

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

FIRST SESSION OF 1976 – 81

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 26th July, 1977

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

PRESENT

His Honour W. C. B. HINDS, J.P., (Speaker); Mr. R. StC. WEEKES, J.P.; Hon. L. S. CRAIG, (Minister of Labour and Community Services); Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, M.A., (Prime Minister and Minister of Finance and Planning); Hon. H. deB. FORDE, S.C., M.A., LL.B., (Attorney General and Minister of External Affairs); Dr. R. B. CADDLE; Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER, (Minister of Health and National Insurance); Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE, (Minister of Communications and Works); Mr. J. G. ODLE, B.Sc., (Chairman of Committees); Mr. M. C. C. WARD; Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN, Q.C., LL.B., (Deputy Prime Minister, Minister of Caribbean Affairs, External Trade, Industry and Tourism and Leader of the House); Mr. V. L. JOHNSON, M.A.; Hon. L. R. TULL, M.A., (Minister of Education and Culture); Mr. DeL. O. BRADSHAW; and Mr. L. L. SISNETT.

Prayers were read.

Mr. L. E. Sandiford and Mr. E. E. Greaves entered the House and took their seats.

CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minutes of the meeting of Tuesday, 19th July, 1977.

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, these Minutes have been circulated and if there are no amendments by hon. members I beg to move that the Minutes be confirmed.

Mr. SPEAKER: If there are no objections to the Minutes...*(A Pause)* There being no objections the Minutes will be taken as confirmed.

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY MR. SPEAKER

Mr. SPEAKER: I have to announce that I have received a Message from the Other Place to the effect that the Joint Committee has now been constituted to discuss the recommendation of the Debates Committee concerning the matter of the Clerk of Parliament.

DOCUMENTS LAID

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I beg to lay the Statement showing Net Customs and Excise Receipts for the two months ended 31st May, 1977.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

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

Resolution to approve of the compulsory acquisition of land at Oistins, Christ Church, relating to the development of Oistins.

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

A Resolution to grant the sum of \$23,682 out of the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates, 1977–78, Part II – Capital, as shown in the supplementary Estimates 1977–78, No. 7, which form the schedule to the Resolution.

Also a Resolution to grant the sum of \$940,000 out of the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates, 1977–78, Part I – Current, as shown in the supplementary Estimates 1977–78, No. 8, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. B. A. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Bill to amend the Medical Registration Act.

NOTICE OF QUESTIONS

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. Michael South, his question re the beautification project for Rudder's Pasture.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, to enquire of the Minister of Housing and Lands:

1. Is the Minister aware that the wire fencing enclosing the hardcourts at Rudder's Pasture, Paddock Road, Dalkeith, St. Michael is broken in several places?
2. Will the Minister cause the necessary repairs to be executed as soon as possible?
3. Will the Minister also state if and/or when Government proposes to assign a caretaker to work at those hardcourts?
4. Will the Minister also consider the implementation of a beautification project for the whole Rudder's Pasture?

Mr. SPEAKER: The same hon. member, his question respecting Barbados' eligibility for a loan from Monetary Trust Fund of the International Monetary Fund.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, to enquire of the Minister of Finance and Planning:

1. Is Barbados eligible for a loan from the Trust Fund of the International Monetary Fund for balance of payments assistance?
2. If the answer to (1) is in the negative, will the Minister state why Barbados is ineligible?
3. If the answer to (1) is in the affirmative, will the Minister indicate whether Barbados has applied or is considering applying for such a loan?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. Lucy, his question, concerning a post box for Pie Corner.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, to enquire of the Minister of Communications and Works:

1. Is the Minister aware that there is need for a post Box in a central area in Pie Corner, St. Lucy, and one in Connell Town in the same Parish?

2. Will the Minister undertake to have post boxes placed in the districts abovementioned?

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

Hon. B. A. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I propose that a Bill to amend the Medical Registration Act (Cap 3) 1971, be now dealt with.

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

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

12.25 p.m.

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, today marks the fortieth anniversary of a significant event in the history of Barbados, a day which has been declared by the Government to be a day of national significance. The night of July 26, 1937, saw the beginning of a revolt that lasted for several days, spreading from Bridgetown to the rural areas of the country. The peace and tranquility which the island had enjoyed since the Federation Riot of 1876 was suddenly and rudely shattered. The reputation we had enjoyed as a law-abiding community for more than sixty years was put in doubt as the people rose in protest against the hardship and privation they suffered during the Hungry Thirties of the present century. Before the uprising was suppressed, 14 people were killed, 47 were injured and 453 were arrested and imprisoned.

It is fitting that we should cherish the memory of those who died on that occasion. It is also appropriate that we should remember the relatives of those who suffered and endured in the struggle for working-class liberation. There are others who should be added to our honours list and these would include Clement Osbourne Payne and the chiefs among his lieutenants, Ulric Grant, Brian Alleyne, Menzies Chase, Mortie Skeete, Israel Lovell, Cephus Mahon and Vernon Jordan.

Here it is also fitting to give special mention to W. A. Crawford. As Editor of The Observer Newspaper he campaigned unceasingly to promote the cause of progress and reform. He faithfully recorded the events of those vibrant years before, during and after the 1937 Disturbances; and the back numbers of his Newspaper are today a mine of information for all those who want to make an objective study of the causes and consequences of that troubled period.

July 1937 is a watershed in the history of Barbados. From that time there began a new trend in Barbadian affairs. A new direction was given to the political, social and economic development of the Island. The social revolution that is still taking place in Barbados today began with the career of Charles Duncan O'Neal who set out the programme that was designed to change Barbados from a rigid, class-bound society to the healthy democratic state it is today. But O'Neal's efforts foundered on the shoals of narrow prejudice and an almost invincible conservatism. Had his programme of reform been carried into effect in his day and generation, the revolt we are commemorating today might never have taken place.

With the failure of the society prevailing at the time to accept the reform and improvements advocated by O'Neal, the explosion of 1937 was perhaps inevitable. If I may use the words of an official enquiry, Clement Payne was the detonator who ignited the highly explosive material that existed in the Island. He preached the doctrine of trade unionism and carried a stage further the campaign for democracy initiated by O'Neal. The enthusiastic reception of Payne's ideas cannot be questioned; and it is no wonder that the immediate occasion of the 1937 uprising was attributed to the circumstances surrounding the deportation of Payne from the Island of Barbados. Whatever may be said of his activities and motives in the earlier part of his campaign, there can be no doubt that he was the catalyst that helped to change Barbados in such a way that it was never to be the same again.

The melancholy events of 1937 were to give rise to a powerful progressive movement that gave birth to a political party and a trade union which, working in close partnership, were to change the character of Barbadian society beyond recognition. The greatness of the man who brought that movement to a high level of achievement in the political, social and economic life of Barbados cannot be questioned by anyone. Nor should we omit to record the names of those who helped Grantley Adams to bring his labours to success in the early arduous years — Chrissy Brathwaite, J. A. Martineau, Edwy Talma, Herbert Seale, Hugh Springer, Dr. Gordon Cummins, M. E. Cox and Frank Walcott, to mention only a few.

These men already have a secure place in the history of Barbados. It is to be expected that the debunkers in our midst will try at this stage to distort the events of the past and besmirch the characters of men whom we hold

in high honour. But the native intelligence and common sense of the Barbadian will enable him now, as in the past, to distinguish between truth and falsehood, between history and propaganda; and to reject any effort to project the partisan politics of today into the historical record of 1937.

This government expresses its gratitude to Reginald Pierrepont for his suggestion that July 26th should be observed as a Day of National Significance. Pierrepont was the moving spirit in the West Indies Defence Committee, based in New York City, which dramatised the 1937 upheaval by its press releases throughout the U.S.A., Britain and other parts of the world. During the years since then he has persisted in his campaign for a national commemorative day and we are pleased to have played a part in bringing that campaign to a happy fulfilment.

The government of Barbados decided to commemorate the 1937 insurrection for a number of reasons. We believe that forty years ago there began a movement that was to effect a far reaching change in the pattern of the Barbadian society. We believe that all classes and sections of our community today appreciate the importance and significance of that movement. We hold the view that the cause of progress and reform was vigorously promoted by the leaders of the Barbados Progressive League, the Barbados Labour Party and the Barbados Workers' Union and it was advanced with no less conviction by our immediate predecessors in Government. The great crusade that was advocated by O'Neal and brought sharply to our attention by the explosion of 1937 has the support and co-operation of all those who love this country.

It is because we are serenely confident of the maturity of our people, because we are profoundly convinced of their wisdom and common sense, that this Government resolved that the day when the poor and underprivileged rose in rebellion against intolerable living conditions should be recognised as a Day of National Significance.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would now like to suggest that we stand in silence for one minute as a mark of our respect for those who died in the circumstances just related by our Hon. Prime Minister.

The House stood in silence for one minute.

ORAL REPLIES TO QUESTIONS

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that the reply to Parliamentary Question No. 43 asked by the hon. member for St. Michael South is now ready.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 5 be the first order of the day.

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

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

Order No. 5 was called — A Bill to amend the Crown Lands (Vesting and Disposal) Act, Cap. 225.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this Bill is to vest in the Government and the people of Barbados for all times in the future approximately 52 acres of land at Harrisons Point, St. Lucy. This land is at present under the possession of the United States Government by virtue of an agreement entered into by that Government and the Federation of the West Indies, which agreement was signed on the 10th November, 1961.

Under the terms of the existing agreement that lease comes to an end on the 31st December, 1977. The history of this Act, however, Mr. Speaker, predates 1961 because it was in 1956 that the first Act was signed giving the United States authority to be the lessee of this parcel of land.

Prior to the independence of Barbados, the defence and security of this country, as indeed its international rights and obligations were dictated by the United Kingdom Government which was then a colonial power in charge of almost all of the affairs of Barbados, and not only its international affairs but some of its internal affairs as well. As a result of the existing international situation, the United States represented to the British Government that it needed to set up a series of defence bases in the Caribbean. I should point out for the benefit of hon. members that Barbados was not one of those territories which were affected by the 1941 leased bases agreement in which the British Government in exchange for some old destroyers ceded parcels of land to the United States.

That is past history, and some people continue to misrepresent historical facts. I should point out that Barbados was not included in the 1941 destroyer deal. The arrangement concerning Barbados took place between 1954 and 1956, but the actual agreement was signed in 1956, and as a result the Oceanographic Act was passed and eventually appeared in Cap. 19 of our laws, and parts of it were also dealt with by the Crown Lands (Vesting and Disposal) Act.

At the time of the acquisition of the rights of the lease the land was purchased in the name of the Admiralty and I should point out that the total purchase price of \$87,000 was provided by the British Government; and at no stage did the Government of Barbados, as it was then paid for this land, so that not only did the relevant statutory provision result in the Admiralty having the revisionary interest on the termination of the lease, but gave it power first of all to offer it to the Government of Barbados, and if the Government did not agree to buy, then to sell the land back to the immediate family — the Websters — which was the family who originally owned the land.

At the time of the revision of the Leased Bases Agreement in 1960–61 the United States Government agreed to return certain areas to respective parties; and at that time the late Sir Grantley Adams made it unmistakably clear, as indeed the documents and the secret files reveal, that he considered that the Admiralty was occupying the land as a freehold owner, but as a beneficiary in trust for the people of Barbados, and for the Government of Barbados.

I said that the documents are there. We have had some difficulty in retrieving these documents, but I am satisfied on the basis of the evidence and on the basis of what existed at the time that this decision was accepted by the United States Government in 1961. There was a change of Government just about the same time and as a result nothing was done between the year 1961 and the year 1977 to ensure that the beneficiary ownership of that land should vest in the people and Government of Barbados.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, the first communication on this matter with the British Government took place in the month of March this year when, acting on the instructions of Cabinet, I sent a diplomatic note requesting that the British Government consent to the land being vested to the people and Government of Barbados. I should disclose to this House that some communications or conversation arose as to

whether or not Barbados would refund the British Government the \$87,000 odd with interest thereon.

I did not take that seriously, but I indicated that if it was necessary I would advise the Cabinet to bring down a compulsory acquisition resolution to this House, and the British Government would have to pay for a claim like anyone else in relation to the land. The point was quickly taken.

12. 45 p.m.

I am happy to say that the relationship or the negotiations with the British government on this matter has thereafter proceeded apace and with the greatest amount of courtesy that one could expect. I have notified the British Government as well as the United States Government of the intention to pass this Act in Parliament so that they would be aware, as parties to the Agreement, of what we are undertaking. There will be no money paid to the British Government for this land. This has met with their approval, and I am very happy to inform the House and the people of Barbados that the base has been recovered for the people of Barbados as part and parcel of the lands owned by the people in Barbados *in perpetuity*.

I would have wished, Mr. Speaker, that in introducing this Resolution I could have left the matter right there, but I think I owe it to the people of Barbados, in the first place, the Government, and the Political Party to which I belong, to clear up a few impressions which are wrongly held in this country and also to give some idea about our situation *vis-a-vis* the United States under this Agreement. At the time of the re-negotiation in 1961, it was made clear that there would have been a stage-3 talks in which economic assistance and other benefits which would accrue under this Agreement would have been discussed with the Government of the United States of America and some arrangement reached between the units Governments as they then were and the American Government on this matter. The officials of my Ministry and myself have done extensive research on every existing file in this country. We have had the benefit of the assistance of other Caribbean Governments as well, and we can discover nowhere in no file anywhere that these talks ever took place. It is significant, however, that all of the other territories who were parties to the negotiations have benefitted from the position, whereas Barbados got nothing.

