THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

FIRST SESSION OF 1976 – 81

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 8th February, 1977.

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

PRESENT

His Honour W. C. B. HINDS, (Speaker); Mr. R. St. C. WEEKES, J.P.; Hon. L. S. CRAIG, (Minister of Labour, Welfare, Youth Affairs and Sport); Rt. 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. 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); 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. DeL. O. BRADSHAW; Mr. L. L. SISNETT; and His Honour E. E. ALLEYNE, LL.B. LL.M., (Deputy Speaker).

Prayers were said by Fr. F. A. Cayless.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minutes of the meeting of Tuesday, 25th January, 1977, are before you for confirmation.

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Minutes of the meeting for Tuesday, 25th January, 1977, be confirmed.

Hon. DeL. BRADSHAW: I beg to second that.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to report that I have received copies of the Accounts and Statements for the month of December, 1976, as prepared by the Accountant General.

PAPERS LAID

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the following.:–

Report on the Audit of the Accounts of the Auditor General's Department for the year ended 31st March, 1976.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the following:–

Financial Statement of the Agricultural Society for the fifteen month period ended 30th June, 1976.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following:–

Resolution to approve the guarantee by the Government of loans to be made to the Caribbean Development Bank by the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for on-lending by the Caribbean Development Bank for the purpose of financing projects in Barbados and of a regional nature.

Resolution to grant the sum of $263,833 out of the Consolidated Fund and to 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. 31 which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Resolution to grant the sum of $610,693 out of the Consolidated Fund and to 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. 32 which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

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

Resolution to grant the sum of $250,000 out of the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1976–77, Part II – Capital, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1976–77, No. 33 which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following.:–

A Bill to amend the Judges Remuneration and Pensions Act.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE entered the Chamber and took his seat.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICES

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Resolution.

Whereas changes have recently been introduced in the public transport system in the parish of Saint Lucy;

And Whereas those changes have introduced a high degree of confusion for the users of public transport in the said parish;

And Whereas the removal of school buses, of the bus service to St. Lucy Parish Church and of the direct bus service to Bridgetown from various points in Saint Lucy has imposed serious hardship on the travelling public in Saint Lucy;

Be it Resolved that this House calls on the Government to introduce immediately a better system of transportation to service the parish of Saint Lucy.

QUESTIONS

Mr. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Question:–

To enquire of the Minister of External Trade, Caribbean Affairs and Tourism:–

Is the Minister aware that there is considerable dissatisfaction amongst Barbadians employed by hotels, especially at the senior executive level, with the terms and conditions of their employment?

Is the Minister aware that Barbadians thus employed enjoy terms, conditions, facilities and privileges which are inferior to those of expatriates who work for hotels in equivalent positions?

Will the Minister urgently consider instituting an investigation into this matter?

And will the Minister take action to ensure that Barbadians working in hotels are thus employed on contracts no less favourable than those under which aliens work?

12.25 p.m.

Hon. H. B. ST.JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I will request the hon. member to give us further information as to his definition of "senior executive level" and the particular hotels he has in mind.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. Michael South, his question with respect to heavy rainfall at Clarke's Avenue, Bayville, St. Michael.

Dr. R. B. CADDLE: Mr. Speaker, with your permission I will ask leave to ask the question.

Mr. SPEAKER: Leave is granted.

Dr. R. B. CADDLE: Thank you, Sir. To ask of the Minister of Communications and Works:

1. Is the Minister aware that after heavy rainfall, Clarke's avenue, Bayville, St. Michael becomes inudated and impassable?

2. Is the Minister aware that the rain water also settles around certain houses on the avenue thereby causing great inconvenience to residents?

3. Is the Minister aware that in spite of the measures so far taken by the Government the situation described has not been corrected?

4. Will the Minister state what plans he has for correcting the situation and whether these plans will be implemented as a matter of urgency?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. Lucy, his question with respect to the sectors of employment in which 3,100 jobs are alleged to have been created.

Mr. GREAVES: To ask of the Minister of Labour, Welfare, Youth Affairs and Sport:

(1) Will the Minister state the sectors of employment in which 3,100 new jobs were alleged to have been created during September 1976 to December 1976.

(2) Will the Minister also state the number of new jobs created in each such sector?

(3) Will the Minister further state the classification of those jobs?

Mr. SPEAKER: The same hon. member, his question with regard to the number of persons whose employment has been terminated.

Mr. GREAVES: To enquire of the Minister of Labour, Welfare, Youth Affairs and Sport:

Will the Minister state the number of persons whose employment in the Public Service or by Statutory Boards or Statutory Corporations has been terminated since 2nd September, 1976?

FIRST READINGS OF BILLS

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Bill entitled The Judges Remuneration of Pensions (Amendment) Act, 1977 be now read a first time.

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

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

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Speaker, I want to make the following statement on public transport:

From the time of my assumption of responsibility for Public Transport in September, 1976, my office was bombarded with complaints daily about the services which the Rocklyn Bus Co. and the Elite Bus Co. were providing and with requests that urgent steps be taken to alleviate the situation.

2. My investigations into the matter revealed that while the Elite Bus Co. was required by its concession agreement to operate not less than 75 buses the company had only 54 serviceable units. The situation with the Rocklyn Bus Co. was even worse with that company having only 33 serviceable units while the concession agreement stipulated that the company should operate not less than 52 buses.

3. It also became apparent that the two companies would on occasions be unable to put all the serviceable units into operation during any one day because of breakdowns, accidents and getting units in proper condition for inspection by the Inspection section of my Ministry.

4. The situation with the Rocklyn Bus Co. began to deteriorate to such an extent during November, 1976 that my Ministry decided that drastic action would be necessary to deal with the matter because my Inspection Department had informed me that at that time only 7 buses from the Rocklyn Bus Co. had been passed as fit for conveying passengers on the roads as required by the Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic Legislation.

5. During discussions with the Directors of the Rocklyn Bus Co. in November, 1976, it became clear to me that the Company seemed incapable of fulfilling its obligations under the concession agreement granted to it. I gave serious consideration to ending the concession agreement because the company had defaulted in its obligation. I decided however against this move because there was the likelihood that Government would have been forced to take over units which have already passed the limit of their economic life. The Transport Board could not operate all of the Rocklyn routes without acquiring additional buses. I was not in favour of taking the retrograde step of forcing the Transport Board to accept units which would become liabilities after a short while.

6. Since the existing concession agreement is due to expire on 30th June, 1977, my Ministry decided that the Transport Board would give assistance to the Rocklyn Bus Co. on routes 2 and 23 from 23rd December, 1976 and offer help on route 22 from 16th January, 1977. It was not intended that the Transport Board would have full responsibility for these routes but could supplement the services which the Rocklyn Bus Co. was providing on these routes. The Transport Board has however been providing all the buses on these three routes since the 16th January, 1977 and the Rocklyn Bus Co. has been concentrating its efforts to upgrade the services to routes 3 and 4.

7. The Transport Board is only able to offer assistance to the Rocklyn Bus Co. by reorganising schedules. This included the introduction of a new concept of a 10 minute service from Bridgetown to Speightstown and vice versa with Speightstown being a transit point and a 15 minute service from Speightstown on the feeder routes to Indian Ground and Boscobelle in St. Peter and Pie Corner, Josey Hill and Connell

Town in St. Lucy. During the first week of the experiment it was decided that school children should travel on the regular passenger buses thus relieving the school buses to be assigned to other routes. It was however discovered that this arrangement was causing school children too much inconvenience and school buses were subsequently reintroduced to the St. Lucy and St. Peter routes.
12.35 p.m.

8. My Ministry is satisfied that there is some disruption in the services which the travelling public of St. Lucy and St. Peter and along Highway 1 formerly enjoyed as well as other areas serviced by the Transport Board. This inconvenience is however temporary and will be alleviated as soon as the Transport Board has acquired additional buses. It is expected that 9 additional units will be added to the Board's fleet towards the end of this month or early next month.

