Extension Division of existing secondary schools. These programmes will be under the administrative control of the Heads of those schools; extend the programme of special education for those who are handicapped."

Mr. Chairman, that is why we started the programme at the new Charles Broome School where we are trying to integrate handicapped children with the ordinary children with the nursery school.

So when you read and hear about this document, Mr. Chairman, this is a document of the House from now on as requested by the Minister of Agriculture. Look at it. It is a pretty book.

(Hon. F. G. SMITH, at this stage presented the Manifesto to the Clerk)

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I am honoured to think that the Minister of Agriculture is so enamoured with the Democratic Labour Party's Manifesto that he demands that history records in the annal of this House, what we promised the people in 1976 which the people regrettably in their moment of euphoria did not accept, but I am sure they will accept it in 1981.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I have refrained from participating in the debate, and I left here to attend two funerals which, as you will understand, is a very necessary part of representation. I rise to make the point, Sir, that it seems to me that when we come to debate education in this House, it is perhaps necessary after a long period in the House for there to be some frivolity, but Mr. Chairman, the question of education in this country is a very serious matter. I do not believe that any one political party has all of the answers to all of the educational problems in the country.

When we are fighting an election it is perhaps desirable that one political party would put forward its view on education to be superior to that of the other party; but I believe when we are getting on with the business of Governing, when we get down to the serious business of education we have to look at it very seriously.

Mr. Chairman, the problems of education in this country are not problems that started fifteen years ago or twenty years ago. They go back a long way, Sir, and they are steeped in a basic philosophy which did not take account of the

ordinary, the poor man in this community. The basic philosophy of education which the Barbados Labour Party inherited and which the Democratic Labour Party subsequently inherited, with the philosophy which did not see the ordinary poor man rising to any position of prominence in this country, has been a problem for all administrations who claim to have the interest of the masses at heart, to find the best ways possible to bring education to the broader masses. The Democratic Labour Party played a significant role in opening up educational opportunities for the poor masses in this country. It is possible, naturally, Mr. Chairman, in any fifteen years of Government to find areas where the Democratic Labour Party fell short, as it will be possible after the present Government has had their few years of governing by 1978 or whenever it is, to find fault with their way of administering the Government.

6.15 p.m.

There are certain things on which I believe that members on both sides of this House should agree and that is that the fundamental problem with education in this country is a certain prejudice against the poor man, a certain disbelief in the capability of ordinary people to rise to any heights in this country.

I heard the Minister say that it is his ambition – and I wish him a lot of luck. I wish to see removed the prejudicial distinction between the older secondary schools and the newer secondary schools. Some will say that we had 15 years. That is not the point. The fact is that there are divisions, which, if they are not faced up to squarely will remain forever.

When the Minister comes and says that he has to get \$258,000 to assist in the programme, that is only a make shift programme. In due course the Minister will have to bring to this House a programme commensurate with the philosophy that he has enunciated on the floor of this House.

I am sure that the Minister, who has been critical of the way in which Education has been handled by the past Government of this country will come with a programme to demonstrate to the people of Barbados once and for all that they will remove the channels which existed between one primary school and another in this country.

Everywhere there are channels it is significant of the social divisions between one group and the other. Most of them who sit on that side are elitists. They go and speak to the poor and put out words that sound plausible and

acceptable. Is it true, for example, that children having gone to some other places for registration are finding in fact that what they anticipated is not so? (Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: That is an ignorant statement.) Is it true that the anticipations will not be fulfilled? Is it true that the question of the re-employment of these persons who are to teach basic skills is not true? That is what is said on the streets. It is said that jobs are being created for certain people. I do not believe it. I would like the Minister to get up and clarify this.

However they may try to shift and move because of what I am saying, the incontrovertible fact is that somebody, sometime in this country will have to face the question of equal opportunity head on. The DLP spent 15 years dealing with this. (ASIDE: And failed.) The Leader of the Opposition said that no one could say in this country that from the time that the DLP was in power from 1961-76 that nothing was done for Education. It takes a dishonest person to stand up or even sit down and say so.

Before the DLP, people, ordinary people did not go to high schools in this country. (ASIDE: You went to one, you idiot, and Caddle.) We are talking about mass education of the people of this country. They will always find it uncomfortable. They can always point to one man that they know but for every man that they can point to, there are 20 or 25 who did not have the opportunity.

The member for St. Michael West has lived in America for many years. He will tell you that he has seen a number of Barbadians in the USA who were rejected by the system of this country, and who went to the USA and had the capacity to rise to the highest level. I am saying, Mr. Chairman, that there are some things in this country that have to be said sooner or later. If they are putting a piece of plaster across a sore in an attempt to give the impression that they are doing something, then we are going to live with the sore.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, nothing of any significance has come out of the contributions from the other side. Therefore, I now beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Your Honour do now report the passing of four Money Resolutions in Committee.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I beg to second that.

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

On the separate motions of Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN seconded by Hon. L. S. CRAIG, the Resolutions were read a first and second time and agreed to.

THE LEAVE PASSAGES (AMENDMENT) ORDER, 1976

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 2 stands in the name of the Hon. Prime Minister, to move the passing of the Resolution to approve the Leave Passages (Amendment) Order, 1976.

Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, consequent upon the revision of salaries and wages recently granted to the public service, it is necessary to make appropriate amendments to the Leave Passages Order, which Order provides for Civil Servants earning certain salaries to an entitlement to be given leave passages to take overseas leave either within or outside the Caribbean as the case may be. The Order provides for the qualifying points of entitlement to be raised in accordance with agreements duly reached at the time of the passing of the appropriate legislation.