In Trinidad and Tobago the United States Government provided the improvement of Port

facilities for Port-of-Spain, the construction of additional road facilities between Port-of-Spain and Chaguaramas, including reclamation of the Cocorite area, the rehabilitation of the Trinidad Government railway, the development of the College of Arts and Sciences of the University; it had a programme for economic utilisation of the areas in the north-west peninsula of approximately \$1.1 million (U.S.) at prices in 1961, and it also made a direct substantial money grant.

In St. Lucia the United States Government not only released 1,700 acres of land, but it also provided various programmes and gave \$350,000 (U.S.) in the fiscal year, up to June 1961 in direct aid, and also carried out works on various projects like access and penetration roads, facilities, equipment and training in secondary education, commodities and technical services to augment the electric power facilities.

In Antigua, similarly, \$350,000 (U.S.) was given and various projects undertaken.

In Jamaica a substantial larger sum was given — \$500,000 (U.S.) and various projects undertaken including low-income housing and slum clearance, preparation of plans and engineering designs for a water supply programme, commodity services and training for technical and trade education, and commodity services and training for extending University education.

I said, Mr. Speaker, that similar talks — stage — 3 talks — should have been taken place in relation to Barbados. I do not know what the last Government was doing. They have always been anxious to tell us that they were attending to the people's business, but in 16 years this Agreement has never been monitored by the past Government. The stage-3 talks have never taken place and, indeed, the record is a shameful legacy of neglect of serious international obligations on the part of the last Government. I make those statements in a very considered manner. I am glad the hon. member for St. John is here, because he had the primary obligation in the first years of Independence, as Minister responsible for External Affairs, a part of his duty as Minister responsible for External Affairs as well as the Minister responsible for Defence and Security is that he was obliged to monitor this Agreement and to see that, as the Minister, he was looking after the people's business.

I regret to say that although I could commend him for some things, he gets no

commendation at all on this score. It was not only he as Minister, but he was succeeded by other Ministers who did nothing at all about this Agreement. There was one meagre attempt made in 1964 to amend the Act in relation to Harbour dues. I would not go into those details, because I am sure by the time the hon. member tries to show that that was of any significance the records, which I have in my possession, may contradict some of the statements which he made in 1964 when he introduced the amending Bill in the House and the attack which he then made on the Barbados Labour Party in relation to that, I will wait for his reply, and I am sure we will get a reply on this point.

But let me say that it was only after a question was asked by the then member for the City, Mr. Elliott Mottley, in 1973 that any attempt was made at all to look at the Agreement, and the then Leader of the House said that he was not in a position to say what was the state of the Agreement, or what would happen under this Agreement, because the Minister of External Affairs was out of the Island and he would have to wait until his return before an answer could be given to Mr. Mottley's queries. Subsequently an article appeared in the newspaper *Manjack*, talking about the base, and the files in my Ministry revealed that one of the young officers drew it to the attention of the Minister that there was some query about this matter and he was not sure what was Barbados' position on it.

An initial attempt was made for approximately one year to garner or garnish any information that was available, and the matter has rested since then until the first week in October. Within a couple of weeks of this Government assuming office, I was mandated to carry out a proper research and review of the Agreement with a view to seeing whether or not it had been properly monitored, where Barbados had fulfilled, or failed to fulfil, its international obligations, and what benefits, if any, we had omitted to give.

12.55 p.m.

It was as a result of our activity between the months of October and now that this first Act has come before Parliament. I want, Mr. Speaker, to outline these facts which cannot be contradicted simply to show that when one talks about experience in politics that it is surprising that a party in Government like ours which was being characterized as lacking experience in international affairs should at least have the pre-science and the promptitude in attending to a matter such as this, and people who have got or

had this tremendous amount of experience on the international scene and who were so much on the ball could do nothing for a period of sixteen years to make sure that benefits that should have been accruing to this country never accrued and to have monitored the operation of this agreement. I said that the agreement was not monitored, and if hon. members want, I can go through many aspects of the agreement to show where information was not even kept by Ministries in order to see what was happening in particular aspects of the past operations. The hon. member for St. Michael North Central I see is in a way following the debate very closely, because he will recall that his Ministry was asked various questions and the answer which was sent by his Senior Assistant Secretary shows signs of having been dictated by him or amended by him, because he too expressed some sort of concern that there was a complete lack of information in Government circles about an important international obligation, and he could not understand what had gone wrong, and wanted to know whose responsibility it was and why had it not been monitored properly. The historical records are there. Some of the other Ministries replied and said it was not their concern, it did not affect them, and the matter rested there.

You have to recite these facts so that we get in perspective how serious we are about being a sovereign power. There is no point in repeating that we gained independence and that we are a sovereign country if we took our vital interests so lightly, and without paying adequate concern to matters that were of importance. No doubt we must have given the United States of America the impression that we were a money rich country. The others could get bi-lateral aid and technical assistance, we had no care for it, it did not concern us at all, and now we are faced with the argument, although I do not want to go into the negotiations to prejudice them, that our omission to be prompt means that we are forestalled from continuing stage three talks which should have taken place since 1967. Obviously the United States itself did nothing to keep us informed. They may well ask why should they, that we were reaping the benefits. We were providing infrastructural conditions for them to operate here; we were not concerned, we were good neighbours; we had been to the installation of President Johnson and sat and wine and dined with him and that was a satisfactory standard of relationship we should have. For this Government that will never be a satisfactory stand.

We consider the United States to be a close ally and a friend, but between friends they must

understand blunt talking as well. They must understand that we can talk as hard as they can when it comes to our vital interests and this would not worsen our attitude to them, because we are not going to talk idly about destabilisation and all sorts of monkey talk based on no evidence. What we will talk about is something more important to Barbados. We intend to be taken seriously on these points. There is no point abusing the United States on destabilisation techniques when you have more vital interests that I have been talking about and attending to, and no doubt they do not take us seriously.

I want to make it quite clear that this Government intends to be taken very seriously about the failure between 1961 and 1977 for us to continue talks that affect the country's vital interests in a continuing agreement, and whereas we will respect any existing international obligations, and this Act makes that quite clear, Mr. Speaker, we will expect people who have entered into these obligations with us likewise to shoulder their part of the obligations as they had been getting their part of the benefits. On that point there can be no compromise, no matter how strong the power, no matter how big the power, no matter how close the power is. There was a point that any country must take its interests as predominant and we have made this absolutely clear, and on that point we intend to remain very adamant, and I give hon. members my word on this point that it will figure in any negotiations that may go on on this matter.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would have hoped that there would have been various procedures laid down under the agreement where we would have been kept informed of the operation of the Base on our territory, and indeed the agreement itself makes provision for the setting up of a joint consultative board in Article 19 between the then Federation and the United States and for the setting up of sub-boards in the unit territories between the United States and the territory concerned. I want to state here that no sub-board was ever set up either, and therefore there was no opportunity for consultation to take place on any of the matters that should have been of vital interest to the defence and security of this country. I believe that the events of the last few days have disclosed that we are entitled to as much information as may be in the possession of a country on our territory as anybody else is entitled, and we are making it clear to the United States that for the future and for as long as they may be in Barbados we would wish to be kept notified of the movements of vessels and aircraft not only within our territorial space, but as well within our zone of important national security interest. I can assure the House that this matter is

being discussed and with respect to the stage at which the discussions have gone, I do not want to go into detail on this, but this too as a principle will figure in any further talks that we have with the United States.

Barbados has named its members of the sub-board and we will use this facility for the remaining period to discuss matters with the United States outside of the glare of publicity, with the confidentiality which such matters call for; but it must be done in the future. The fact that it has not been done in the past should be no reason why in the future we are not able to talk with the United States on such matters.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the agreement also provided for the United States of America to pay a reasonable sum of compensation for the use of our airport facilities, as well as compensation for damage to our roads and the use of the roads. Again these are uncontradicted facts. No effort was made by the past Government even to raise this question. All the files reveal that between 1961 and today not one penny has been collected by way of compensation for the United States aircraft using our airport. This is a fact; and indeed no request had been submitted to the United States Government in this respect until the matter was raised this year by my Ministry. 1.05 p.m.

Likewise no request has been submitted to the United States in relation to the use of the roads. I do not know how much of the people's business was being done, but I consider these as important matters. One of them of course, should have been within the sphere of the Ministry of Communications who should have provided some basic information to the Civil Aviation department who would pass it on to the Ministry of Internal Affairs, and I would have expected that the effort would have been co-ordinated. But this was not done and once again the United States Government must have taken the attitude that if Barbados is not minding its own business why should the United States mind Barbados's business. I have always understood this to be a proper national position to display; if you have vital interests at stake and ignore them, do not expect an international power to be so disinterested as to inform you that you are not getting the benefits you should. I understand the United States in this respect, but I made it clear this would not happen in the future and we are now seeking to recover the benefits that should have accrued to Barbados under the 1961 agreement.

Now I want to answer one allegation. Some people have the opinion that the 1961 agreement

was an agreement negotiated from a position of lack of strength, but anyone who has read Dr. Eric Williams' "Inward Hunger" would find that that approach to the matter is completely unfounded. The agreement which forms the Schedule to the Act was negotiated from a position in the West Indies where Trinidad, and Dr. Williams in particular, made it quite clear he was substituting an agreement by West Indians for West Indians for an agreement which had been negotiated by non-West Indians. He made it absolutely clear in 1961 — and the first draft was done by the present Governor-General of Trinidad; and I refer hon. members who may be interested in the implications of the historical reference to read Dr. Williams' thesis on the Chaguaramas and other negotiations which took place.

A happy note on this then, Mr. Speaker, is that I would invite hon. members to agree to the passing of this Bill, so that the people of Barbados will get the benefits which they should have got since 1961.

One final word. In 1968 there should have been a review of the agreement; in 1973 there should have been a review of the agreement as well. In neither of these years did the Government of Barbados move to review the agreement; no talks took place with the United States in 1968 after independence, or in 1973, for a review of the agreement; and as a result we still continue to operate under the agreement as in 1961; and so on two occasions we failed to pursue the benefits that should have come to us. I accept this legacy of omission and undertake to correct it and undertake that any negotiations with the United States will be conducted in a friendly manner but in a manner of strong bargaining. We are a small country but have always maintained our integrity from the time of settlement, and in negotiations with any power we intend to maintain our integrity and do not intend to accept any type of settlement unless it is fair and reasonable to Barbados as a whole. I have communicated these sentiments in talks with the United States officials and other persons and I believe this is now clearly understood. I have the complete confidence of the Cabinet and the Barbados Labour Party behind me, and I am sure the confidence of the people of Barbados in any such negotiations in pursuing the rights we have under the 1961 agreement.

Mr. Speaker, I therefore beg to move that this Bill be read a second time.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member who has just sat down has

indulged in a great deal of chest pumping and histrionics.

I have before me an Act of Parliament passed in 1956 when the Naval Facility, as it is euphemistically called, was established in Barbados, but my knowledge of this transaction goes back before that time because the first attempt to introduce an act of Parliament in this House on this matter was frustrated by me when I pointed out to the Government that it would be iniquitous to allow any foreign Government to acquire land in Barbados. The first effort that was being made was for the United States Government to buy some land at Harrisons in St. Lucy, the parish in which I have the honour to be born. The Government of Barbados should not allow any foreign country to buy land in Barbados, because by sheer weight of wealth such countries as Russia, China or the United States could come and buy up land in Barbados, and the people of Barbados themselves would have no land. This was how the Act came into being.

1.15 p.m.

In the Other Place I sat many a day representing the Webster Trust Company in this matter for arbitration and eventually the arbitrators awarded the sum of \$87,000 which has been mentioned by the hon. member for Christ Church West. So not only was I involved in this matter as a parliamentarian but also as a legal adviser to the Webster Trust Company. The Hon. Mr. Lisle Ward was one of the persons who appeared, the former member for the City Mr. Ernest Deighton Mottley, also appeared in this matter. The land then was vested in the Admiralty.

I should like to make it clear that there was no agreement between the Government of Barbados and the Government of the United States in 1961, it was an agreement between the Federation of the West Indies and the Government of the United States as a result of the agitation made by the Prime Minister of Trinidad and Tobago, the Hon. Dr. Eric Williams, for the patrimony of the people of Trinidad to revert to them out of the 1941 Bases Agreement which was concluded between President Roosevelt and Mr. Winston Churchill, as he then was, without any consultation between them and the Governments of any of the territories in the West Indies. That agreement took place in March, 1941. No territory of Barbados was involved in the establishment of a base at that time; absolutely no square inch of Barbados. When Dr. Williams started his agitation for the reversion of the land, some 23 square miles at Chaguaramas, his main purpose quite apart from repatriating

the lawful possessions of the people in Trinidad and Tobago was that Trinidad and Tobago would be the Federal capital in that area, Barbados was not at first invited to the discussions.

I remember Mr. John Whitney coming in here in a Gulf Stream aircraft, a Gulf Stream 1. Mr. Whitney was the United States representative and Barbados was not at first invited because Barbados was not part of the regional Bases Agreement. One of the things that the United States Government did at that time was to invite the Premier of Barbados, as he then was, and several other West Indian dignitaries to Patrick Air Force Base and then on to Cape Canaveral, as it then was, in order to pacify them and to alleviate their fears and suspicions of the *bona fides* of the United States Government. I remember that very well, but in 1956 Parliament of Barbados by Cap. 64 of that year, not in 1961, endorsed the legislation which read as follows:

"Whereas the Government of the United States of America wishes to establish an oceanographic research station in Barbados to be used in association with the Government of the United Kingdom for the purpose of continuing a joint naval programme of oceanographic research designed to acquire and evaluate the fundamental difference of a general defence interest relating to water conditions in areas where the information is lacking; to develop technique and equipment for acquiring such data from shore based station and for for the training of personnel;

And Whereas the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Barbados have concluded an agreement for the establishment of the base;

Be It Therefore Resolved by the Government, Council and Assembly that this Act may be cited as the United States Oceanographic Act."