9. My Ministry is still committed to Government taking over the operations of the two private companies at the end of June, 1977. I have been exploring the possibility of acquiring additional buses for the Transport Board before the expiration of the concession agreements. If these investigations are fruitful, the Transport Board will be able to take over the routes being operated by the two private companies when their agreements expire and provide satisfactory services to the entire travelling public of Barbados.

ORAL REPLIES TO QUESTIONS

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Speaker, the answer to Question No. 4 is ready.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Order No. 1 was called.

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 to consider a Resolution for sums of money for the service of the Government.

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1976–77 – CAPITAL, No. 30

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Mr. Chairman, the Resolution before this Committee is for the sum of $812,000 to be taken out of the Consolidated Fund and placed at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates, 1976–77, Part II, Capital, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates, 1976–77, as clearly set out in the Addendum to the Resolution.

The Resolution, Mr. Chairman, is quite simple and clear. Hon. members on the other side are well aware of this Resolution, and having over there two ministers of the former Government, we do not see how they will oppose such a Resolution. As I have said, we on this side have got a policy which we would like to implement at a very early stage, and today we are seeking this sum of money so that we can go forward and implement our plans as soon as possible. As I have said, Mr. Chairman, the Addendum is quite clear and simple, but I do invite comments from all hon. members on this straight forward Resolution.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, I had occasion previously to speak about the manner in which Resolutions and other items of Government Business have been introduced into this Chamber; and anyone listening to the introduction of this particular Resolution – which of course we are not going to oppose from the Opposition benches – but anyone listening to the introduction would still be at a loss as to the reasons why this particular Resolution is necessary and why there is need for a new secondary school at Country Road and why.....

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member would give way – I am on a point of order. The hon. member complained about time wasting. He says that the Resolution was not properly introduced. The Addendum makes it perfectly clear that the Resolution for the sum of $812,000 is required to meet construction cost and consultancy fees to the end of the financial year for a new secondary school to be erected in Country Road Whitepark Road area.

Mr. SANDIFORD: That is the type of "sick him" reaction that you get from the front benchers over there. It seems to me that the

Minister has assumed the role that he must come in in some belligerent and bellicose manner rather than dealing with matters under his portfolio. It seems to me that he does not have anything to deal with.

I was making the point – and I absolve the Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance. Indeed I was most impressed during the debate last time that we met with the way that he gave this Chamber information. The Deputy Prime Minister also attempts to give us the information which we require.
12.45 p.m.

I am sorry I cannot absolve all of the other members. I include the Hon. Attorney General in that front line. Here we have this particular position on a Resolution which deals with the whole question of the provision of places at the secondary level and it is extremely important. We would, certainly, like to hear and to know what are the reasons for the location of a secondary school at Country Road. When that site was purchased for the improvement of primary school education, it was certainly one of the criticisms that has been levelled against the educational system in this country that the base of the educational system needs improving, and that site at Country Road was purchased, plans devised and instructions given for the drawing up of plans and specifications for the construction of a primary school to replace the Roebuck Primary School at which, at least, one member on that side attended. We have had numerous reports, verbal and written, from the headteacher and teachers about conditions in that Roebuck Primary School, and it was part of our programme to upgrade the primary schools.

Mr. Chairman, we were on a consistent programme, and we dealt with the Christ Church Girls' School, the St. Bartholomew's School, the Vauxhall Primary School, and a number of Primary Schools. We built the new Charles F. Broome Primary School. This was part of our programme of upgrading the very base of our primary school system, especially in those areas where from reports, both from the professional officers, from the teachers and the parent teachers as well, there were complaints about the fabric and the siting of the school. This is what we were doing, but instead of that we hear nothing at all about these reasons. In addition, requests were made by the Moravian Church, because the Roebuck Primary School, as far as I can recollect, is a Church School and the property of the Moravian Church. We have had requests and representations from that denomination for the release of the school buildings to the Church for their own ecclesiastical purposes. We have had it in respect of the Roebuck Primary School, it came in in respect of Grace Hill Primary School, it came in in respect of Vauxhall Primary School, and we have been able to meet the request albeit at a later date than the Moravian Church was demanding.

Mr. Chairman, we have been able to build a new school at Vauxhall. Plans were in train for the replacement of the Grace Hill School, and the land at Country Road and the plans, because instructions were given, and I believe that the plans were nearing completion, for the Roebuck Primary School as a replacement for the existing school at Roebuck Street. But what we get now is a shift and without any explanation as to why it is necessary to site a secondary school at Country Road when the plans and the site are available, to the best of my recollection, for a secondary school at Ferniehurst to relieve the severe pressures that exist at the Richmond Compound of the St. Leonard's Boys' and the St. Leonard's Girls' School. There is severe pressure on the St. Leonard's Compound. We have had incidents at that site, and I believe there were incidents late last year as well, in addition to incidents previously. It is a very tight and overcrowded campus. It is a divided school because part of it is at the Farm, and the highest priority was being given to the construction of a secondary school at Ferniehurst to relieve that particular overcrowding.

Mr. Chairman, if we are talking of distributing the secondary school resources throughout this country, we have to ask ourselves whether the location of a secondary school at Country Road is the best location for additional secondary facilities. There are demands for extension of secondary school facilities in St. Peter; there are demands for extension of additional secondary school facilities in Christ Church; there are demands for additional school places for the parish of St. John, and let me not forget the parish of St. Thomas, which is represented by the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance. Indeed, over the news media this last weekend I heard of a Resolution – I was not present and I have no means of knowing, other than through the Press, what goes on within the conclaves of the Barbados Labour Party. I do not have that type of information, but this was reported in the media, and I am certain that the member for St. Michael North East will tell me whether it is an accurate record or report in the news media or not, if he has been asking questions about these matters. I do not know if it is his business, but.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You are straying somewhat! *(Asides.)*

Mr. SANDIFORD: I am just trying to be accurate, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! *(Asides.)* I will not stand for the interruptions from the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, and I would like to draw his attention to the Rule which says that, should he continue, I would have no alternative but to ask him to withdraw. Please continue.

Mr. SANDIFORD: I thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I will certainly retain our composure here. We are not going to be bullied out from making the comments that we have to make on these matters. Of course, I am not referring to you, Mr. Chairman. You will never bully this Chamber.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will you confine your remarks to the Resolution.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, the question is that the provision of additional secondary facilities in this country is a requirement and it is a necessity, and nobody quarrels with that. The particular necessity and where these facilities are located are debatable questions. We would believe and would think that the distribution of facilities now in other parts of the country, when once the St. Leonard's situation is rectified, is really the line along which the provision of these additional secondary school places should fall.
12.55 p.m.

Of course I recall when the great promise was made of taking back in the fourteen years olds, and this is no new thing because each new school that was constructed by the previous administration was a part solution and an easing of the problem because more of the fourteen years old were retained in the schools with each new school that was constructed, we were criticised on that side for putting up too many secondary schools, and now one of the first actions in education on that side is to transform the plans for the provision of a primary school to replace the physical plant at Roebuck Street which is old, somewhat tired and in need of replacement, in addition to the request from the Moravian Church for the return of its facilities, and to change the primary school into a secondary school. Of course when I raised the question of the return of fourteen year olds, I made the point on that occasion and said that I could offer some advice because I know that these are pressing problems, and however many congratulations come from that side from the Minister of Education, it is not going to change the hard facts that if you bring back in children, that you have got in addition to easing the present shortage of places to find additional places for those whom you are bringing back in. When I offered the advice it was scoffed at on that side, but I have lived to see that a Resolution has now been brought in here after the event to try to catch up with the problem. That is the real reason why this particular Resolution is before us to transfer facilities for the primary schools into a secondary school.

You brought back in the children and put them into unsatisfactory conditions, in social centres and other places as a make-shift and in schools that were abandoned because the teachers were complaining about inadequate facilities, and you now find that those particular pressures have caught up with you and you therefore have to make another makeshift arrangement by transforming what was to be a primary school site and school plans into a secondary school.