I may say that while the passage of this Order was anticipated almost as a mechanical matter which follows naturally upon the salary revision which was agreed during the negotiations between the previous Government and the Unions concerned, I would yet like to add that the present Government is undertaking a careful review of the situation with respect to leave passages. We do tend to think that leave passages, if they continue to be granted, should be granted only in connection with some kind of study. For example, the head of the Civil Service who I think I can very fairly say probably agreed with us on this side in this regard and who himself has recently returned from a leave passage, took the opportunity to hold talks in London with the Crown Agents relating to certain wastages which he has found in our supply procedure — the wastages seem to arise after the supplies reach Barbados rather than before — and carried out one or two other functions which related more nearly to his duties than to the mere taking of vacation.

At the present time, at least speaking for last year, there were only 56 officers who were entitled to leave passages. An officer would take sixteen years before he could really absorb all the passages to which he is entitled at the present rate of conversion, so I think that the situation is not one of over generosity, and I would not like this Government in particular to be criticised for over generosity in this matter of leave passages. We used to come in for abundant criticism when we were last in power before 1961 from certain members of the then Opposition, who after a lapse of I believe 18 years find themselves placed in their proper seats in the Opposition benches for the first time in all those years. But nonetheless leave passages have remained part of our legislation. Only today I made it clear to one or two interested persons that the entire question of leave passages will be reviewed by the Government at the time of the next salary negotiations in respect of the salaries of public officers, and I do give the House the assurance now, the hon. member for St. Lucy will perhaps take particular interest in this, that on the next occasion of such negotiations, the process of collective bargaining will be pursued through to the bitterest end possible. We will not cut the Gordian knot, Mr. Speaker because we will not waste the people's money in such a way that when it comes to rewarding the public officers there will be no money to pay.

I would also like to give public officers an assurance in respect of these negotiations that none of the 50 or 60 public officers who will be entitled after the present order is, as I confidently expect, passed will lose their entitlement. We are already resolved that officers presently entitled to leave passages will continue so to be. If it should be that our negotiations in the proper spirit of collective bargaining result in public officers accepting some other form of recognition for those who have achieved certain salary levels and abandoning leave passages in consequence, this will relate to the future and not to officers instantly qualified.

I think I have given as ample an explanation as I can, Mr. Speaker, and I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I rise to second this Resolution and I am quite sure that as the Leader of the Opposition has indicated there is going to be no debate from that side. We are well aware of the fact that his wife being a doctor, is entitled to leave from which of course he will benefit, and we are quite sure.....

Hon. F. G. SMITH: What I would like is that with the new change in sex discrimination my wife can carry me and get me a leave passage too which she cannot get now. Being a doctor she is entitled but I cannot get one; so if the new sex discrimination is going to give me one, you know I will support it too.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I thought that just in seconding this Resolution my colleague on the other side would not have said a single word, but I did mention to my colleagues on this side that it was likely that he would get up.

However, I beg to second the Resolution and I am quite sure that as long as it is of some material benefit to the Leader of the Opposition, he was not going to oppose it.
6.35 p.m.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker,....

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I reserve my right to speak.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has already made his contribution to this debate.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I can recall the last time we dealt with leave passages in this Hon. Chamber I took the position, as I will take today, that it is my considered view that leave passages should be abandoned. The Prime Minister has indicated that the Government is looking at a revision of the terms of the Leave Passage Regulations and the whole idea and scope of leave passages. I would really hope that a thorough investigation is made of it because when one examines the rationale and the idea behind the coming into being of leave passages one can see very clearly that today those conditions do not apply. I do not see why in Barbados people who are recruited in Barbados should be entitled as an inducement to work in the Civil Service to a leave passage. I believe that some other form of compensation might very well have to be worked out, but certainly this can be considered as a drain on our limited resources.

When people go on leave, with leave passages, they obviously have to make arrangements for getting foreign exchange and a whole set of other things which will have an effect on the situation and it is my view, Mr. Speaker, that we should move very quickly to a decision where leave passages should be abolished in this country.

Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I do not want to delay the House but anybody who has followed the contributions of the Barbados Labour Party when in Opposition, and who has followed my speech, will appreciate that the abolition of the leave passage is broadly speaking the policy of the Government. I have given this matter careful thought as to whether we should at this stage open negotiations with senior officers who are entitled to leave passages about their abolition or what we should do, but the current cost is only around \$200,000 a year, and I believe we can carry this for the couple of years before new negotiations are gone into.

We take note of what the hon. member says, but we feel that perhaps at this stage we will not wish to upset the apple cart.

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

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE CIVIL
ESTABLISHMENT (TEACHERS)
(AMENDMENT) (NO. 2)
ORDER, 1976.

Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, this is also a Resolution which this Government has inherited. There was a Civil Establishment Order which created a new post of Special Grade Teacher. I do not want to go into all the differences between qualified and unqualified teachers or semi-qualified, all this has been canvassed in the past, but it was intended that there should be two Qualification Bars in the salary scale and I am informed that there was some error and these were omitted, and the Order just now made and which this Resolution seeks to bring into force seeks to rectify that.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: I beg to second that.

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

RESOLUTION TO AMEND RESOLUTION NO.
48/1976 RELATING TO THE EMOL-
UMENTS OF TEACHERS IN
SECONDARY SCHOOLS

Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution relates also to the position of Special Grade Teachers. It inserts the definition "Special Grade Teacher" into the appropriate Order, and I beg to move that the Resolution do now pass.

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: I beg to second that.

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

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, that brings Government Business to an end, and I beg to move that this House do now adjourn till Tuesday, 26th October at 12.00 noon.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to second that.

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