I cite that not for the sake of being tiresome or tedious or anything, but the hon. member talked about the 1961 Agreement; this was the 1956 Agreement. This Agreement was one of the last, if not the very last — I will just check that — it was two before the very last Act in 1956 which was Cap. 66, this was Cap. 64. It was enacted in November, 1956. It was shortly before I ceased to be a member of Parliament, about a month before, and I was involved not only in the passing of this legislation, I was involved in the acquisition of the property by the Admiralty, because I said that the Government of Barbados should not allow the United States Government to buy any property in Barbados.

Having ratified the agreement between a metropolitan power and the United States Government whereby these two Governments were carrying out certain experiments — I do not know what the secrecy was about — because it was largely in connection with long range communication instead of VHF, very low frequency communications for under-water craft, it was a technique being pursued by the Royal Air Force and the United States Navy, which was much more effective than using high frequency or very high frequency, and there was no atomic site or any nonsense about, I am sure that the Russians did not know anything about it, there was no classified aspect to the kind of research they were doing, but because it was shrouded in secrecy and mystery, and having established the base here with a few radio antennae and so on, the Naval personnel withdrew the CB's and so on, and it was largely taken over by civil personnel under the management of the United States Navy.

The number of aircraft which would normally visit Barbados in connection with that Facility during the course of a year would be two or three, about \$500 in landing fees, because most of the equipment which was brought in for the Facility was brought in here by.....

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: On a point of order, Sir. So that the hon. member would not get himself too much in the deep, is the hon. member saying that his information is there were only two or three, or is he stating as a fact that there were only two or three?

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Is that a point of order? I said the normal amount of aircraft, I am not talking about the U.S. Weather Bureau, because this is not a weather station, this is an oceanographic station. There is no requirement, except some special piece of equipment has to be brought in that could not be brought in by an LST, for any aircraft to come here at all, except an Admiral or somebody who wants to have a joy ride to visit one of his stations under his command. I am saying that the number of aircraft that would be necessary in the normal course of events would be two or three per annum, maybe \$500 in landing fees if they were something like C.130 Hercules which is a big, tremendous freight carrier. Even if they were bringing that kind of equipment, and I doubt during my tenure of office that we saw more than two or three aircraft coming in here which were necessary for the running of that station.

1.25 p.m.

United States aircraft have come here from time to time as part of the Weather Watch out of Puerto Rico. United States aircraft come during

the hurricane season, and all the time but not in connection with that station. I think I know what I am talking about. The hon. member has accused my former Government of not following up Stage 3 of the talks. Talks between whom?

The station was established in 1956. From 1956 to 1961 nothing happened until Dr. Eric Williams began to complain over the presence of bases about which West Indians were not even consulted. We were consulted about this base, we had full participation and we passed laws here dealing with the freedom of U.S. personnel from the normal criminal sanctions of the laws of Barbados for acts done within the jurisdiction of the base. That is what we were concerned about at the time.

From the time that the base was established the personnel did carry out certain voluntary work such as assisting in the putting out of fires and things of that kind in the northern parishes without any consultation between the Government and themselves except the Police Force and the Fire Service.

Now, in 1961, when the question arose about compensation — if the hon. member checks the files he will find out that as a result of the agitation of Dr. Williams certain things were done for places like Antigua, Trinidad and Tobago, St. Lucia and other places where bases have been established as a result of the Churchill-Roosevelt Agreement in 1941 with a view to compensating those countries for the utilisation of their land. Let us talk about that now.

What the Barbados Government really should have concerned itself about at that stage was the fact that we owned 4,900 acres of land in the South of St. Lucia at Vieux Fort. When the bases were taken away, Vieux Fort was one of the areas including the airport which had been taken over by the U.S. Government; and as I have mentioned before on the floor of this House, that was done without any consultation with the people of Barbados; but you cannot, in my opinion, approbate and reprobate at the same time.

You will remember that I said earlier I do not believe in a foreign Government owning any bits of land in Barbados. I do not believe that the Barbados Government had any right owning any land in St. Lucia. When the bases Agreement was enacted they took away the land that belonged to the Government of Barbados — not in Barbados, but in St. Lucia because we had a settlement scheme for 120 families down there; and all of the people left good agricultural land

— the best land in St. Lucia — the only place where you could put a proper airport. It was agricultural land suitable for cane growing. There is land suitable for bananas like Cul de Sac and Anse Loret, but down there at Vieux Fort was the prime land in St. Lucia.

You will remember, Sir, that some of our people, including Labour Department officials went down to administer the scheme; and as soon as the U.S. started to build the base — you will remember, Sir, that the former senior member for the parish of St. Andrew got his name “Yank” because he got his American accent in Vieux Fort through working with the Americans. However, a lot of people gave up the land and went to work with the Americans constructing the base.

The Parliament of Barbados did nothing. I suppose that during the war you had to be patriotic and you did not raise embarrassing questions. This is the land that we should have complained about. When we came to the end of the war two things should have happened. In the first place the land should have reverted in the special company — there is an Act of Parliament dealing with this. I think it was the Vieux Fort Company. A gentleman called Mr. Chase was the Chairman of that company. You would know about it, Sir, but these “Latter Day Saints” would not know about that. Mr. Chase was in charge, and again the Parliament of Barbados did nothing.

About 1948 the Americans decided to pull out. Two things happened. There was a good hospital down there and a good airfield and buildings and the U.S.A. wished to turn the whole thing over to the Government of St. Lucia, when it should have been to the Government of Barbados in my humble opinion. The British Government said that they should not do it. Even the jetty was allowed to tumble down because it would upset the economy of these territories if any of these facilities were turned over to the respective Governments. No wonder Dr. Williams got annoyed in 1961 about the treatment meted out to us not by the American Government, but by the British Government.

To add insult to injury now and to show how Parliament in Barbados was treated, a certain gentleman who had 9 children — which was his only title to fame as far as I know — the Earl of Oxford and Asquith — not our local Asquith who went to Oxford — but the Earl of Oxford and Asquith, a staunch member of the Church which was disestablished by Henry VIII, wrote to the Governor of Barbados. I have done research on this. He wrote to the Governor of Barbados, not

the Parliament of Barbados and offered something like the ridiculous sum of, I think £42,000 for 4,900 acres of land belonging to the people of Barbados in Castries, St. Lucia. This is what Lord Asquith and Oxford, did, and he wrote the Governor of Barbados; and I can find no record in the House of Assembly Minutes where the House of Assembly agreed to sell this land.

So, during the war the Americans were using land belonging to the people of Barbados. There was a personal letter written by the Governor of St. Lucia and Governor of the Windward Islands, as he then was, written to the Governor of Barbados; and that is how Barbados was dispossessed of nearly 5,000 acres of land at Vieux Fort. As I told the Premier of St. Lucia some years ago, I was glad to hear that they were building a new airport on our land, which is indeed a grand airport for the Associated State of St. Lucia.

Let me go back to where the hon. member started. He started in 1961. I started in 1941 to show the history of this thing. Barbados had no base in 1941, and the only part of Barbados which could be deemed to be part of the Agreement was the land which we owned in Vieux Fort which was never discussed in Parliament. In 1961 Hardwicke came down here, it was very difficult for the Barbados delegation to get a claim because they said that we were no longer part of the bases agreement as such; and nobody raised the point that Vieux Fort was part of Barbados' territory and that we should have been compensated for the use of Vieux Fort and the dispossession of the farmers and their families who have settled as a permanent part of Vieux Fort in the 1930s before the war even broke out.

There was no discussion on this point at all; but in 1961 an Agreement was signed by the Federal Government, and it was signed by the Prime Minister of the Federation, by Dr. Gordon Cummins, Premier of Barbados, Mr. Bird, Premier of Antigua, Mr. Manley, Premier of Jamaica, Mr. Charles for St. Lucia, Dr. Eric Williams for Trinidad and Mr. John Hardwicke. Those were the signatories, and there was provision in that Agreement. I am going to read what the Agreement says. The Agreement said that they would renew it in the light of its operation.

1.35 p.m.

The Agreement, in the light of its operation, was that consideration shall be given to the need for the defence areas and to the desirability of modifications of its terms and conditions. That is Clause 2 of the Duration

And Review, Article 24. That deals with 1968, and then it goes to 1973. As early as practicable in the year 1973 there shall be a further review of this Agreement and consideration shall be given to the strategic need for defence areas. Nowhere is there any talk about compensating anybody for anything. Nowhere is there any talk about hand-outs. He is accusing the former Government. He does not go back to the 1956 Agreement, but he comes to the 1961 Agreement made with the Federation of the West Indies in which Barbados barely got a look in and in which they said that in 5-year intervals 1961 and then in 1968 one will review the Agreement, and in 1973 one will review the Agreement. You must remember Sir, that at that time the authority for concluding external treaties of this kind, within the terms of the Act of 1961 and the Agreement which it ratified, was the Federal Government, and it was clearly contemplated that the Federal Government should take the initiative. The Federal Government went out in 1962, as you know. The Federation was dissolved formally in 1962, and we became Independent in 1966. It is questionable, in the terms of our own Act, whether the Barbados Government, on its own initiative could force, without the co-operation of the Governments of those other territories, the United States Government to come and review an Agreement which was concluded between the Federation and the Government of the United States in which we are merely sort of subsidiary signatories. (*Asides.*) All I am saying is that it is questionable.

I challenge the hon. member to show me anywhere where the United States contemplated paying the Government of Barbados any compensation. (*Asides.*) I do not have any files; the Minister has them. All I am saying is that since one of the first acts done by the Hon. member for Christ Church West, who is now Minister of Foreign Affairs, in charge of the Attorney General's Department and everything else, was to go to the United States to ask for aid — You can get aid from the United States if you want to get aid from the United States, and if they are disposed to give it, independent of any base Agreement, because it is not spelt out that there is any consideration or financial assistance, or something of that nature, from the United States Government to the Government of Barbados in particular or to any of the other Governments because the settlements in respect of the usage of the Bases during the war and immediately after the war were concluded at the time that this Agreement was entered into, and I think it was my predecessor in office who pointed out that since

Barbados itself had not been used as a base under the Churchill and Roosevelt arrangement, that Mr. Whitney had said that there were no benefits to inure, to use the expression employed by the hon. member of Christ Church West, to the country because we had not been utilised in that way.

What had happened in 1966 was that the Admiralty paid for this land and they leased it to the United States Government. A prior attempt had been made by the United States to buy the land direct, which was resisted by me, and then I went over on the other side and work for the Webster Trust Company to make sure that the Barbadian Company got a fit and proper price for the land which they were giving up. I do not know whether I was successful, but they got a better price than the Government of Barbados at the time suggested should be paid because the Admiralty had no special knowledge of these matters.

I will come now to the other aspect, the existing position. It is right that the Admiralty should not own this land any more, and it is also right that we should not pay the Admiralty any money for this land, because the Agreement itself said that the United Kingdom, whether it is true or not, whether they did it as a camouflage or not, the Agreement said that the United Kingdom, was going to use the Base. If they had the use of the base jointly from 1956 to 1977, they cannot claim that they have not had any benefit from it. There should be no talk about not paying them for it because they do not deserve to be paid for it. It was not a big lot of money anyhow. They said that they were using it jointly in 1956, and again in 1961 that was clear.

Now, when it was known that the lease expires in 1977, I, personally, started very quiet negotiations which I reported to Cabinet. I started negotiations as a result of a Resolution passed at the Annual Conference of the Democratic Labour Party about three years ago, and the programme which I had in mind was that when the lease came to an end, as I am fairly certain that the United States Government is no longer interested in it — All of this chest beating and chest thumping from one of the weakest vessels that we have around the place is not very impressive at all. He had better be careful he does not fracture a few ribs, when he does all of this chest thumping and says he is not afraid of the United States and so on. I do not think the United States Government is any longer interested in the research of the facility which exists in

Harrison's Point in St. Lucy. My idea was that the Base would be admirable as a polytechnic institution for the North point of the Island and every member of my Party here can tell you that. (*Asides.*) I am reminded by the members on this side of the House that I said so inside this Chamber.

I am a Barbadian, and I do not believe in this business they are getting on with trying to divide the country straight down the middle. Those who are in the Government have jobs, and those who are not with the Government do not have jobs. Those who are in the Government can go to school, and the rest must remain ignorant. I would like to see the people even in St. Peter, and you know what I mean, Sir. I will go further and say that I would like to see the people in St. Peter especially have the use of that facility at Harrison's Point to further their education. I am not suggesting that they need this to change their representative. I am talking about technical education and not political education. We will do the political education, but I want to see a polytechnic institution in the North of the Island. As a matter of fact, it is the committed programme of my Party that there should be two more polytechnic institutions in the Island. I would like to see that base used for that purpose. You can be assured, Sir, that if there is a step in the direction that we are going to get that institution, then it will have my support. I do not like this kind of talk that I heard in here today that the Government did nothing to get this or that from the United States. If we wanted to get anything from the United States, as we tried to get a programme for housing, we would operate it independent of any question of a Base Agreement.

1.45 p.m.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, I do not know if there is any other hon. member who wishes to speak.

Mr. SPEAKER: Are there any other hon. members who wish to make a contribution?

Dr. CADDLE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to assure the hon. member for Christ Church West that in my capacity as a Minister of the previous Government I have always exercised an interest in this particular matter, and contrary to the statements which he has made here today, although he may not be able to find it in the files to make him think otherwise, I have pursued this matter repeatedly and I have got different answers on different occasions. I would like to assure him, and I believe that he is the

type of person who would believe, that this matter has been pursued between 1971 and 1976 when I was a Minister. He has reminded me of an incident reading from the files where this matter was taken up by the Ministry of Home Affairs, and even on a number of other occasions I have taken up this matter, because I have always found it difficult to accept a Base as such in Barbados under the terms enunciated in this particular Act.