Now it is known that that side of Country Road is inadequate for the facilities of an adequate secondary school. There will not be enough facilities there; it will be a tightly packed campus for the provision of a secondary school. It does not meet the requirements as arrived at and this is one of the problems we will have to face. We are not criticising the provision of additional school places because in my estimation we need at least six additional secondary schools dispersed throughout the country together with additional places at the existing secondary schools to cope with this problem of finding additional school places.

I hope the hon. member for St. Michael South East is not misunderstanding what I am saying. Let me congratulate him on his acting appointment; he is now temporary Minister and he is in the First Eleven; he has come forward. It is a tribute to the backbench that he has come forward, but he will not find any Braddie's United Social anything on that front bench; so I am not harsh on him on the introduction of this particular Resolution. I realise this is his first excursion there and I certainly wish him well because I know that education is dear to his heart. I cannot resist the temptation of pointing out that when Resolutions are introduced there is no point someone getting up and reading the Resolution, and reading it very badly at that. We can read over here and we do not want him to read a Resolution for us.

Mr. Chairman, we are not opposing this, but we are saying that the priorities are wrong here,

and that the secondary school at Deacons Road should be constructed and secondary facilities dispersed throughout the country, but this is an attempt to catch up with the problem of bringing back in the fourteen year olds.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution is for $812,000 to supplement the Estimates as set out in the Addendum, and I never expected to hear the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat because I must point out some of the inconsistencies in his argument. He started off by saying that the conditions are bad for primary schools. Now it is the very hon. member who since 1970 was looking at the building or the extension of the Roebuck Boys' School. Anybody from outside Barbados who did not know that we only took office five months ago would believe that we created these conditions. Now the Leader of the Opposition and the member who just took his seat at one time or another were appointed or reshuffled as Ministers of Education. They were Ministers of Education between 1970 and 1976 and the hon. member who was critical of this Resolution could have given it an easy passage because he caused the background to the very Resolution. He knew the conditions at Roebuck Boys' School since 1970 and this shows the inconsistency of his argument which is illogical. When he says that my Ministry is doing nothing, I cannot do anything if I have nothing to do, but you had something to do since 1970 and did not do it. This is the type of thing you get from the other side. All the Acting Minister did was simply introduce the Resolution and finish by saying that he was aware of the fact that the Minister is acting and is not *au fait* with the facts, and therefore he is not going to harp on it, but yet he criticises us for not giving enough information. The Acting Minister gave the amount of information that is in the Addendum, so I do not see the need for talking about where the school should be built and why it should be built, when you were only put out of office five months ago and the Leader of the Opposition was a Minister of Education. I do not see the argument. You brought this very Resolution in here. (A VOICE: Not for a secondary school.) To build the Roebuck Boys' School. We are resiting this now. Are you going to tell us what we should build and what we should not build when since 1970 you were supposed to build a school in Roebuck Street and had approval from Town and Country Planning in 1971? All you had to do was simply to welcome the Minister as acting Minister of Education and congratulate him that he is going to do something that you did not do and let the Resolution pass, but you are just filibustering and talking about the Barbados Labour Party. What is the Barbados Labour Party to do with you? That is our business.

1.05 p.m.

You have to write about Haynes, Caddle and Barrow, do not worry about our business, worry about yours, you should just let the Resolution pass and that is the end of it.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, the Government of Barbados during the course of the campaign in the last general election made it clear that it felt that the policy of the Democratic Labour Party was wrong, to put children out of school at the age of 14, and we felt that it was necessary in the context of the 1970's to keep children in school longer. As soon as the Hon. Minister of Education settled in he went about in his Ministry to devise a scheme whereby this acknowledged policy of the Barbados Labour Party could be implemented.

Naturally adjustments would have to be made to existing accommodation to cater for the additional demand for school places in that particular age group. As a result of this, it has been discovered that if this policy is to be implemented some 2,000 places would be needed in that age group for the school year beginning September 1977. The proposal that the Ministry of Education therefore makes is that the new school in Roebuck Street to replace the existing Roebuck Street School should be temporarily used as an emergency measure to cater for part of this demand: 800 of the 1,200 new school places that would be needed would be provided at this site.

We have also asked, as I understand it, and received agreement that temporarily the school would be able to continue – that is, the existing primary school – and that this school together with Ferniehurst would provide in the coming school year the relief that is necessary.

But, Mr. Chairman, the hon. members on that side cannot deny the fact that the public of Barbados to a man have congratulated the Government of Barbados for its bold stand in deciding that children should not be sent out of school at 14 and should be kept in school till age 16, and we have searched and searched and found that with proper utilisation and the sound plan of using for secondary school places which were originally used for primary schools part of the problem would be relieved. Look at St. Giles' School. There is no magic in saying that because this school was a primary school it must be so for all generations, you must look at the needs and interests of children in the particular area, and the Hon. Minister has used the physical

facilities at St. Giles' for some of these classes and he will do the same in this new school, because it is our belief that great emphasis should be placed upon this age group, and this is where we also have our disagreement.

The former Minister of Education is smarting under the criticism that the former Prime Minister made of him when he opened the Alleyne School and said that all that was provided as far as he could see had been more school places, but what we have always said is that where the Hon. Minister went wrong, and where the Democratic Labour Party went wrong, is that they did not lay enough emphasis on creating the diversity of curricula not in theory but implementing it in fact, and that they were not bold enough in making the traditional academic grammar schools change their policy to suit the needs of Barbados, and if you had expanded the traditional grammar schools part of that problem would have been relieved.

It is not only a question of building the school places, you have to put the children into them with a curriculum which is totally fitted to their talents, and you cannot deny that you had a curriculum which is totally unsuitable to their talents, so there is no need for this heat on this Resolution, we are in a position to implement our policies despite the criticisms from the other side. We shall listen to them, if they are valid we shall take them into account, if they are not valid we shall tolerate their criticisms and know that things will improve in the future, but on this occasion we can now say to ourselves that we are in a position to implement what we know is right, and we feel that this is the right attitude.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I really would like to see him in the law courts. Here is the Acting Minister, and as the Minister of Labour says, I welcome you, I am very glad to see you on the side and I hope they will find a place permanently for you on the team, but what the Leader of the House has said now, until the member for St. Michael South spoke we did not know about, because the Leader of the House has now said to us that the secondary school at Country Road will be temporarily used as an emergency measure to make room for the 5,600 children that are coming into school as a result of the common entrance; at least some of them. If the member who is acting as Minister had told this to the member who spoke first then we would understand, because all the member for St. Michael South was saying in this House, not criticising it, is that when we were in power we planned for a primary school and now we find a Resolution for a secondary school. What is the reason for this? The Leader of the House gets up, after the member has spoken, and attempts to castigate the member when he is bringing in new facts that were never told or uttered in this Chamber when the member spoke.

This is no heat, because the member clearly made it known that we were supporting the Resolution and he drew to my attention that the Democratic Labour Party in power had plans for a new school at Ferniehurst which should be built. I know that the one in Roebuck Street is being built because you hope that you will be able to complete it in time for the September term, because if you do not, as they say in Barbados, you are in duck's guts, the children will be running about the road, so I can see with you, but give us the facts. It is an emergency measure, it is a temporary measure, but the Minister of Labour is always getting into something that is too deep for him and he will drown himself one day, but the Leader has now given us for the first time the reason and we understand it, we are not opposing.

On another point, I have been hearing that the last Government decided that Foundation Boys' and Girls' should be a co-educational school. Let it be clear to the public that the decision was taken by the Barbados Labour Party and not the Democratic Labour Party, because when the chaos comes in that institution I hope you take your lashes.
1.15 p.m.

I would like to say that in so far as the providing of school places is concerned, the former headmistress, now Senator Lynch, opposed amalgamation and so did the headmaster and the Governing Body. If the Minister would look at those files dealing with the secondary school places, he will see that the Governing Bodies were asked their view. The headmaster and the headmistress were asked their view and they and the teachers were opposed to it.

I want to tell the public that it was not the Democratic Labour Party Government which took the decision to amalgamate the Foundation Boys' and Girls' Schools. It was the Barbados Labour Party by a decision taken at Cabinet level in October. We are not quarrelling with the Government for trying to meet a need which is going to be pressing; because if there is one thing which we will go down in history for is the facilities which we gave to the masses of this country for educational development.

We made education free. We met so many needs, that boys and girls who did not have a

hope are today holding down positions because of opportunities given to them for free secondary education and free university education, between 1961 and 1976. They seem to think that education is a static thing. It is a changing thing. It was the Democratic Labour Party that set up a National Curriculum Council. There are experts working on the National Curriculum Council. When the Leader of the House said that we gave a stereotyped type of education, what is the committee working on?

He seems to think that you can decide overnight to teach something. When you decide to teach something, you have to find staff, you have to find money, you have to find schools; you have to find the tools and everything that you need to make that particular subject worthwhile.

Lodge School is teaching geometric drawing and technical work. Harrison College does technical work. I have seen at Speech Days where these older secondary schools have a curriculum of as many as 20 subjects. In the days of the Hon. Prime Minister, in the days of the Hon. Deputy Prime Minister, they did not have the facilities that we got under the DLP Government. Under that Government there was a constant attempt to widen the curriculum within the limited financial and physical facilities and the trained personnel with which to teach them.

Now that we know that this is a temporary measure, now that we know that it is an emergency measure, we are only trying to draw out from you, to get out of you the reason why you have shifted suddenly from a primary school to a secondary school. If they had that explanation, perhaps there would have been no need for long talk.

I do not blame the Minister. This has a long history. Education costs money. Technical education costs more money than ordinary education. So that when the Minister of Labour gets up and fulminates about 1970, our record goes back beyond 1970. If we had had the money, there would have been no problems about Education at all. If we had the money we would have been able to start the building at Ferniehurst.

Education is a constantly shifting process. Therefore the Opposition will support this measure. I hope that the building will be completed in time and that by the end of September you will get the first storey up. I do not know if the building will be done by the Ministry of Communications and Works or whether the Minister wants to tackle this job himself. I hope that in the interest of the people's children – because otherwise when the Common Entrance Examination is taken in May, you will have 5,600 children to look for.

If you look at those files you will find that any back tracking or slowing down of the process in building the school in Country Road is due to the simple fact that there were financial constraints. Read the files and you will see that there were financial constraints. The architects were asked to go slow. There could not be the expanded programme. Therefore we had to tolerate Roebuck Street. We had to continue with conditions which we thought were not satisfactory in order to enable the money which we had to stretch further and further.

For the 15 years that the former Government was in power, members over there, if they are honest with themselves, will have to accept and see that the Democratic Labour Party, whatever may be its fate in the future, can be proud of its contribution to the education of the masses – where the children of domestic servants can sit in school side by side with "Massa's" children. Children of domestic servants going to Lodge when they could not even walk through the gates when I was at Harrison College. People are going to all sorts of schools today, thanks to the Democratic Labour Party. Children are going to these schools because there is no question, like when they were in power, of being asked whether your mother put the food in separate plates for each child, or in one plate, whether you were a servant's son, or whether you go to the standpipe for water. All those were the questions asked. When you went for an interview those were the questions asked – about going to the standpipe for water.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: He must call names. He cannot just say that these things happened.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I will not call names because your mother was involved. *(Asides)*

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I could quote an instance of a girl not getting into Queen's College; but today, thanks to the Democratic Labour Party, they can go to Queen's College, Harrison College and Lodge. For all that you fulminate, we have a record in this country. There are thousands of children at Cave Hill, thousands of children in secondary schools which can testify today to our contribution to Education.

If you mean the people of this country well, if you have their interests at heart, your duty is to build on the foundation which we have established for you. It is a sure foundation built on rock. Education is a continuing process. You have five years to govern and you have a contribution to make. Try to make it, because we have made ours.

Today as I walk through Barbados I can see proof of the system we have established which can enable poor children in this community to walk tall. It is time that the people of this country know this. Anybody between 20 and 25 years of age today holding positions is a tribute to our contribution. Prior to the speech of the Prime Minister – I am not casting any blame on the Deputy Prime Minister – we did not have enough information. We accept that this is a temporary measure, and we support you on this Resolution, with this explanation.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: On a point elucidation. I got the impression that the hon. member said that I said that the number of school children of the 16 age group in the coming school year was 5,600. According to the records it is 2,000 additional.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I have had to make during the last four months objection to the Opposition coming into the House and monopolising as much as they can monopolise of the speaking time between now and lunch, making at times some of the most outrageous statements and the greatest misrepresentations and getting publicity which in the past they have not allowed us when we were in the Opposition. You must concede that certainly in this session they have got greater parliamentary reporting than has happened at any time in the history of this country.
1.25 p.m.

Certainly in this Session they have had the benefit of greater Parliamentary reporting than has happened at any time in the history of this country, and, then believing that there is nobody on the Government side who is capable of answering them, they hope that after the answers are given the daily Press has already left and, therefore, they are giving a one-sided picture of the position.

Now, let me begin by saying that fundamental to this question is the one skirted over by both speakers on the Opposition benches. Is there an emergency in education? If there is an emergency in education, what is that emergency and how was it caused? If it exists, what is being done to answer that emergency? No amount of skirting around the question and dealing in polemics, or trying to make political hay whilst the sun, they think, is shining is going to skirt around those fundamental questions. Anyone who looks around the country at the 2nd September, 1971, would have recognised that there were being thrown out of the secondary school system every year thousands of children who were still capable of obtaining a proper education to fit themselves for jobs in life and for their future. This was happening for the 15 years under the same Democratic Labour Party Government.

Mr. Chairman, we were confronted with that situation on the 2nd September, 1971. We had spoken in this very Chamber prior to that day pointing this out to the Democratic Labour Party, and they went out of power having failed to do anything to answer that problem. The substantive Minister of Education answered the problem promptly, and within a period of two months he had all of the children back into the secondary school system with teachers and emergency places being provided for them. I would have expected that the least thing the Opposition should do is to congratulate the Minister. Not one word of congratulation from two former Ministers of Education. Instead we hear all sorts of polemical expressions. I make bold to say that, had the Democratic Labour Party been returned as the Government of this country, those 2,000 children would still be out of the school system today idling and liming on the streets of Barbados.

Let me answer the first problem. I will come back to this because it is dealing with why this becomes necessary. It is an undoubted fact that other children are coming up for this situation, and the Minister of Education has been looking around to find additional school places so that they would not be on the streets, as used to happen under the DLP Government. Now, not only is he going to use the new Roebuck Primary School, because that is what it is going to be eventually, it is being used as a temporary measure as a Secondary School, but he is going to make use of any existing buildings which Government has as well as to use the extra plant facilities which exist in the primary schools. I cannot see anything wrong in that policy.

Now, in the Estimates for 1975–76 the Government said that they were going to build the Roebuck Street Primary School. That is the plan that they started since 1970, and when they went out of power in 1976, although they had

the plan since 1971, they had not completed the school, but it was occurring in the Estimates yearly. What sort of great priority did they give to primary schools at that time? I remember speaking on education from the other side and criticising the Minister and telling him that part of the failure of his policy was that he was not concentrating on upgrading the primary schools properly, and that he had to carry both projects hand in hand together. He said then that it was a question of financial resources.

Mr. Chairman, we are stating here that we are not abandoning the need to upgrade the primary school system in Barbados at all, because we recognise the necessity for this. When the substantive Minister speaks on the main Estimates in March, 1977, he will give the other side chapter and verse of the Development Plan which he has for the primary school system over the next five years, not only in terms of building and improving facilities, but also in terms of improving the curricula content and the necessity for educational aids which he is planning.