In passing I would like to point out that this Act came about as a result of agreements signed on the 10th February, 1961, between the Government of the Federation of the West Indies and the United States relating to the use and occupation by the United States of America of a Defence Area in Barbados, the operation therein of an Oceanographic Research Station and for other purposes arising out of and incidental to the said agreement, and it was ratified by the House of Assembly on the 1st December 1961, by the Government preceding the Democratic Labour Party. There are things in this Act which I have questioned, and Sir, you will recall that soon after the elections in September I came to you with a Resolution dealing with the matter and on your advice the matter was not proceeded with. I am saying that just to emphasise that I have been interested, and because of my interest in the matter the Cabinet has had to consider it on various occasions and give advice. Whether or not I accepted that advice for the reasons given, the point is that it was dealt with. I am not concerned with the past because there could be a lot of reasons advanced to explain why this did not happen and why that did not happen, but I am quite certain that in due course of time the present Cabinet Ministers will find that a lot of things they would like to have done are not done because there are a lot of reasons Civil Servants can advance.

The point I am concerned with is that we have reached the stage where we are now going to see the end of the ownership of this land by a foreign Government. What I would like to know and what I believe most of the people in Barbados would like to know also is what would be the position of the United States now that the ownership of this land is passed from the Admiralty of the British Government to the Government and people of Barbados. I believe that the hon. member in his reply would be able to expand on this, because I feel it is high time that an independent country such as Barbados, being aware of the various conditions and circumstances attendant in this particular area, should seek to get out of such an

agreement and have no Base of the nature of the one in the northern area of Barbados which stood to expose us to a lot of problems unnecessarily. Only a couple of days ago the people of this country were disturbed over a certain report concerning ships off the coast of Barbados, and I must congratulate some of the members on the other side for the speed with which they went to the airport. Maybe they wanted to put themselves in a position of being a Government in exile, and I am concerned because when you have bases of this nature on your country, other people who have a grouse with a country that hold these bases are not going to overlook what you may consider an unimportant matter. I would therefore like to congratulate the Hon. Minister on the speed in which he has set about to effect, as I would put it, stage one in the elimination of this Base from the northern area of Barbados.

The Hon. Minister has talked a lot about the failure of the previous Government to get certain benefits. I also am at a loss to understand from anything in the Act what are the benefits which would have accrued to Barbados if, as he said, the previous Government had pursued this particular matter. Now, Sir, it is very easy to castigate the previous Government, and in this atmosphere which you now have which I refer to as political cannibalism where you find politicians setting about to eat one another, you must expect this type of thing to continue, this type of bellicose verbosity which we hear over and over again and which some people could interpret when they hear it that it means a solution to the problems of Barbados. You will find in the long run that that is not the case, and I think that in trying to give the impression repeatedly that there is a division in the ranks of Barbadians can only invite some of our enemies to attempt to really bring about a type of situation which some of us thought was occurring a couple of days ago.

Sir, I hope when the Minister replies that he will set out in some detail the benefits which he claims we should have got and did not get because I am concerned, and I would like to know because I have noted as he has noted that other countries which have concluded agreements with the United States have been given various forms of aid and have continued to get this form of aid even after these bases had served their usefulness. In the case of Barbados while it is very easy for him to use these examples to indicate that we have not been doing our homework, I think he owes a greater duty to the people of this country to get down and

qualify the benefits which he claims we should have got, but due to negligence of the former Government the people of Barbados did not get.

Sir, I have been made aware recently that the United States Government has no great interest in continuing that facility in the northern area of Barbados, and in a private conversation with the hon. member for Christ Church West I have alluded to this, and I hope he will be in a position to confirm or deny whether or not this is so, and at what time can the people of Barbados look forward to the removal and exit of the United States personnel and equipment from the northern area of this country, and to indicate to the people of Barbados what is the policy of the present Government regarding the land in the northern area. As the hon. member for St. John has said, and I would like to confirm this, this matter has been discussed by us at Cabinet and the question of a polytechnic facility for the people of the northern parishes of Barbados has been put forward as one of the uses to which this plant can be put.

It is quite easy to get up and repeatedly talk about not finding things in the files. There are a lot of things which people will discuss and come to agreement on that you will not find on file. This has happened before and will happen again because until you decide to take definitive action on an issue, it is very unlikely that a file would be opened up on that matter. Yet this will not prevent people from sitting down and discussing in their party caucuses or among Cabinet Ministers what should be the position on a particular point. I have every reason to believe that the present members of the Barbados Labour Party do it; they sit down and discuss what they would like to see done on a party basis, and I do not think it is nice to use the excuse that the absence of information on a file is evidence that we discussed or did not discuss a particular area.

Sir, I hope that in concluding this agreement that the hon. member will go a step further.
1.55 p.m.

The people of Barbados are concerned about the presence of the base in St. Lucy. We need not go into the kind of problems Barbados has had in the past from the United States facilities, but I believe that in that particular area there is going to be a sigh of relief when the base comes to an end. There are certain people who will regret its closing because of certain benefits they have received; but one of

the problems which arose from the presence of those people in the area is the matter of Barbadian women becoming pregnant. This is nothing new; it happens wherever service men are involved, but you find that the mothers are at a loss to make contact with the father of the child....(ASIDES)

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us have some order please.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: If the hon. member would give way I think it is time for the suspension.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. SPEAKER: The time is now 2 o'clock and this Sitting stands suspended until 2.45 p.m.
2.00 p.m.

On resumption:

Mr. SPEAKER: It is now Question Time.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, before we go into Private Members Business, which I don't think is on the Order Paper, I would like to raise a matter. It is not a contentious matter but as Leader of the Opposition I would like an explanation....

Mr. SPEAKER: I must enquire, is it a matter which has occurred since we returned to this Chamber at 2.45 p.m.?

Hon. F. G. SMITH: No, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: You will not be heard by me on this matter.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Do you know what it is I am raising?

Mr. SPEAKER: Since the matter did not occur since our return to this Chamber it would mean you had ample time to raise it....

Hon. F. G. SMITH: During Government's Business?

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the Opposition will not be heard.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I expect to be treated with courtesy.

QUESTION TIME

Mr. SPEAKER: It is now Question Time. The hon. member for St. Michael South, his question No. 43.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, To ask the Minister of Education and Culture: Will the Minister state: (i) How many persons not previously working with the School Meals Department have been given employment with that Department on the unestablished Staff since April 1, 1977? (ii) What are the ages of each such person so employed? (iii) From what dates was each such person employed? (iv) How many persons have been recruited for employment with the School Meals Department's unestablished staff but whose actual employment is not scheduled to take place before 1st August, 1977?

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Speaker, the reply to Parliamentary Question No. 43 is as follows:

1. None.
2. Does not apply.
3. Does not apply.
4. None.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Supplementary Question, Mr. Speaker. Are there any workers taken on in the School Meals Department in an acting capacity since April 1, 1977?

Hon. L. R. TULL: There have been a few people who have been acting in a temporary capacity for people on vacation.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Would the Minister state the ages of such persons who have been taken on in an acting capacity for those persons who may be on leave?

Mr. SPEAKER: This is not a proper supplementary.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, the original question asked about ages, how then - - -

Mr. SPEAKER: Please do not argue with the Chair.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker...

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the hon. member take his seat.
2.50 p.m.

Mr. SANDIFORD: I believe he was attempting to provoke the same type of response of this side. It may be felt that he had a very good Gallery and that he should attempt on this occasion to criticise and castigate the Democratic Labour Party. He

should have realised that the television cameras had long been removed from the Chamber and that the type of publicity which he might have been hoping for through that medium was not available to him.

However, I would like to say this much. Let us look at what this measure is about and let us see who are really responsible for the present position. Mr. Speaker, it is a very simple matter. The measures which are being sought to be amended were not of the making of the Democratic Labour Party administration, they were not of the Democratic Labour Party administration, so whatever gallant attempts are being made from the Government benches, front and back, in order to try to put the former administration in the dock, as it were, for the existing position certainly falls short of the mark, for the simple truth is that the agreements enshrined in the laws of this country all predate the coming into being of the Democratic Labour Party administration in 1961. All of those measures that they are talking about were negotiated by the Barbados Labour Party, and if they want now to criticise the actions done by the first Barbados Labour Party administration, well let them get up openly and say that, but do not try by specious argument and by devious reasoning to try to make it appear, to make the people of this country believe that the agreement in relation to the land in St. Lucy used by the United States Government for its oceanographic research station, so called, that that was something devised, concocted, agreed and set out by the Democratic Labour Party, because that is far from the truth, and if we have to put certain things in perspective - it seems to be worrying the member for St. Michael South East - it is not because of our love for history or for some antiquarian interest in things past, this is not Thomas Carlisle past and present, we do it because of actions taken on behalf of the people of this country since 1961 and down to 1976 are being questioned, are being attacked by the present Barbados Labour Party administration, and on each occasion when those attacked are launched from this side of the Chamber we will defend what we have done for the people of this country, and so we have to put those things in perspective, but we do so because there is a distortion of the record.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the Opposition. (Hon. F. G. SMITH: I am listening.) (*Asides*).

Let us have some order. There being no further questions, this brings us to the end of Question Time. It is now Private Members Business; but there being no private members matters on the Order Paper, we now go back to Government Business. Government Business is now the instant Order of the Day.

RESUMPTION OF DEBATE ON BILL TO AMEND THE CROWN LANDS (VESTING AND DISPOSAL) ACT

Dr. CADDLE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that we on this side welcome this piece of legislation because we accept that it is in keeping with the dignity of a sovereign, independent country; and we do not deny him the credit which will fall on him for introducing this Bill. However, we feel that something more has to be done, and as I have pointed out in my previous remarks that something has to do with the continued presence of the United States base or facility in Barbados. I hope that during his reply he will give some indication of what the Government intends to do about that.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the Hon. Attorney General on this particular piece of legislation, and when he had finished speaking I thought that this piece of legislation was something earth shattering; but all that this Bill seeks to do is to vest in the Crown a property which is now being used as a naval base and which was formerly vested in the Admiralty.

I do not think that it is a piece of legislation with which anyone could disagree. Barbados is a small country, and there is not much land to occupy; and therefore any land that is foreign owned should be vested in the Crown in the right and on behalf of the people of Barbados. If you look at the sections of this particular Bill you will realise that it deals with amendments to Sections 25, 26, 27 and 28 and the Schedule of an Act which has absolutely nothing to do with the naval base in the sense that the Act establishing the naval base in Cap. 19 of the Revised laws of Barbados.

Of course, the existence of the base is relevant, and the agreement is relevant. We have heard that we are going to get money, and that we are going to talk to the Americans straight. I have had the pleasure of listening over the weekend to this alarm, and I have told the Government and the Minister responsible for Defence that when it comes to the question of

the integrity and the safety of Barbados he has my whole hearted support.

I wonder what the Government is now seeing when they criticised the coast guard. I was happy to see that one of the first Defence Forces that went out was the coast guard whom we were led to believe were people who used to go pushing in the Grenadines; and they were accusations about a waste of money and of the coast guard not being a priority. Yet we hear that the coast guard was one of the defence units shadowing the biggest aircraft carrier in the world belonging to the Russians. It is very interesting; but be that as it may, let us go back to the naval base.

The Minister has not told us yet whether it is Government's policy not to renew the agreement with the Americans when it expires this year. Am I to understand from the Minister that the Government is prepared, provided that the terms suit the Government, to renew this lease to the American Government, or whether on the expiration of the agreement the Americans will be asked to pack up and go? That is the fundamental point, and I want to be told what is the Government's policy about this base.

If the present Government wishes to continue the lease, that is the decision that any Government has to make. We are saying quite clearly that if we were in Government, we would use it for educational purposes in the north of this country, therefore inferentially indicating that the Democratic Labour Party would have terminated the lease. We hinted that. We said that we would terminate the present lease.

It is all right for the Minister to go through the files. I am tired of hearing the complaints that something is not in the files. A Development Plan is only a guide line. You can add to it or subtract from it or alter it. Be that as it may the Minister is talking about what he is to get although he has not got it. I wonder if he could give the House some idea of what figure he estimates, since the last Government, according to him, did not collect from the American Government for the lease. He said that he is going to talk to the Americans, and yet we read in the newspaper that he is annoyed with the Americans because they were jamming radar at the airport and did not tell him what the planes were doing.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: On a point of order. Will the hon. member keep the records

straight? I never said that I was annoyed with the Americans.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: The Prime Minister's Press Secretary sends out about three letters a day. I would like to see an extra one.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The hon. member last week made certain innuendos indicating that I want him to be...

Hon. F. G. SMITH: That is following your example. What I am saying is that I have seen no correction to a suggestion that the Barbados Labour Party was annoyed with the Americans either for not telling them before hand of the present planes in the Barbados area, or not giving them the necessary intelligence of the presence of Russian ships in the territorial waters of Barbados. That is what the public read. I am not saying something which comes out of my fertile imagination. (*Asides*) A fertile imagination is connected with intelligence.

3.00 p.m.

I hope you understand military operations, because I have heard it said that you went to the Airport fairly speedily. Be that as it may, on the question of security, you have our complete support. What I would like the Minister to do is not to harp back, because he seems now to be the spokesman of the bad old days. On the 2nd September the people gave you the Government and, therefore, your job is not to make political points that we did nothing in 1971 or 1973, and Mr. So and So got money from the Americans. As a matter of fact, the Barbados Government, as you have discovered, under the Democratic Labour Party, apart from a gift of \$50 million at Independence, existed and improved the standard of living of the people of Barbados without any aid from America. That in itself is an achievement.