Now, Ferniehurst was mentioned in the 1975–76 Estimates, but when the last Minister of Education got to 1976–77 he had dropped Ferniehurst out of his reckoning. He had no money provided for Ferniehurst, and the position is that within the Department the present Minister found that the plans for Ferniehurst were not far advanced, so he had to use the only existing plans available to deal with an emergency situation. If the last Minister – not the last but one – was serious, he would have explained why he had not included Ferniehurst into his proposals. The hon. member for St. Michael South had it in 1975–76. He was changed as an emergency measure to hold hell when the "Skipper" decided that he was not telling anybody to which Ministry he had to go, and his emergency fieldsman – because that is all he was, he was never able to implement any decent policy in the Ministry of Education or in the Ministry of Communications and Works – picked up a plan and did not even look to see what you had for Ferniehurst and never pushed the Ferniehurst plan. How can he criticise a Government of five months on an issue such as this in such a short space of time?

Let me state quite clearly that it has already been discussed, raised and settled at Cabinet that we will continue, where necessary, to construct additional secondary school places. This will be done at Ferniehurst; it will be done in St. James; it will be done in Christ Church; it will be done in St. Thomas, so do not make any bones about that. The Barbados Labour Party will do it in the five years, too, as we did before you became the Democratic Labour Party Government, as we built Combermere, the Foundation, we extended Harrison College, we built Coleridge & Parry or did the extension to Coleridge & Parry, we built Parkinson and so on. *(Asides.)* We did not build all of them. You built a couple of schools, and we give you the couple you have built. But when you hear the hon. member for St. Michael South Central talk, you would believe that education only began in this country in 1961. I want to explode the myth of this idea of free education. Free education to whom? That is a myth, and it is about time that people wake up and see what is the myth. It is still true that more than one-third of the children going to secondary schools are paying for their own education in this country today, and they are at the same time contributing to the cost of those who get free education at the limited school places.

Now, under the Barbados Labour Party we also had some people who were getting free education, and you have extended the system to some extent. It is a fallacy to get up and make the people in this country believe that all education in Barbados is free – free tertiary education. Prior to your coming into power, people who went to the University of the West Indies from Barbados got their education free, too.

1.35 p.m.

We acquired Cave Hill for the extension, and today you have not got free education at tertiary level either. It is a figment. Every Barbadian Law Student is paying the full account of his tuition fees as well, so do not give us that. You want to know if people can read. We can read also on this side, and when you talk about free education, what are you talking about? You are using the people's resources. It is not free to the people; they are paying taxes for it, and that is why I object to the idea of free education. (Mr. GREAVES: Why have you used the word "free" in your manifesto?) Because it has become a political word to use to get you in power to talk about something being free. All that has happened is that you have used the resources to say that those people who are fortunate enough to get in will not themselves pay the direct amount for their education, but it is coming out of the taxpayers in another way. I am not sure what the hon. member is shouting about that this is free and that the Democratic Labour Party must be congratulated on this. I expect any Government wishing to be in power for 15 years should have done something and that what he must realise is where he went wrong in educational policy.

The hon. member for St. Michael South knew that before he took the Ministry of Education Mr. Cameron Tudor had done nothing at all, and education was in total doldrums. Look at the record which is there under the very Democratic Labour Party Government and the criticism from us when he took some sort of policy which he did not unfortunately remain long enough in his Ministry to complete.

Mr. SANDIFORD: If the hon. member would give way on a point of order, the hon. member for Christ Church West said that my predecessor as Minister of Education did nothing and that I knew it. I would like to say that I do not have that knowledge and it is really attributing knowledge to me that I do not possess.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The hon. member is more ignorant than I have always assumed him to be. The hon. member had the benefit of looking at the files; he had the benefit of looking at the record. He knows that; it is there. One of the reasons why the Hon. Cameron Tudor as he then was was moved was because all he was able to do was to come in and introduce school meals. There were no building projects under him, and indeed part of the legacy we have now inherited which the hon. member inherited is due to Mr. Tudor's failure for the years he was in that Ministry to continue to upgrade the schools at both secondary and primary level, and therefore we lost that very vital period of years which successive Government are trying to catch up on. I handled education for a short while and the hon. member knew that in the first speech I made in here I commented on the necessity to upgrade the primary schools. I said it was a policy that the Barbados Labour Party would support, and it is one that we will continue to pursue now that we are in office. If at the end of the five year period we have not done so, you can complain, but do not come in five months time and tell us we must do everything. We recognise that you know that we are a great combination and that we have the ability. I recognise that, but we cannot with the physical resources available to us in the country get it all accomplished in five months.

I give the hon. member the assurance that we will accomplish it in five years and we will give him the promise to continue.

I want to make one other statement about the idea of co-education. I do not know what the hon. member for St. Michael South Central is really bothered about in the idea of having boys and girls sharing the same school rooms. Let us be serious. The thing about the Foundation Schools is that they are physically much better situated as a place where you can have co-education at the two schools than anywhere else. The hon. member may quarrel about the degree of consultation that is going on with the Governing Body or the teachers. The hon. member should also know because as a Cabinet we do listen to our colleagues, that we have the benefit of seeing their files and are kept informed by other Ministries as well. I do not know if you used to hide what happened in your Ministry from anybody else, but if the hon. member does not know, under his regime Mr. J. C. King, the Chairman of the Governing Body of the Foundation Schools put to the Foundation Schools Governing Body and to the Headteachers the whole question of co-education and bringing the schools together. He got an unfavourable reaction from the head teacher and the hon. member promised to look into the matter, but he was removed by the Government before he had the opportunity; so do not get up and disclaim that. You should say it is a policy which you would have liked to remain to be able to carry through. That is what you should get up and say.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: That is a policy I would like to have been able to carry through. Are you happy?

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, I assure you that if I remain in here long enough I will teach the hon. members to be men and not to be mice. The hon. member got up and left it like that because the substantive Minister is not here, but I am fully aware of the discussions on the Foundation Schools, and I assure the teachers at the Foundation Schools that the Minister has had consultations with them and intends to have maximum consultation, because like them all he desires and all any right thinking Barbadian should desire is that the quality of education should be improved, that we should rid our people of the idea of discriminatory treatment of boys and girls, and if it is a fact that one school is better than the other, then we must try in the integration process to make sure that the quality remains high and is improved rather than comes down.

I do not take notice of asides, but I do not think the hon. member should make mention of the rumour of some school meals going to some place, because I am hoping that sort of thing would not become the norm. Let me assure the hon. member for St. Michael South that the Government intends to proceed eventually, I understand it is a three year period at the most, with the Roebuck Street Primary School being

sited where it originally was. Ferniehurst will be next and will be built in 1977–78 and other plans are being formulated and put forward for the other secondary schools. We are going ahead with plans to upgrade the primary schools as well, and subject to the people of this country producing more, earning more and making more resources available, we are giving this country the assurance, not only the other side, that we will use their resources, the people's resources to the maximum benefit of the people, subject of course to any failing on our part as human beings you have to say, and subject to God giving us the strength to do it, as we are sure that the people will return us to continue the work after five years.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am glad to hear congratulations from the Opposition bench.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, I would not begin by saying what I would expect from you as Chairman, but of course you know your rules. I rose to speak on this particular motion relative to this question of the establishment of a secondary school in Roebuck Street. What really bothers me is to hear the hon. member for Christ Church West who has just sat down refer to a great combination being over on that side.
1.45 p.m.

What was ably demonstrated here today is that either something went wrong with the combination or that it is nothing other than a great confusion, and I will show you what I mean when I say it is a great confusion, because we had the Acting Minister, or indeed the person who presented this Resolution here this morning, making the presentation, we had a speech from this side, and then we learnt to our consternation from the Deputy Prime Minister what was the real intention of this Resolution. I say consternation because in the first place one would have thought that in presenting this Resolution – and this is what we are critical of – a vital factor of that nature would not have been left out, and the confusion was further compounded by the member for St. James when he got up and indicated in no uncertain terms that this was for a secondary school, no kind of temporary measure, so that what one saw was a whole mass of confusion which is symptomatic of the governing party.

I would think that we should be, as has been done to some extent by the member for Christ Church West, the Hon. Attorney General, having an in-depth look at some of the problems which face education in this country, and he has quite rightly identified a number of these difficulties and problems. He has identified of course the problem which the Democratic Labour Party has identified as a problem, the emphasis on primary education, and indeed as has been pointed out, you will see a programme which was being developed, and indeed the Manifesto of the Democratic Labour Party indicated in no uncertain terms that emphasis would continue to be placed on building a solid foundation at the primary level. It is my contention, Mr. Chairman, that the major problem in education in this country is at the primary level and we need to look very carefully at upgrading the facilities there, upgrading the level and quality of teachers at the primary level, reviewing and revamping the techniques which are used in the primary schools. This is of fundamental importance and I think that when once this has been identified efforts should be made to get the situation getting into operation as quickly as possible.

I want to make a further point, Mr. Chairman, and it relates to the whole siting of the school. We understand that it is going to accommodate about 800 children, and you will recall that just a couple of weeks ago the Prime Minister in giving one of the reasons for removing the Polytechnic from Martindales Road was this question of the congestion which would be experienced in an area which is normally congested, and I am submitting that we have to look very carefully at this particular area, because if I understand Roebuck Street, it is basically congested because not only do you have Harrison College and one or two other schools in that area, but it is a business district, so you will create another problem, so we see here expediency taking precedence over not having a common sense look at a particular situation, because when we are talking in terms of establishing schools in any particular area we have not only got to look at the kind of education which we are going to be offering, but we have to look at the environmental situation we have to look to see whether in truth and in fact there is room for proper facilities to be erected, we have to look at the health of all children and whether or not we are adding further congestion to an already congested area. I would hope that this matter would be taken into consideration.

On the question of co-education, the Democratic Labour Party is not, and never was, opposed to co-education. You can see quite clearly that this was enunciated in policies which we developed in this country. New schools which were built were not built either for girls or for boys but there were boys and girls who were going to the schools which were built, probably with the exception of the Springer Memorial. I want to say that one in one's right senses could never be opposed to co-education, and I think what the Leader of the Opposition intimated was that he was expressing the dissatisfaction of the Opposition with the method of amalgamation, and we are submitting that there is a fundamental difference. I, myself, and the shadow Minister of Education, the member for St. Michael South, we have had the benefit of going to a school which was amalgamated – I think the member for St. Michael West was also in that situation – and we know the difficulties which were experienced in that situation, because when for the first time you bring children together from different schools with different school backgrounds, different practices, different textbooks, and different approaches to problems, you will have problems, and indeed that school did not become a united school until all the pupils who went into the two separate schools had gone out of the system and we had people of the new generation who started in Coleridge-Parry rather than the Parry School or the Coleridge School, and I think it is a matter which has to be taken into consideration.

I would think that the best way to deal with this situation would be to start with the first form and put the boys and girls together and move up gradually so that in the process of time you will have a situation without all the difficulties you are likely to encounter. If the policy of the Barbados Labour Party Government is to have co-education, why is it not at a school like Harrison College? In fact there is at present an advertisement being run in the *Advocate-News* newspaper for a Deputy Head at Harrison College, why is it that the advertisement says they want to have a Deputy Headmaster? The Hon. Attorney General is always looking after women's rights and I would have thought that this is something he would put right, because if we are going to be talking in terms of equal opportunities for women and not making any distinction or difference, this would be one of the ways in which we would be able to show that we are practising what we are preaching.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: On a point of order, Sir, the hon. member should be aware that at Harrison College there are almost as many female teachers as there are male, and the hon. member should be aware that not only do I see advertisements by Government bodies but also by private employers making this discriminatory way of treating women, and I hope he will use his position in the Union to make sure that those things stop. I assure him that I will draw this to the attention of the Minister in due course.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Your point is taken.

1.55 p.m.

Mr. GREAVES: I do not think that I would have to draw this to the attention of the hon. Minister. He talked about being on the look out. He is always on the look out. The Deputy Prime Minister said, Mr. Chairman that there was no magic in using the facilities of primary schools for the purpose of secondary schools. The Democratic Labour Party recognises that there is no magic in this, because it is a matter of history and of record that ever since 1971 this was demonstrated in no uncertain terms when the D.L.P. used the existing primary school facilities at the mess house at the St. Lucy's Primary School and converted this into a secondary school; and that is where in St. Lucy a secondary school is now sited.

We recognise that there is no magic in this. It is not to say that this is a new discovery by the Barbados Labour Party as they are trying to point out. On the question of St. Lucy I was to make a point concerning this parish which I represent. It relates to the St. Lucy's Secondary School. In the Estimates for the current financial year there is a provision for completion of work in progress, and there is a Phase 4 for the St. Lucy Secondary School which is mentioned as part of this completion of work in progress. No mention has been made of this. I am saying, Mr. Chairman, that this is an urgent need, an urgent need for that constituency, to get completed this Phase 4 which involves the provision of science blocks, additional school places etc.

I am submitting that it serves not only the parish of St. Lucy, but also St. Peter and some people as far away as St. James. So in truth and in fact, what we should be looking at and what should be done is that we should be concentrating on building up existing facilities, and what I would have thought, Mr. Chairman, that in the broad statement of the hon. Attorney General that Phase 4 of the St. Lucy Secondary School would have been mentioned.

I am asking the hon. member who is standing in for the Minister of Education that some serious attention be paid to this because of

the very pressing problems and difficulties which are being experienced at that school because of the lack of facilities and the obvious overcrowding which is taking place.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The time being now one minute before 2 p.m., I must report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair.

Mr. SPEAKER: The time is now 2 p.m. This sitting stands suspended until 2.45 p.m. today.
2 p.m.

RESUMPTION

On the resumption:

Mr. SPEAKER: The sitting is now resumed.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I did not want to raise the matter, but when I look around I see that you will have to have the bell rung in order to get a quorum.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the bell be rung.

The bell was rung and a quorum was obtained.

QUESTION TIME

Question No. 4 was called.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, Question No. 4.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker the reply is as follows:—

The surveys for the road required at Pie Corner, St. Lucy, have been completed and steps are being taken to complete the purchase of the land. It is proposed to commence work on the project early in the 1977—78 Financial Year.

Mr. SPEAKER: That being the end of Question Time, it is now Private Members Business.

PRIVATE MEMBERS BUSINESS

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, there is one Resolution in the name of the Opposition. I am asking that this matter be deferred.

There being no objection, the Resolution was deferred.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is now time for Government Business to be resumed. When this sitting was suspended the House was in Committee of Supply and to that it now reverts.

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN: When the sitting was suspended the hon. member for St. Lucy was on his feet. He has two minutes more, and he may continue if he so desires.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, I want to revert to the point I made about the St. Lucy Secondary School and what appears to be an abandonment of Phase 4 in the development of that school. I want to refer to the speech made by the hon. member for Christ Church West when we were dealing with the Physical Development Plan. He said: "I can assure the member for St. Lucy that we will not be abandoning St. Lucy."

I want to say that he as Government spokesman did not mention anything about the development of Phase 4 at the St. Lucy Secondary School. I want also to refer to the difficulties which are being experienced still in spite of the assurance of the Minister of Communications and Works by which children who go to the St. Lucy Secondary School should be getting transportation to and from the school. I would also refer to the removal of the St. Lucy's Church bus which would have brought a lot of alleviation of the difficulties which children experience in getting across from Crab Hill to that section of St. Lucy over to the St. Lucy Secondary School. What it means is that people have got to be walking. The facilities which were extended to them under the Democratic Labour Party have been taken away from them by the Barbados Labour Party.
2.50 p.m.

I would like to see this situation put right. I would hope that the Minister of Communications and Works and the hon. member who is standing in for the Minister of Education would see to it that proper transportation services are provided for the people of St. Lucy and for those children who go to St. Lucy's Secondary School. There was an instance of a youngster from St. Peter who, some weeks ago in order to get home, had to take a lift in a hearse. The situation is as bad as that. I do not know what the hon. member is.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I must call time. Please be seated.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Chairman, I do not know exactly what the hon. member is trying to deal with. A statement was made earlier today, and I do not know if he is trying to debate the statement in a roundabout way. I do not know what relevance this has to do with the subject under discussion.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Are there any hon. members who wish to speak on this Resolution.