Whether the former member for St. John dine or wined with President Johnson, I think it will be agreed in Barbados that in our Government we were thought to be opposed to the Americans and, especially, when we joined and went along with the other Caribbean territories and established diplomatic relations with Cuba. I think you know from then on what happened in the various territories of the Caribbean. I think it was quite clear, and it was clear when the Prime Minister called in the last American Ambassador regarding certain utterances he made. It must be clear that, whatever may be said of the Democratic Labour Party Government, it could not be said that it was a mendicant Government, or went to the American Government cap in hand for any support for anything that we did.

What we are interested in is that the Minister himself, now that he is the accredited representative in the field of Foreign Affairs of the Government and people of Barbados, must try to get for the people of Barbados, if he so can, the maximum from an Agreement entered into in the days when Barbados was not a state of the country. To get on as if the last Government did not have a microscope monitoring an Agreement — (*Asides.*) To me those days are passed, and that is no political mileage. If you find that there are areas in this Agreement which will enable you, economically, to benefit, then it is your function, since you have the reins of office, if you can, in the firmest and strongest terms, get for the people of Barbados what you say they were entitled to and which the last Government, according to you, did not collect from the American Government. We wish you the best of luck. If you can get billions you can get them, and you will have our support over here. If you get hundreds of millions, you will have our support, but what we want you to do is to come and tell us that you have them. Do not say you are going to get. When you get, then my praises for you will be greater. My praises for you will know no bounds when you come in here either terminating or renewing, but renewing on such terms that the Treasury of Barbados will benefit to a colossal extent from the negotiations which you have firmly, sincerely, and bluntly carried on with the country up North.

We are not opposing you, but we do not like the manner in which you of late — and this is quite contrary to your approach lately — and that is why we will tangle. At one time you were a strong member of the Party fighting, naturally, in the best traditions of Parliament, but lately you have undertaken the task of being the political defender. I see the member for St. Andrew smiling. He is a politician right through, and I have a tribute to pay to him. As I said to him before, you have to like people to run five times and lose and still keep on. I would not be doing that. I do not like people that much. I pay tribute to him as a politician and a man who likes people. I have told him that to his face. I would not run five times to lose anything. I can tell you that. Five times?

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us come down to the Crown Lands.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I appreciate that. I would not get into five marriages. Be that as it may, I want the Minister of Labour — (*Asides.*) Not the Minister of Labour, he is on my mind. I want the Attorney-General to know that on this Bill he has the support of the Opposition, and in the negotiations which he says he is about to

carry on with the American Government the Opposition hopes that he will endeavour at all stages, if he has found — I have not been asked to interpret the Agreement. I have read it, but when you are not reading it for a fee you do not interpret it with the strictness that you would if you had to give an opinion. Be that as it may, I hope that he will be in a position, if it is possible, and if as he says — I assume that, as Attorney-General and as principal legal adviser to the Government and with the amount of officers he has at his disposal, he has certainly gone into this agreement in greater detail than I have done. I would like to assure him that if, as a result of any efforts he makes and any negotiations he engages in can benefit the Government of Barbados and thereby obtain from the country to the North the maximum results, then he has the wholehearted support of the Opposition. We are supporting this measure, and he need not worry that on this matter there should be any great difficulty. The only reason I speak is that I think we have come in this Parliament long past the days when you say, "The last Government did this and that."

I have had the experience, and I think my colleague, the member for St. Michael South, finds that when you ought to say the last Government initiated something, or the last Government brought something to a point, you do not say it. If you do not say it when we do something, like the telephone loan, do not go back and say we did nothing. If you are going straight down the line and have open Government, then praise the DLP for what it did, and castigate it for what it did. That is all we ask. Do not just criticize us when you have the files with something to show that we initiated it. You go on as if the world started with you. The beginning started with the BLP and there was light. There was light before you came into power, and there will be light long after you have gone.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on this matter because I have very strong feelings on the question of treaties with Foreign Governments. I want to say that I was, certainly, very heartened and pleased when I realised that there was a strong desire on the part of this present Government, of which I am happy to be a member, to make sure that the treaty which governs the naval base in St. Lucy would be re-negotiated to the point where the people of Barbados would have reverted to them the land which is theirs and which they are entitled to have.

As the hon. Attorney-General pointed out, when he introduced this measure, Barbados seemed

not to have done well with respect to the lease Agreements dealing with these bases which sprung up all over the West Indies, and to a greater extent in the World, during the period from 1941 onwards.

3.10 p.m.

We in Barbados have benefited nothing at all as a result of the use of land in St. Lucy and it was my unhappy experience to discover only recently in the Ministry of Communications and Works when you are asked to evaluate the damage which could have occurred to the roads in Barbados and what the Ministry could have lost as a result of the operation of the Naval Base in this Island that we would not have lost less than \$½ million by way of taxes for motor vehicles and repairs to roads in this Island. It is unfortunate to say the least that the Democratic Labour Party Government did not see the necessity despite the constant pricking which we were having from people in our midst and despite the fact that people throughout the world were seeking to negotiate these various treaties. We have had the experience of Chaguaramas and the efforts on the part of Dr. Eric Williams and his People's National Movement, to galvanise the people of Trinidad into action by claiming the area of lands which the people of Trinidad had conceded, I believe not because of their will but because it was imposed upon them by the British Government, and therefore, Mr. Speaker, we in Barbados feel that the time has come when we cannot ignore the fact that there is a large track of land which is ours by right and which we are entitled to have benefits from remaining in the possession of a foreign power.

The Naval Base in St. Lucy operates as a law unto itself and as a sovereign state within a State, and no self-respecting people or Government can continue to have such a situation operating on its territory. The present Government of Barbados being aware of its duties and responsibilities to the people have decided to bring to an end the situation as we found it. The Learned Attorney General referred to the question that we never sought to negotiate stage three of the agreement. That was a vital stage. If we had sought to negotiate stage three of the agreement, we would have found ourselves able to get a number of benefits which other areas of the Caribbean have got. Trinidad got tremendous benefits and of course I do not have to spell out to this House the financial position of Trinidad and Tobago. They are far better off than we are. They are so wealthy now with their petro-dollars that other Governments in the Caribbean are running to them cap in hand at certain times to seek benefits from them. If they could seek to have

certain benefits from the wealthy and mighty United States Government, there is no reason why we in Barbados should think that we are so important and mighty that we should not seek to have benefits from the American Government as well. That we do not have these benefits and that the former Government did not seek to negotiate these substantial benefits we could have got is certainly no credit to them. They have failed miserably in their duties and obligations to the people of this country, and they stand indicted for having failed to get the necessary benefits which they could have got as a result of allowing the United States Government to continue to operate and to derive the benefits which they got from the use of the Base in St. Lucy.

This Government is now seeking to put right the mistakes of the past, and to try to bring up to date the problems which the last administration failed to bring up to date. By this Act which we are seeking to implement today, this Government will seek to bring to the country the benefits which we are entitled to. Take for example, Mr. Speaker, Antigua. Antigua has sought in its way, despite the fact that it is not a sovereign independent state, to get a number of benefits from the United States Government. Equally so the Government of the Bahamas, and as I said previously the Government of Trinidad and Tobago; and I feel very strongly that the Government should set about in very forceful terms to get certain rights which we are entitled to by way of benefits for the number of years that the Americans were operating in this country without this Government getting any tax benefits. The Leader of the Opposition remarked that he would be glad if we could get hundred of millions of dollars. We may not get millions of dollars, but I feel that with very hard bargaining, with a determined approach towards the problems and letting the Americans understand that we are not begging them for anything, but that we are entitled to certain benefits as a result of what they got from us, the use of our roads, the use of our airport, the use of our harbours, the use of our infra-structural arrangements, we can impress upon them that we are entitled to certain benefits from that Government. They have given certain funds and have helped to put corrupt regimes in the area; all over the world they have done this, they have spent millions of dollars to buttress reactionary Governments, and there is no reason why support could not be given to honest and sincere Governments trying to work in the interest of people in honest societies.

We feel very strongly that the American Government should be told in no uncertain

terms that they have had sufficient from us, and it is time in turn that they should give something back, and we cannot sit idly by. The people are questioning how it is that the Americans continue to operate among us and there are no benefits to be derived.

When I pass the walls in St. Lucy I wonder what is going on there. We cannot afford to have a Government within a Government, and we have got to be concerned; we have got to be unhappy, we have got to be thinking as to what is happening within the walls of St. Lucy. That the British Admiralty is prepared to vest this land as a result of our determination to get it back in the Government of Barbados is indicative of the fact that they understand our determination to see that our rights are not trampled on, and we will not allow the American people nor any other Government for that matter to utilise the resources in this country without giving adequate and corresponding benefits to the people of this Island.

For myself I will do all that lies within my power to make sure that a careful investigation is carried out as to what harm has been done to the country as a result of the leasing of the land in St. Lucy, the use of the Base and the use of the facilities so that the people in this country will get benefits in return for the lease of the properties which they have suffered as a result.

Mr. BRADSHAW: Mr. Speaker, I have listened attentively to hon. members on the Opposition benches and what amazes me most was the fact that I felt at one stage that the hon. member for St. John was treating us with some historical facts and was taking us into a journey in the past. I must say that I have been in this Honourable Chamber for over ten months, and I do not believe that the historical facts that appeared correct and accurate were indeed accurate. However, the Attorney General in introducing this Bill simply wanted this Honourable House to know that there was a question and a need to look into the agreement and the leasing of the portion of land in St. Lucy.

3.20 p.m.

And he made it abundantly clear that as Attorney General and Minister responsible for this he was going to see to it that the lands are vested in the Government of Barbados for the first time, and hence give Barbados rightful ownership to this piece of land. The Attorney General had made abundantly clear the lack of foresight in not understanding that the people of

Barbados should have the right and entitlement to the land in St. Lucy, but I notice that members of the Opposition get up and try to criticize the Government nevertheless. I want them to understand that we on the back benches will take care of them.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as early as when the Black Star was in circulation, a member who is now a member of the Democratic Labour Party criticized the agreement between the administration which was in power then and the United States administration, and I must say he criticized the former administration for entering into agreement with the U.S. Government and at the same time not looking after the interests of Barbadians. He was criticising the DLP administration and he said that the truth of this matter needed to be unfolded. That is what I call plain talk. So don't come here today and say that the hon. Attorney General is looking into the past or that he is throwing aspersions on the former administration, because members of this Government brought it to the attention of the then administration and they dragged their feet; and I see no reason why we as a progressive government should allow this situation to continue without some satisfactory arrangement made. We feel that the United States, Britain or any other government should not be entitled to possess lands in Barbados. We feel that all lands should be vested in the government for the benefit of the people, so it is no point coming here today and seeking to excuse anyone for not acting in such a manner to see to it that the agreement which existed in 1956 or 1961 was not entered upon with the condition of review to see whether it was relevant to Barbados.

In 1966 we obtained independence, and all agreements which then affected Barbados should have been looked at; but absolutely nothing was done in this direction. Yet the hon. Leader of the Opposition gets up with some imaginary idea seeking to make a cheap political point. What the Leader of the Opposition must understand is this: this is no time to get up in here and at one time say he is going to support this Government, and on the other hand seeking political mileage for his party. The people of this country were not satisfied they were doing their jobs properly and threw them out in September 1976.

So, Mr. Speaker, this Bill before us is straightforward and simple, and I rise to support the Government in its bold steps in confronting the United States and asking them to sit down and negotiate in terms not detrimental to our people. The Attorney General is big enough to stand up and negotiate on behalf of this

Government, and this is what we need. I am sure that Barbadians are not satisfied that such a bold step was taken by the former administration. So we must realize that the hon. Attorney General has brought to this House a very far reaching Bill. I am sure that the Attorney General in his wisdom and with the credibility and potential he has will bring a satisfactory conclusion to this matter once and for all.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I would start by taking up a theme initiated by my colleague who in his address to this Chamber on this matter expressed a certain measure of regret that the Attorney General in introducing this matter slipped from his accustomed position of putting matters in perspective and sought on this occasion to criticise the former Democratic Labour Party administration for something for which it certainly should not be blamed.

3.30 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, the main point I wish to get across as my contribution to this debate is that the legislation which is being criticised here today was not legislation drafted by the Democratic Labour Party, and I want this to get home to all and sundry. It was not done by the Democratic Labour Party, this was something done in the days of the Barbados Labour Party, and this essential point seems to have escaped certain spokesmen over there and others in the country who may be misguided on this particular matter. It has to be said, Mr. Speaker, and I am going to make the point, so if this present Barbados Labour Party administration comes now to correct certain errors — shall we call them errors? — (*Asides*). I will use the word you tell me to use on this matter, certain infelicities? If the present administration now comes to correct certain deficiencies which were created by the first Barbados Labour Party administration, then they should come out and say so openly without trying by innuendo, or by some association to taint the Democratic Labour Party in that particular process.

That is all there is to this particular matter that is before us, that is the only matter that is before us, and I believe that in a matter such as this which is really a national issue — and this is what I regret about the manner in which this particular measure was introduced, or at least part of it — the fact that in a matter such as this which is of national importance, which brings us face to face with sovereignty in this country, that the present administration should be trying or attempting to divide the country on an issue such as this. On an issue such as this there should be a national consensus when it comes to the

resources of Barbados, because land constitutes the main resource, apart from the people, of this country and on this matter we should be approaching it with a national consensus the terms and conditions under which one of the main resources in this country should be controlled by the people of this country. Instead of that, what do we get? No national consensus, but an attempt to blame the Democratic Labour Party for something which was not of the Democratic Labour Party's making. I will repeat it. The negotiations and the agreements resulting therefrom all arose under the first Barbados Labour Party Administration, so I give the Government credit for coming now and correcting the deficiencies in the agreements which were originally made.