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Mr. Chairman, the Resolution before this House is asking for the sum of $812,000 which will go towards consultants fees and construction costs up to the end of this financial year. I would have thought that the members of the Opposition would have taken it upon themselves to ask me to breakdown this money that we are asking for today. This was not done. I shall, in breaking down this money that is required, or what is being asked for today, proceed to answer some of the queries which some of the hon. members made in their speeches.

Mr. Chairman, the school which my Government proposes to have constructed at the corner of Country Road will cost $2,034,000. There is a fee of $1.8 million which will be allocated to the actual construction costs. In addition to that there is $234,000 which will be the sum required to meet Consultants fees. In other words, Mr. Chairman, you will see that we are not, today, asking for the $2,034,000 but we are asking for a mere $812,000. We have to meet $650,000 which is the required amount for the commencement of work on the school, that is the preparation work including the cost of materials to be put on the site. In addition to that, we are seeking permission from this Honourable House to be able to allocate a part of the Consultants fees which will be another $162,000. You will see that the money we are asking for: $650,000 plus $162,000 will take us up to the end of this financial year, March 31, 1977.

Now provision will be made in the 1977–78 Estimates which will take care of the balance of $1,115,000 for the expenses which will be incurred by the contractors, and there will be a further $72,000 which will go towards paying off the Consultants fees. As I said before, Mr. Chairman, the remainder of these outstanding amounts will be provided for in the Estimates for 1977–78. The urgency of this Resolution is that we, in the Barbados Labour Party, believe that the Democratic Labour Party did not find it fit to arrest the real problems of school leavers and education in this country. We found, on coming into power, that children at the age of 14 did not have to leave school. But the Hon. Leader of the Opposition said that, regardless of what was done, children at the age of fourteen or fifteen would have to leave school. We, on this side, have made it abundantly clear that these children did not have to leave school, and we are ensuring that, with a good directive policy, the children will be able to return and to remain in school.

Mr. Chairman, the Roebuck School will be meeting temporary measures, as far as the secondary phase is concerned. It is true that plans were made and devised from 1970 by the Democratic Labour Party. I am sorry that the hon. member for St. Michael South is not in his seat, because he was the Minister of Education then. He knew about the plans, and he disclosed that the school was to be built in 1970. What do we have? In 1976 they were swept out of power, and no constructive plans were made to have this school erected. For six years he was the Minister of Education, for six years he was in the Government, and nothing was done about this matter.

Mr. Chairman, I am convinced that, had the Democratic Labour Party retained the reins of Government, absolutely nothing would have been done to arrest the problem which confronted the 14-year old children of this country. It is an abominable shame for the Leader of the Opposition to come in here and have the gumption to get up and say that he has not had a clear explanation, and that I was using the same tactics that was employed on the front bench. Let me at this stage tell the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, as a member for St. Michael South, that I do not have to get up, or I should not be getting up in here explaining something that is clearly written. If they cannot understand what is written, then it is too bad for both of them.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, on a point of elucidation. It was the Leader of the House who told us it was an emergency, temporary measure and he did not tell us that. Where is that in the Addendum? Read it to me in the Addendum that it is a temporary, emergency measure.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please be seated.

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Mr. Chairman, the Addendum clearly stated that this was supposed to be a school. The Leader of the Opposition knows that since we were thinking in terms of keeping the 14-year old children in school, since we were planning to provide places for the

11-plus children who will be coming out of school and would have to seek places in secondary schools, it is quite obvious that both of those hon. members knew that the provision for this school meant that we were going to provide places for children. It was a foregone conclusion.
3.05 p.m.

It was a natural and sensible thing for anyone who had his thinking cap on to understand, and we did not have to spell that out. I have always said that the members on the other side come in here with half-dead arguments trying to think that their arguments are well taken by members in the Gallery. They are playing cheap politics.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the position is that we have got a situation in Barbados today where some 2,000 children will be seeking places in these secondary schools, and we as a first measure are seeking to provide some of the places by September, 7. We have also got plans to use the Abergeldie building which is on Dayrells Road and which that Government bought in 1970, and instead of using that they went into Belmont Road and rented the Federal High School for $41,000, wasting the taxpayers' money when they could have taken the place at Abergeldie and provide places for the children. Mr. Chairman, I will say that Abergeldie has some three acres of land, and if they wanted to expand at Abergeldie it was possible for the Democratic Labour Party to do so, but it goes to show you the way they have been misusing and abusing the people's funds during their tenure of office.

Mr. Chairman, what must be brought home is this: the hon. member for St. Michael said that there was no money. It is equal to fooling people that there was no money to build schools when they took the taxpayers' money and hired 258 people to work in Parks and Beaches just before the election campaign. Are they going to tell us in this House that $½ million were not taken and thrown into the National Housing Corporation which could be used towards alleviating the problems in education? We found them throwing away $1 million just to capture votes, and I want the hon. member for St. Lucy to understand that he is a lucky member today, because $75,000 of that money was spent in St. Lucy to assist him in getting here. That is not all, Mr. Chairman. They said there was no money to carry out a school-building programme. The Leader of the Opposition took on a host of people just before the election campaign for the school meals programme. Thank God the elections came and went too soon. Although he took on some 100 people two weeks before the election campaign, he barely scraped home by 20 votes. That shows you the sort of hypocrisy of the Democratic Labour Party, their ministers and members.

The school which we propose to construct will accommodate some 800 children. There will be 26 classrooms, and a point of explanation is that it will not only be a secondary school but will embrace primary as well. All we have done is to take the land, and knowing there was a need to accommodate fourteen year olds, what we are doing is using part of the building to accommodate some of the fourteen year olds.

As I said before, Mr. Chairman, this Resolution before the House need not have sparked off so much bitterness. We are hoping by having this school constructed to relieve the situation which would have arisen had the Democratic Labour Party been in power, that is to keep the fourteen year olds in school. On the other hand, we are hoping that when the eleven plus children come out of school or when they take the examination and are seeking places that we will be able to accommodate them. This is part of the progressive policy of the Barbados Labour Party, and I am sure that when the nation realises that we are thinking in terms of embracing the difficulties and handling them effectively that they will compliment us.

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

On the motion of Hon. H. B. St. JOHN, seconded by Hon. L. S. CRAIG, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Resolution in Committee of Supply, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. DeL. BRADSHAW seconded by Hon. H. deB. FORDE, the Resolution was read a first and second time and agreed to.

THE MARRIED WOMEN (SEPARATION AND MAINTENANCE) (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1977

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, in moving the passing of this Bill, I would like to make a few comments. If hon. members on the other side are satisfied as to the reasons for the Bill and the purpose, I do not intend to offer them any further explanation. They have so indicated and I hope that in future I would not hear the allegation that the hon. member does

not offer an adequate introduction. During the second reading of this Bill there are some further amendments which have been circulated which I would like to read. I can only give hon. members the understanding that the purpose of the Bill is really to rectify an error that occurred in the Bill passed in 1975.
3.15 p.m.

The Department has not gone any further on this occasion to do any act of revamping the law. The reason is that we have a draft Bill dealing with the whole area of the divorce, matrimonial causes and family relations, but since the Commission on the status of women has recently begun its work we have been requested by that Commission to await the outcome of its report before going any further with the draft legislation which is in the Department. I am assured by the Commission the results of the report will be available to the Government before the end of the year, and I undertake that after Cabinet has had an opportunity to see it to lay it on the Table of the House and have it published for the benefit of the public, and I hope that as soon as that has been done that we can formulate a proper Bill for a very wide reformation of the laws dealing with divorce, matrimonial property and all other ancillary matters in those circumstances. It should not be long now, I know members are anxious about this part of the law and it is getting priority treatment in the Department.

I therefore ask that this Bill be read a second time, subject to the amendments that have been circulated.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, I rise to second that, and I am surprised to hear that the first Attorney General of Barbados sitting on the other side is now begging that we go through with it quickly, because the last time they were speedy to criticise the Government but after they realised that we were tidying up the errors which they have committed they do not want the general public to know that we have to tidy up their bad work.

Dr. CHELTENHAM: Mr. Speaker, I believe that it was a year or more ago when Mr. Elliott Mottley was then representative for the City that he introduced a Bill into this Hon. House as a result of which so-called illegitimate children were able to get $10 per week maintenance by way of a court order, and ever since that amendment came on the Statute Book there has existed a dichotomy whereby so-called legitimate children seeking a maintenance award in the Magistrate's Court were only able to get upwards of $5 per week support when the so-called illegitimate children were getting $10.

This amendment really seeks to correct that position in so far as all children, both legitimate and illegitimate would now be able to get $10 per week. That is one of the amendments. I am glad that both legitimate and illegitimate children will be getting the same amount and I hope that in future we will continue to treat all children the same way, whether they be legitimate or illegitimate they will get the same amount of money.

I want to say, however, that putting the amount at $10 is still inadequate. $10 cannot be regarded by any stretch of the imagination as an adequate maximum that the Magistrate's Court should have power to award, and a lot of mothers have found that the provision in the Magistrate's Court is so inadequate that in order to get more money they have to use the more cumbersome and expensive machinery of going to the High Court under the Evidence Act where a Judge has limitless power, as it were, to award maintenance. If the father is working for $20,000 a year the court give, let us say, for one child $400 or $500 as he sees fit, and many poor mothers have had to use that expensive machinery of going to the High Court in order to get something over $10 a week for their children. The point that I make here is that we should have given the Magistrate more power so that it would be possible for the Magistrate to find that the father should pay John and Mary $20 each per week until further order of the court.

The Magistrate could even be given a wider discretional power in this amendment so that he could award far more money if the circumstances so merit it. The Magistrate's Court procedure still is a simple and effective and speedy way of getting justice, and I think that in amending all these Acts we have to ensure that the Magistrates are given far more jurisdiction, more power so that more and more people can get justice through the speedy and simple mechanism at the Magistrate's Court rather than having to go to the High Court.

I would have hoped that the learned and hon. member for Christ Church West would have taken the opportunity to tell us whether the family court we have been hearing so much about would in future be handling all these matters or whether we will still have the family court dealing with some matters and the Magistrate's Court dealing with similar matters with a lower

and a more limited jurisdiction. I was hoping too that the Hon. Attorney General would have been kind enough to let us know whether in the new provisions of the Family Act we are likely to have any machinery for allowing the money awarded against fathers to be deducted by their employers rather than have the situation which at present exists, whereby there is sometimes great difficulty experienced in getting fathers to support their children and some of them even run up arrears of several thousand dollars. It is my experience, even recently, to find that cases come before the court where fathers have not paid for two or three years and the writ server has reported that he could not find the father, although he is still in the island.

I welcome this amendment, it is long overdue and it is likely to lead to a flood of applications to the Magistrates' Courts for the variation of awards, and I hope that we can in future see the day when the Magistrate will have far more power in these matters and children can be awarded upwards of $75 and $80.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to get into this, but the fact is that I was the first Attorney General..... *(Asides)*..... No laughing at that can remove that fact, it is a fact of history and a fact of life. I entirely agree with the hon. member for Christ Church East, and I think that this particular Bill, welcome as this amendment is, needs to go much further and I accept the Attorney General's sort of promise that in due course we will have a more up to date piece of legislation which will ensure that the children of this community, both from marriages as well as unsolemnized unions, get a better deal. What the hon. member for Christ Church East has said, even in my short period in the City I have discovered to be true, and I am sure that my experience will help me as the years go by.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, since no other hon. members wishes to speak I think I will just reply briefly to the two hon. members. The first point I should like to make is that this is not an amending Bill, it is a repealing Bill, and why I make that point is not merely to correct a factual error on the part of the two hon. members, but to point out that one of the reasons why the Bill is not more comprehensive in scope is because it was intended to be only a repealing Bill to re-enact the legislation which this House passed in 1975 which originated as Mr. Mottley's Private Members' Bill, which would have equalised the position between the legitimate and illegitimate children so-called, and that is all this Bill seeks to do.

3.25 p.m.

That is all that this Bill seeks to do. The hon. member for Christ Church East raised some aspects of the question of a Family Court. I have had a very brief look indeed at the question of having a Family Court, and it seems that although this has been adopted in Jamaica for instance in the Caribbean, that it does not justify having a Family Court in the same sense as it has been established in Jamaica. The costs would be too heavy for the country.

What we are proposing at this stage is a division of the Supreme Court which will be called the Family Court Division; and it is intended, subject of course to the advice of the experts, that it will be staffed by a judge or judges who have specialised in Family Court matters, and that the Court will have available to it the expertise of sociologists, Welfare Officers and people of that sort.

I intend to have the maximum consultation with people who have had dealings with Family Welfare, with the judges and magistrates, the Bar Association and any other citizens who take an interest in this sort of matter before our proposals are firm and are brought before the House.

So far as increasing the jurisdiction of the magistrates is concerned, my department has not yet settled in its mind, nor have I settled in my mind whether we are going to allow magistrates to have concurrent jurisdiction in all areas with the judges of the Family Division Court; but it is intended that people will have a greater facility to come before the Court so as to make this sort of application easier, and I hope that expenses will be less.

In so far as the deduction of wages from the pay packets of men or women who have an obligation to support their children is concerned, I give the hon. member the unequivocal assurance that the legislation will contain provisions for the attachment of wages. This policy is a policy statement made by our party when we were in the Opposition and it is, I believe, also repeated in the manifesto; and we intend to carry out that part of the manifesto.

I can assure hon. members that the Family Relations Act will be a comprehensive piece of social legislation which, I hope, will not only stand the test of time, but will go down in history as a piece of legislation of which this Parliament can be proud. I hope that it will not be partisan supported or acrimonious. I have the assurance from the hon. Minister of Youth Affairs, Sports and Welfare that his department

will contribute as much as it can; and we are looking for the best for Barbados in this respect.

I have myself perused the legislation of all of the Commonwealth countries – their up to date legislation on this matter; and Miss Bannister, the Chief Parliamentary Counsel in my department, has done an extensive study of the laws in other countries, and we have had the assistance so far of the Chairman of the Commission on the Status of Women who is a very erudite and distinguished lady in her own right. I hope that the end results will soon be before Parliament. So I can assure the hon. member that he is already speaking to the convinced, and there is no need to convert the front bench to the back bone of the combination. The combination is combining, is working, is not confused, is producing and will make sure that the end results can even be welcomed by the Opposition. I look forward to their praise when the measures come before this House.

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

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee on the Bill.

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

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

Clause 1 was called.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 1 stand part.

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

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

Clause 2 was called.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that that Clause 1 of the amendments which have been circulated be substituted for Clause 2 and that Clauses 2 to 4 be re-numbered Clauses 4 to 6 and that this be read a first time.

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

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

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, I move that the amendment be read a second time.

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

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

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 2 of the amendment be added to the Bill and be read a first time.

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

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

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the same clause as amended be read a second time.

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

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

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I move that Clause 3 of the amendment be added to the Bill and be read a first time.

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

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

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the same amendment be read a second time.

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

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

Clause 4 was called.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 4 as amended by Clause 3 of the amendment circulated stand part.

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

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

3.35 p.m.

Clauses 5 and 6 were called and passed.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Your Honour do now report the passing of this Bill, as amended, in Committee.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: 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.

On the separate motions of Hon. H. deB. FORDE, seconded by Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE, the Bill was read a third time and passed and cited as the MARRIED WOMEN (SEPARATION AND MAINTENANCE) (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1977.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. H. B. ST.JOHN: Mr. Speaker, this concludes Government Business. I beg to move that the House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 22nd February, 1977, at twelve noon.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I beg to second that.

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

3.41 p.m.