I wish to make a particular point, and it relates to the relations between the United States Government and the Government of Barbados. We have heard a lot of statements coming from United States sources about respect and regard for human rights in all parts of the world. We have heard that the United States will be reviewing its policy, or changing its policy in respect of those Governments which do not have a true regard for human rights and re-arrange its relations in a beneficial way — let me put it that way — in regard to those countries which have a high regard for human rights.

3.40 p.m.

Well, the Government of Barbados has been one of the few countries in the world, or among a minority of Governments in the world which have an outstanding record as far as respect for fundamental human rights is concerned. (ASIDES). Mr. Speaker, why do you not protect me from the member for St. Michael West? I am not saying that it was the only Government. I would say, Mr. Speaker, that what has happened is that in spite of our record for human rights and in spite of this newly enunciated policy over the years there has been very little bilateral assistance and direct assistance from the Government of the U.S.A. to the Government of Barbados.

We have never gone cap in hand seeking aid. We have always been interested in this country in using our resources and the resources of friendly governments in order to make life for the people of this country much easier; but we have never been the beneficiaries of any such financial assistance from the Government of the U.S.A. A few years ago I took up what I believe was a fact sheet which the U.S.A. put out on different operations in the world in terms of assistance agreements between the U.S.A. and those

countries. When it came to Barbados, the only assistance that we could find in that particular document was the fact that the United States Government contributed to the World Food Programme, and that the World Food Programme is a project going on in Barbados. That was the only project of assistance that we find listed in that particular document.

I hope that this present Government, instead of talking about who went to dine with the former President Johnson at some stage in his political career, would get on with the constructive areas of Government and carry out the type of development plans where this land is concerned. I would like to tell him that there was discussion — indeed it was part of the policy of the Democratic Labour Party as enunciated from time to time, including an enunciation in the manifesto — that we would build not only one Polytechnic, but two, one in the north of the Island and one in the south of the Island. Those who want to do research can find this out.

I know that they say that they cannot find the files. If they read a little more carefully and study their briefs they will see that the things that we are saying are accurate. The hon. member may try to laugh away these statements, but the truth is that the record cannot be laughed away. This is part of our policy and this party is still committed to that development; and within the next two years when the Democratic Labour Party returns as the Government of this country — your time is shorter than you think. The people of this country are watching and they are suffering already; and when the time comes we will put this country back on the road of national development which has been in operation between 1961 and 1976.

So, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I wish to point out that this matter is a simple one. The present Barbados Labour Party administration is now correcting some of the deficiencies of the previous Barbados Labour Party administration. That is what this is all about. On a matter like this we would have been silent; but instead of simply coming here and doing the people's business, putting the legislation here and getting the concurrence of both sides of the House, the present Government has lapsed into trying to criticise the previous administration for some sin of which it has not been guilty.

Mr. GREAVES: A lot of points have been ventilated on this particular matter, and I would feel very sorry if this debate had taken place and I did not make my contribution. As you are aware, the area of land presently under discussion

is part of my constituency and it therefore means that I have some particular interest in what sort of arrangements are going to be made under this particular law.

I have listened to the Hon. Attorney General when he introduced the Bill here today, and after listening very carefully I am still at a loss to find out exactly what is the position as far as the future of the piece of land is concerned. I think that the Hon. Attorney General owes it to this House to let us know the terms that he has negotiated and what is the policy of the Government on this matter.

As has been pointed out by my colleagues this is a matter of vital importance in public relations between this Government and another Government. I think that it is important for us to know — with all this talk about open Government — what the position is. There have been some comments made in a different place, for instance that the BLP does not intend to renew the agreement, and that the base will be moving to an island just off Anguilla. I would like to know what the position is because people will be affected, and the whole relationship between Barbados and the foreign Government is something that we are discussing here.

I would like to think that it is important that in the reply of the Attorney General he gives some indication as to the position of the present Barbados Government on this particular matter. As I have said, this is a question of foreign policy, a question which is of vital concern to all of us.

3.50 p.m.

I daresay it is a question which also has to do with security, and since it is a matter which involves the entire country, then the openness which he has espoused on more than one occasion should now be forthcoming so that we could know very clearly what the position is and we would be in a position to understand the issues which are involved in this particular matter.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, I think that the interest in the Opposition in this debate demonstrates that I began on the right foot, because instead of having only one main spokesman in answering some of the points which I have made, we have had five major speeches today from the Opposition benches. I would have liked to have been in a position to congratulate some of the speakers, but I regret that the first speaker not only suffered from a lapse of memory, but an ability to forge

historical rectitude and correctness of fact, and as for the hon. member for St. Michael South, I think that he tried in vain and with a great deal of fortitude, of loudness of language, but not really fortitude of spirit, to explain away the omissions of the past Government.

Regardless of how much he may like his Acting Leader of the Opposition today talking about my thumping my breast or indeed, regardless of how much he may say that we have not as much time as we anticipated, the point remains that he has no clue at all, after having been a Minister for several years, of what happened under this Agreement. I believe that the hon. member for St. Michael North Central spoke, perhaps, correctly in some respects, that he was continually asking, he says, for answers to his questions and not getting them from the responsible Minister, which would be at one stage the then Prime Minister, who was in charge of Foreign relations; Mr. Cameron Tudor, who was in charge of Foreign relations, and Mr. George Moe, who had been in charge of Foreign relations. This is obvious. Now what am I being told? We have a duty now, according to the Leader of the Opposition, who is now back in his seat, to get on with the job, and see that the Agreement is carried out, but we must gloss over their duty which they had to do between 1961 and 1977 to see that the Agreement was carried out as well, and where they have omitted and failed in their duty, I am to come in here as though I am somebody incarnated and be nice to them on a matter that they have never been nice to the Barbados Labour Party or themselves.

I sat in here in 1971, and not only was the past history of the Labour Party misrepresented and, thank God, forty years afterwards, Sir Grantley Adams' son is here to correct a lot of the wrong things said about him in historical perspective, but the history of the Labour Party and its work between 1948 to 1961 was misrepresented both outside and inside of this Chamber. I have heard hon. members on the other side, including the hon. member who ran out of this House from me last week, misrepresent the position — (*Asides.*) He is begging today!

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us have some order, please.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: That is the situation, Sir. We have a duty as well when you have gone wrong in your administration to let the public of Barbados know that you went wrong in your administration, and all is not

praise for you. If you did a job badly, you did it badly, and I will continue to say that you have done it badly. The manner in which you have administered this Agreement pays no credit to the intelligence of Barbadians as a whole. That is the indictment. The hon. member for St. Michael South can try to riggle out by saying that the Agreement was signed by the Barbados Labour Party Government in 1961, and the people must get that clear. The point is you, as successor to the Government, had an obligation to make that Agreement work to the maximum benefit of this country. As the hon. member for St. Andrew said, you stand indicted as having failed miserably on the point. That is the charge that none of the other members have answered.

Now, I want to go back to deal with the hon. member for St. John. I opened in historical perspective by stating that Barbados did not come under the 1941 U.S. Lease Base Agreement, or the Destroyer Agreement, as some people called it. I said that the history of the Act started in 1956 and prior thereto in 1955 when the negotiations were going on. The hon. member was obviously not listening. He opened by saying that my knowledge was restrictive and that the Act was passed in 1956, but his knowledge goes back before that time when he was working for the Webster Trust Company. I know that the hon. member worked as a junior counsel to Mr. Edward Keith Walcott and holding his papers in relation to the negotiations for compensation. I know how much he was paid. The notes are there. He was working for the Webster Trust Company. You would not hear in these days that the Webster Trust Company was big business. He was a good lawyer, and he obviously helped Mr. Keith Walcott against his well-known friend and enemy at times, because himself and Mr. Dear has a kind of love/hate relationship, Jack Dear on the other side and, indeed, he got more money than the Admiralty was willing to pay but less than what he was asking for. I know all of that, but this has nothing to do with the fact that when I opened on this that I am not stating the historical facts. This 1961 Agreement, however, was negotiated by the Federal Government with the Government of the United States under a power of an entrustment given to it by the British Government, and where all of the unit territories affected by the lease bases were represented at that talks and, indeed, the Agreement was signed by them as delegates of the Federal Government in order to keep the strict legal position, and because each of them

insisted that they had a right to negotiate about their own future.

It is not strictly speaking correct to just discount what happened at those negotiations. The negotiations took place in three stages. Stage I was the opening canter, and they got some sort of preliminary Agreement. Stage II, for most of the others detailed discussions, because if there was one thing which was insisted on it was that any renewal of the base Agreements in all of the territories should not be a blanket renewal based on defence considerations or the contribution which the United Kingdom was making to NATO and Western Defence, but that the interest of the particular territories should as well be taken into account.

4.00 p.m.

The United States Government did with each unit territory discuss the way in which they could benefit from economic assistance. Now hon. members have asked me what were the benefits. I think the Leader of the Opposition, despite the fact that he was the first Attorney General, Minister of Education, Minister of Communications and a member of the Cabinet, Defender of the Faith, merely scraping home against Charlie Hinds by twelve votes still had not done his homework sufficiently to have recognised that he could have looked at past Cabinet papers to find out what was the position.

Now take for instance the case of Trinidad and Tobago and some of the benefits which were available. Trinidad and Tobago got a programme of assistance in which I have already read out the money in their hands, but also the College of Arts and Sciences was built, the construction of additional road facilities, rehabilitation of the Trinidad railway as well as money grants, totalling something in the region of \$20 million. St. Lucia got \$US350,000 in direct money in 1961, but in addition it got access and penetration roads, equipment and training in secondary education, commodities and technical services to augment the electric power facility at Vieux Fort. Antigua got \$US350,000. It also got the widening of Coolidge Airport, complete preparations and studies required with the Deep Water Harbour in Antigua, providing storage winds and driers in the Antigua cornmeal industry, and as the hon. member for St. John would know, they actually built the corn factory. (*Asides*) The monies were paid in 1961. (*Asides*) Why don't they follow? They have not read the files.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, if the hon. member would give way, I pointed out during the course of my speech that Jock Whitney as he is popularly known came down here in his Gulf Stream and all this was negotiated in 1961. My predecessor in office came in here and said he had just got a plane to go up to Cape Canaveral to see the rockets, but Barbados was not strictly in this hand-out as it were; but there was no 1968 or 1973 renegotiation of any compensation by any of the territories.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, I will come to 1968 and 1973 because the hon. member obviously has not followed what I am saying. The position is that Barbados was told by a cable from the Secretary of State, and it is recorded in the very files which were in the hon. member's office in 1961, that the United States Government...

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I should like to remind the hon. member...

Mr. SPEAKER: On what has the hon. member for St. John risen?

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of elucidation, and the hon. member has given way. And I would ask you to ask the hon. member for St. Michael South Central to keep quiet. The Bases Agreement was negotiated in February, 1961. My Government, the one of which I was Chairman of the Cabinet came in on 5th December, 1961. My Government the one of which I was Chairman and the Cabinet came in on 5th December. Mr. Whitney took my predecessor in office up to Patrick Air Force Base and all Barbados got out of it was a trip for him and Mr. Ronald Mapp. I am sorry; Mr. Mapp went on moral rearmament. He went to Florida too, but not on the bases, and that was at the expense of Sir Dudley Leacock. It is my mistake, Sir.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Obviously the hon. member has not read the files, but if he will just listen he will understand. The position is that it was made clear that Barbados would sign the agreement, but whereas stage two talks had not been completed on behalf of Barbados for economic assistance, that after the stage three position Barbados' programme of economic assistance would be pursued. This is the point I am making. Dr. Cummins made it absolutely clear before he went out of power in writing in the files that the stage three position would be continued and Barbados was obligated to put up a programme for assistance. The Bill actually commenced in November, 1961, at which time the Barbados Labour Party went out of power.

You had an obligation as the in-coming Government to at least read the files and at least continue to put up a programme which you should have sent to the United States Government. I am saying without fear of contradiction that you went out of power without having done so.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will not tolerate any heckling from the Opposition benches. None whatsoever.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: They went out of power, Mr. Speaker, without formulating in money terms what they wanted just as Jamaica had formulated, Antigua had formulated, St. Lucia had formulated and Trinidad and Tobago had formulated.

Now if the hon. members are claiming that the agreement was not signed in February, there is clear evidence in these files which can be verified both by way of Cabinet Papers and by way of correspondence passing between the Secretary of States for the Colonies and this Government that these economic talks had to continue as part and parcel of the settlement of the agreement. Nowhere will he find in the agreement a specific term as to what Trinidad got because the discussions had continued on that basis in the exchange of notes and correspondence between the parties. So don't get and make it appear because you can read the agreement that it says nothing in here about this. The point remains that you failed to recognise that the vital interest of Barbados demanded that where it was giving up its rights to be paid certain dues for the use of its country, and whereas the hon. member for St. Andrew has said its whole infrastructural arrangements were being placed at the disposal and use of a foreign power, we were in duty bound to negotiate and to obtain and to pursue maximum benefits and compensation in lieu of the direct charges which had been made. That is the position and no amount of talking that I am a chest-thumping and a weak vessel will prevent me from hammering you.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the Attorney General will address his every remark to the Chair, it could reduce the incidence of cross talking.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, whenever I hear an argument addressed to the Chair which cannot hold water, I will expose that argument through the Chair, and it is through you that I say that no amount of excuse or attack or cross talk will move me away from letting you know that the Democratic Labour

Party failed miserably in this aspect of our foreign relations. Now, Sir, we come to 1968 and 1973.

4.10 p.m.

Honourable members on the other side said there were no renegotiations in 1968 or 1973, and that this never happened with any other country. This is not correct historically. The whole of the Chaguaramas peninsula was not returned to Trinidad in 1961, and Trinidad subsequently negotiated the complete return of the bases under the review procedure that was provided in the agreement. Honourable members on the other side still cannot explain to this House why they never took the opportunity provided within the terms of the agreement to monitor the working of the agreement and renegotiate the terms. The simple fact of the matter is, as I have said, that the agreement had never been monitored adequately or at all by the past government, and for the benefit of hon. members I would draw to Your Honour's attention the comment I made after I had an opportunity to review the files; it is a conclusion that is founded on the basis of objective analysis of the performance of the past government, and I repeat that a perusal of these files shows that the government since 1961 failed to monitor properly the operation of the lease bases agreement. And as a result there is a lack of adequate information on the files for the period 1971-76. This situation must be corrected urgently. That was minuted on December 15, 1976; that is the position. Honourable members must be aware of this. It is not that we come in as a government and despite Cubana or Sydney Alleyne we are sitting down and doing nothing. It is not that we are out to keep you in the Opposition for fifty years. It is that this was in the vital interest of Barbados and hon. members responsible had not been doing their homework. So, Mr. Speaker, I regret to say that despite the support for the principle of the Bill which has come from the Opposition, they would have shown themselves bigger men had they got up and apologised for their bad administration; that is what they should have done. But they are wrong and strong, and history will record that in this exercise of the national sovereignty of Barbados they failed the people of Barbados miserably.

Now to the other point. Honourable Members raised the question as to what is the stage of the present negotiations. The stage of the negotiations simply is that we have had what are called preparatory talks; we have not reached the stage of preliminary talks yet; but we have made it quite clear that we cannot consider any request

for renewal until the present agreement is considered and our rights under that agreement respected and fulfilled. That is the position of this Government, which I think the people of Barbados appreciate. When the United States is prepared to talk to us about matters to which we are entitled under that agreement, we will listen to their request and consider it in the national interest as perceived by the Government at that time. I am aware of the fact that the United States Government is negotiating with the Bahamas and with the Government of Antigua under an entrustment given to them by the United Kingdom, and I am also aware of the fact that the United Kingdom Government has had a request concerning the use of Dog Island. But those are matters that concern the United States and other governments. As a strong Caribbean and West Indian people we have an interest in those as well, because they raise questions about the security of the whole Caribbean area and the question about how Caribbean peoples should negotiate with foreign governments no matter how friendly they are. And I would say that if we are approached by either of those two Governments, or indeed by the people of St. Kitts, Nevis and Anguilla for any assistance we can give them, we will not hesitate to do so and will let the United States Government know that too; because I believe that in international diplomacy one must be frank and blunt; we have no secret undertakings; we have nothing to hide; and that is our position on these matters — straightforward and direct.

Obviously it is in the interest of the Caribbean countries to maximize any benefits they can get, because they are contributing to the whole defence of the Southern Atlantic; there are contributing to the defence of the United States as a whole and they are holding a line in the under belly of the United States regardless of whether the bases are of an offensive or defensive capability. And this must be appreciated by the people in Washington, because unless it is appreciated there will be little progress, if any at all, in the talks. And everything I have said here I have said quite clearly in my talks with those persons in the State Department with whom I have discussed these matters.

I regret that I cannot at this stage give hon. members any further details of the negotiations; and in fact I do not think hon. members would wish the negotiations to be prejudiced by minute point by point disclosure of what is going on; but I am hoping that we

can review negotiations for a review of the agreement and that all options are open; but they must be subject to this overriding consideration on which the Government of Barbados is adamant, that we will not get to talking about other options unless it is clearly understood that compensation for past services be considered and that economic talks that should have resulted following stages two and three are continued in Barbados.

We are at the moment in the position where the agreement is still current, and I am not buying any argument that the Congress of the United States have various rules that they cannot go back and ask to pay for an inter-national obligation that they should have carried out before. Reading the law on reparations in international law shows the principle to be clearly established. I think the hon. member for St. Andrew, as well as the hon. member for St. Michael South, were correct in stating this. Despite the record of the people of Barbados, we have not had the same substantial and warm reciprocations in international relations, particularly in bi-lateral assistance by the United States. Barbados has borne more than its fair share of the defence of the Western Hemisphere and it is time that the message gets home and we be paid for that. And hon. members can rest assured that I am speaking with the full authority of my colleagues in the Cabinet and of the Barbados Labour Party on this issue. And it seems to me, from the speeches of hon. members on the other side that there is a bi-partisan commitment on the issue in looking at the talks. Now if the United States cannot even talk about what is due to us, it is very unlikely we can reach a settlement on anything else other than the vacation of the base on December 31, 1977. That is the blunt position of the Government of Barbados; I am not hiding anything.

It is on that note that I have much pleasure in moving the second reading of this Bill which will recover for the people of Barbados, without a cent, fifty two acres of fine land which has a valuation of not less than \$30 million.

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

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

On the motion of Hon. H. deB. FORDE, seconded by Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN; Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went

into Committee on the Bill, Mr. DOLE in the Chair.

4.20 p.m.

The Clauses of the Bill were called and passed.

On the motion of Hon. H. deB. FORDE, seconded by Hon. H. B. St. JOHN, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On the separate motions of Hon. H. deB. FORDE, seconded by Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

THE CENTRAL BANK OF BARBADOS (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1977

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, this Bill stands in the name of the Minister of Finance who has been unavoidably called away and I am asking for leave to deal with it.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister is seeking leave to deal with this Bill in the absence of the Minister of Finance. There being no objection, leave is granted.

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, this Bill is to amend the Central Bank of Barbados Act, 1972-6. The object of the Bill is to correct a number of typographical errors which have been discovered in the Bill among other things, but there are one or two amendments of a substantial nature, the most important of which are as set out in paragraphs (c) and (d) of the Object and Reasons, namely, to provide —

- (c) a legal basis for the Bank in fixing the buying and selling rates for commercial banks and other persons authorised to exchange foreign currency under the Exchange Control Act, Cap. 71;
- (d) for the establishment and administration by the Bank of schemes relating to export credit insurance and guarantee and to the guarantee of credit extended by commercial banks and other financial institutions.

As is well known, Sir, for a long period of time in Barbados there was considerable dissatisfaction over the amount one received when one went to change foreign currencies at

banks, and as a result of representations made by the public the Central Bank intervened under the Exchange Control provisions and stipulated suggested rates. This amendment would be legalising the authority of the Bank so to do under the provisions of the Central Bank Act.

In respect of the last amendment, the other amendment I spoke of, for some period of time it was recognized that if we are to facilitate the export effort in Barbados, that we in Barbados, like many other countries in the world, will have to provide facilities whereby our exporters could obtain financing in order to give credit abroad.
4.30 p.m.

The Central Bank is in full agreement with our effort of expanding exports, and it is through this vehicle an amendment to the Act to specifically empower the Central Bank participating or initiate schemes for providing export credit whether the particular scheme is by way of insurance or the discount facilities of banks. The whole object of the exercise is to allow the Central Bank to encourage and initiate this type of development.

Opportunity was also taken to expand this area of activity because under the amendment the bank would be able to guarantee not only the credit granted by other financial institutions, banks or otherwise, for exports, but credit granted by banks and other financial institutions in other areas of activities. As it is well known, the Central Bank gives discount facilities to the Sugar Industry Agricultural Bank in respect of loans for the financing of the agricultural industry and this is a method by which the Government can ensure that the economic activity in the country receives a flow of funds at a reasonable rate of interest.

I myself am aware of applications being made for assistance by other sectors of the sugar industry. I have always felt that the rum industry is an industry that is of particular importance to Barbados. An analysis of the constraints surrounding this industry shows that they have to finance the keeping of stocks for a period of over two years before they can export them; and it will be appreciated that a considerable amount of capital can be tied up in stocks that are being matured for the market. I think that any help that can be given in financing this cost to that sector will mean that this finance can be used while these stocks are being matured. This is a commercial area that I have already raised with the Governor of the Central Bank.

So it is this effort to achieve greater flexibility of the Central Bank that is the object

of the amendment to Section 40. Other sections are not of material importance. They seek to correct typographical errors, with the possible exception of the amendment to Section 30 and the object of that is to allow the Central Bank to dispose of some of its profits in a more flexible manner. The present Section 13 establishes a degree of rigidity of the use of profits which it is felt is no longer necessary in view of the period of time that the Central Bank has been operating, and the responsibility that it has demonstrated in its functioning.

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

Dr. CHELTENHAM: I beg to second that.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, we in the Opposition will be supporting this particular measure. It is really one that is non controversial, and I did not hear the usual attempts to criticise the now Opposition for any sins of omission or commission; and that is really commendable when measures of this sort are introduced, when there are good measures and desirable.

These are amendments to an Act which carries the date 1972, and the main structure and functions of the Central Bank of Barbados remain in tack and are somewhat strengthened by this particular measure, and so we on this side are not opposed to these measures that are proposed here.

According to the Central Bank Act of 1972 the purpose of the bank shall be:—

- (a) to regulate the issue, supply, availability and international Exchange of money;
- (b) to promote monetary stability;
- (c) to promote a sound financial structure;
- (d) to foster the development of money and capital markets in Barbados; and
- (e) to foster credit and exchange conditions conducive to the orderly and sustained economic development of Barbados.

These are the main functions of this bank, and I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to the management of the Central Bank of Barbados for having done an exceedingly good job ever since it came into being in 1972. Its management has been sound both in terms of advice tendered to the Government, as well as in

terms of its management and the day to day administration. I think that the establishment of this particular bank has contributed to the sound financial resources of this country.

As far as I can recall, the bank had an authorised capital of \$5 million. I believe that that was the figure which the Minister who was deputising for the Minister of Finance gave; but although central banks are not profit making organisations, they sometimes end up with profits. It is a reasonable source from which money accumulates. It is not very often in this Chamber that we actually get information relating to the profitability of this organisation; and I am wondering if on this occasion the Minister can let us know out of the profits of the Central Bank how much money has been paid into what is known as the General Reserve.

I think that under the terms of the Act it is supposed to pay money into the General Reserve. I wonder if he could tell us what was the amount of the profitability of the bank during this financial year and how much of these funds was paid over the General Reserve. I would like also to deal with this question of the responsibility of the bank for the management of the resources of this country.

4.40 p.m.

From time to time we know that it is the function of the Central Bank to defend the currency of this country and to ensure that the balance of payments position is kept steadily under review and in a reasonable state, but judging from figures which have been released, from time to time, it appears as though the balance of payments situation is getting slightly out of hand certainly in the last quarter of the year 1976 and in the first quarter of the year 1977. It appears as though the import bill has been increasing, and, in spite of the actions taken by the Government, whether on the advice of the Central Bank or not I cannot say, it appears as though this is one of the major problems of this country. I would also be glad if the Minister would let us know what further steps, if any, may be contemplated in ensuring that our balance of payments position does not get out of hand.

Mr. Speaker, you can rest assured that I will not attempt by any roundabout means to get around any ruling of yours, but this is a very important matter for the economy of this country. The Central Bank is a very important institution in this country and, as I have indicated, it has proved that the decision to establish that particular institution was in the best interest of development of this country.

As far as export credit insurance is concerned, I would like to say that the effort is a commendable one. I say this because it is certainly through the pushing of exports and correspondingly trying to hold down imports that we can really try to reduce our dependence on external funds coming in to redress any imbalance which there may be. Of course, I believe that the Minister will admit that efforts to promote exports by means of the formation of an Exports Promotion Committee, or however it was styled, that these efforts were instituted some time ago. I believe that the Governor of the Central Bank was a member of the first Committee which was established to operate in this area. That was before September 2, 1976, when it was recognised that the promotion of exports is an essential plank of development in this country. Since that time we have heard that the whole business of exports promotion has been restructured, reorganised and no doubt up-dated in some respect, and we certainly hope that those efforts will bear fruit.

Mr. Speaker, the subject of the Central Banking tends to be somewhat esoteric in that the members of the public may not at first value realise the importance and the inter-connection between the operations of the Central Bank and the cost of living, but I would say that there is a very good relationship which may have escaped the minds of those who have not been trained to think in these particular areas, but which they feel, nevertheless, from time to time. What the Central Bank does, in terms of expansion or restriction of credit, has a direct bearing on levels of employment and levels of investment in this country and, from time to time, we have heard statements made from certain sectors reacting to the so-called credit squeeze which is in operation at this moment.

I understand that certain taxi men are not pleased with how certain measures which have been proposed, are actually being operated. They believe that they are under certain restrictions which create a hardship on them. We have heard certain persons, who are in the business of importing vehicles, say that they are dissatisfied with the operations of certain measures of this credit squeeze which have been instituted by the present Government because they tend to restrict the number of vehicles that they can import. The number of people, presumably, that they can employ or retain in employment, and to that extent they have been critical of the actions taken by this Government in a field which is employment generated. That is from the point of view of those who manage the importation and sale of motor vehicles,

particularly cars, and it is from the point of view of the taximen who actually operate these vehicles. That is an area which we would like to hear about from the Government. We would like to hear whether they intend to listen and to give some type of relief to the problems being faced by this particular sector of our economy.

Indeed, there have been comments made that the suggestion made by the Minister of Finance that these car firms and the companies which deal in the importation and sale of motor cars could go in for the reconditioning of used vehicles. This is a non-starter which, possibly, should be laughed out of court. Maybe some reaction we could get on this particular matter.

I have indicated that, as far as I can recall, the statistics published indicate that, during the last quarter of 1976 and the first quarter of 1977, there have been increases in the import bill. In spite of the measures enunciated by the Government, the import bill continues to be on the increase. We would certainly like to know whether any further action is contemplated by the Government in terms of imposing further restrictions on the availability of credit to finance these imports.

As I have indicated there have been complaints already, and the Government must now state what is its approach on these matters; whether there is any modification or whether there will be an extension of the measures, which may be considered by some to be draconian in this particular area. I have been dealing generally with the question of the balance of payments and the high import bill when compared with our exports.

4.50 p.m.

We welcome the measures to stimulate export and to that extent this particular measure will be welcomed. But, Mr. Speaker, we do know that the International Monetary Fund which has set up a special Trust Fund to assist in balance of payments problems have instituted a programme of selling some of its gold, the gold which members were supposed to pay as their share to the International Monetary Fund. They have been selling some of this gold by auction and part of the profits from the sale of that gold is available to member countries for assistance in balance of payments problems, and that they should constitute what in the arts is known as restitution of the sums that have been paid in by member countries. We would really like to know whether Barbados will share in this restitution resulting from the profits made out of the auction of gold by the International

Monetary Fund. There are all related matters, Mr. Speaker.

We heard earlier that a number of countries have been approaching the sister country of Trinidad and Tobago for balance of payments support and certainly other loans to assist in meeting certain commitments. We in this country would like to know that our finances are being managed in a worthwhile manner and in the best manner possible in consonance with the resources available to us. In this regard the proposals and the schemes relating to export credit insurance and guarantee are to be welcomed.

Mr. Speaker, I do not wish on this particular occasion to speak any further on this measure, but I do hope that the Minister will find it possible to respond to some of the matters that I have raised. As I have indicated, it is a measure which will gain support from this side of the House, but we would certainly like to get his response to some of these matters that we have raised.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, my intervention in this debate will be very brief and more or less to say that I have listened to the speech of the hon. member for St. Michael South and indeed I turned to my colleague on my right, the hon. member for St. Andrew, to ask whether the hon. member was criticising the Government, complimenting the Government, feeling for policies himself or merely asking for information. The manner in which he phrased his debate is very interesting, Mr. Speaker, because it was only about a matter of a few months ago when the Opposition was criticising the Government in no uncertain terms because of certain temporary restrictions which had to be imposed in relation to hire purchase contracts, and of course it was being made to appear, not by the hon. member for St. Michael South I would say, that the Government was being draconian in its approach to this matter, and it had a desire to repress the progress of the poorer person in this community and had no concept of what financial policy it should pursue. The truth of the matter is that since 1975 the then Government had passed a Hire Purchase Credit as well as Hire Control Act which came into commencement by proclamation, and I recall as indeed you did, Mr. Speaker, that at the time of the debate on that particular measure the hon. member for St. John pointed out that it would become necessary for the Central Bank to have powers to monitor the outflow of hard currency and foreign exchange which was being spent on

non-consumable and non-durables, and indeed at that time the Opposition, responsible as it was, the Opposition which is now the Government, recognised that one must monitor the movement of currency.

It is a fact that the balance of payments position of most of the Third World developing and under-developed countries have worsened since the oil crisis of 1973, I believe it was, and indeed has worsened in terms of our receipt of funds for the primary produced commodities which we sell on the world market. Barbados is a slightly industrialised country, but our industrial output is still not big enough to take up any drastic shortfall in foreign earnings which may result from the lowering of prices for primary commodities such as sugar and molasses, and although we do get some foreign exchange from the development of the tourist industry in this country, yet a significant proportion of these earnings do not remain in the country or indeed remain for the use of the the country for purchasing capital and other goods to be used for the benefit of Barbados.

I believe that the country as a whole understands quite clearly that the temporary restrictions instituted with the Hire Purchase arrangements were in the interest of Barbadians and not in the interest of a small segment of the community. Mr. Speaker, I must say that not only as a member of the front bench and member of the Cabinet but as a Barbadian I am well satisfied that there was a very strong case for the restriction on the importation of cars. This situation was running at a rate where we were spending in the first quarter of 1977 almost as much as we had spent in the first six months of 1976 on the importation of motor cars, and I say this because I think it has provided me with the first opportunity from the floor of the House to reply to a comment made in the Other Place by another hon. member of that Place which seemed to give the people of Barbados the impression that members of the Government armed with inside knowledge were restricting the importations of cars, but each new Minister had gone ahead and purchased new cars and we were denying the people having motor cycles, but having to ourselves the benefit of motor cars. I think this is the sort of politics I would deprecate, and I would have welcomed a repetition of the statement outside the Chamber because it would have given me a wonderful opportunity to take somebody for a libel action.

I believe the Prime Minister has made the position of the Government clear. As far as I

know there are only two Ministers who bought new cars, the Hon. Minister of Housing and myself.

5.00 p.m.

As far as I know there are only two Ministers who bought new cars — the Hon. Minister of Housing and myself; and in the case of myself I wish to make it quite clear that my original car would have been eight years old in April this year and certainly I was not subject to hire purchase terms. But I think it is good to get an opportunity to make this clear, because it is the sort of short term politics and uncalled for attack that you get.

Mr. SANDIFORD: On a point of elucidation, Mr. Speaker. Is the hon. member telling us that he bought the Datsun for cash?

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Yes, Sir, the hon. member is saying just that. I am not beholding to any person in Barbados for anything by way of hire purchase or otherwise, and I like to be able to talk to them, because I sold my old car, and just like the hon. member for St. John might be able to buy an aeroplane for cash — I have not reached those heights yet — I can still buy a Datsun for cash. That is the position. It was not borrowed money or stolen money or anything of the sort. I think it is necessary to make these statements because there is nothing that I do in public life in this respect that can derogate from the integrity of government as a whole. And I believe it was a very uncalled for attack on the Government in the Other Place for an hon. member to make snide statements that were not based on the factual position as it stands.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to compliment the hon. Minister who led off this debate, although in complimenting him I am also complimenting the Cabinet. But there is no doubt that he is very keen on the question of export promotion and that he has personally, together with members of the Industrial Development Corporation, been pushing this particular aspect of our policy. And it is important that Barbadians recognize that unless we can sell more and earn more we cannot have more to distribute among ourselves or in the long run increase our standard of living. We have to realize that we must limit our conspicuous consumption of foreign goods and try where possible to substitute our own goods. And in this respect we need a total policy in relation to agricultural production and meshing this in with the needs of industry and our own food bill; and I welcome the effort being made by the Minister of this department

and the departments like the IDC which come under him, and I am sure that we will see the full effects of this in the next few years when we have got past existing balance of payments difficulties and there can be a greater relaxation of the restrictions which must now apply in circumstances such as this. If we are contracting and are unable to finance capital goods, then we will not be able to create employment opportunities. If we take scarce resources and spend them on luxuries rather than necessities — vital foods, for instance, and other necessities to keep our factories going — then we are making a mistake. I think the Minister has made this quite clear, and I am satisfied that a programme in this respect is one that each member of this House should welcome and support.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, there are a number of points raised by the hon. member who spoke on the other side, the member for St. Michael South, and I will deal with them one by one.

The hon. member raised the question as to the profits of the Central Bank. In the latest report which has been filed in the House of Assembly for the financial year ended December, 31, 1976, at page 90, the Profit and Loss Appropriation Account of the Central Bank is exhibited and for the year 1976 and the profit before appropriation — the net profit — was approximately \$2.1 million. Of this approximately \$525,000 was transferred to the General Reserves of the Central Bank; \$10,000 to the special Credit Trust, and into the Consolidated Fund \$1,567,000. So I believe that answers one of the questions raised by the hon. member.

The balance sheet is set out at page 88 and shows authorized capital under the assets column as \$5 million; the paid capital is \$2 million and the reserves which came from earlier profits amount to \$7 million in General Reserve, \$510,000 in the special Credit Trust, and \$336,000 in the Staff Pensions Reserve Fund.

Now the hon. member also raised the question of the balance of payments position in Barbados. I am very grateful to the hon. member for raising that question, because it is only last year that we had a meeting of an Institution created by this party since we came into power, namely, the Import Licencing Review Committee, and I want to explain the composition and functions of the Committee because it has a very direct bearing upon the point raised by the hon. member. This Committee was presided over by the Minister of Finance. The other members of

the Committee are: The Minister of Agriculture who in his capacity is responsible for Consumer Affairs and for day to day licencing arrangement, and myself. We are advised by a technical committee and on this advisory Committee we have representatives of the Central Bank, the Ministry of External Trade, and Ministry of Agriculture, and the Committee is at liberty to summon any other public servants or bodies or associations in Barbados for the purpose of dealing with specific areas. This Committee monitors the total imports into Barbados, and we have been carrying on an exercise in which we have analysed large areas of imports into Barbados. Particularly we started off with what is known as consumer durables, i.e., refrigerators, airconditioners, motor cars, TV sets, etc., and a detailed analysis of the imports for the last three years has been gone through. We have also done the same thing in respect of the manufacturers, the clothing industry in Barbados, and it would surprise some people to know that despite all the talk about the garment industry in Barbados being in difficulty we imported in 1976 nineteen million dollars in garments. And of that \$19 million approximately 50% came from CARICOM countries; so that as far as we in Barbados are concerned, we issued a challenge to the garment manufacturers in Barbados when we pointed out to them that approximately \$10 million of garments were being imported from third countries, not CARICOM countries, because as we have always said, it has always been our policy, because of our firm belief in the integration movement, that any restriction for balance of payments that we have to impose, only in the most dire circumstances would we impose them on CARICOM products.

5.10 p.m.

We pointed out that \$10 million in garments were imported in Barbados, and we went further, we had as a special exercise a statistician attached to the Ministry of External Trade go through every item of those imports so that we could segregate them and show what were the particular type of garments being introduced into Barbados, and we handed the manufacturers the document and we said to them, that is what you can look forward to and it is your duty to put your house in order and show how you can help us to reduce the imports into Barbados.

Mr. SANDIFORD: I wonder if the Minister could just indicate to us, however briefly, what were the main types of garments that were imported and constituted this \$19 million in imports?

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I could not do it briefly. If the hon. member wants a copy of the

exercise I will send the hon. member a copy of the exercise. If the hon. member is contemplating going into the garment industry I would welcome him, because there is obviously \$10 million in slack to be taken up. The basic position is that the exercise is done by what we call the SITC numbers, and we went through all the items. The manufacturers are making a submission as to how we can help them to try to meet this demand, but the point that I am trying to illustrate is that so seriously do we regard this problem that we have set up this committee to analyse the total import bill to isolate it in particular sections to see whether in Barbados we have the manufacturing capacity to be able to satisfy some of this demand. This is something that we regard as fundamental to proper planning if your imports and your exports, and parallel with this we carried out a manufacturing survey which is now going to go on the computers, but the truth of the matter is that we are concerned about the balance of payments position in Barbados, and I know that the Central Bank shares that view.

Despite the restrictions that have been imposed so far, the level of imports in the first six months of this year is still running at the order of something in the vicinity of over \$240 million. It was anticipated that in retained imports this year we could look to something in the vicinity of \$435 or \$440 million, but if in six months we have imported \$240 million, you will see that the original estimates, the guidelines produced by the Central Bank are in danger, and I cannot promise that further action is not going to be taken. Further action is going to be taken, we decided upon some action last Friday, but in taking the action I want to demonstrate to the hon. members how we take the action. We first analyse the imports of what are nonessentials down to every item, then we go to the food imports and we look within the food imports and see what is non-essential. We hope that as a result of this demand study of our imports, so to speak, we will be able to provide some useful information for the productive sectors, not only the industrialists, but the agriculturalists, and I am very glad to see that so many Barbadians have heeded to the Government's call and have made application and are making efforts to bring more land into production, because that too will help the balance of payments problem which the Central Bank is very worried about.

You see, one of the things we have to be careful of is that we do not want to be in a position to be written up in the Trinidad Guardian like how some of our fellow countries have been written up recently. We do not want to be in that position. We know that the Trinidad

Government has acted with great generosity towards some of those countries who have been in balance of payments problems, but we feel that we must call upon the Barbadians to make a sacrifice first, we must make a sacrifice first. We do not want to be in a position of having to go and beg our more affluent neighbours to help us with our balance of payments position before we take the necessary steps here. I know that some of the public will be irritated, but I just want to make one specific point in reference to the point raised by the hon. member in respect of taxis.

With the greatest respect, taxis have been classified not as consumer goods but as intermediate goods, normal goods which are part and parcel of the productive process. Taxis are part of the tourist industry, they are to the tourist industry like mini mokes, and those taxi people should not have any difficulty in obtaining credit, because they are intermediate goods, it is not like if the hon. member buys a motor car for his own use, taxis and commercial vehicles have been classified completely different under our scheme of things.

Now, Sir, we go further. The analysis is now going along in relation to chemicals, detergents and household cleaners, and we believe there is scope in that area for some reduction. All of these areas will be examined. There are large number of areas in the tariff and the hon. member knows the areas where restrictions have been put. One of the things the Central Bank has also made some further recommendations — and the Government and no doubt the Minister of Finance will be bringing those to Cabinet — but I want to inform the House, and I am grateful to the hon. member for raising it, that we are not out of any balance of payments difficulties, because this year it would be appreciated that our sugar price has risen slightly and we are only selling a small proportion of our sugar under the Lome' Convention, the balance has to be sold on the world market, and the world market price is the most depressed price for a long period of time.

Again in the tourist industry it is true we had our large numbers, more numbers coming in, but they are coming in but they are not spending as much as they used to spend before, because let us not forget that in countries like Canada the Canadian Government itself with all its resources is encouraging its people not to spend too much money in foreign countries because they too are under the balance of payments problems. We will obviously have to pursue all areas therefore in trying to restrict our imports. It may court some unpopularity, but a Government that is in power

has to govern, a Government must look after the national interest and the well-being of the people as a whole, not only for the short term but in the long term, and it is my belief that steps are necessary to ensure that we do not indulge in the consumption habits that we indulged in in the last half of last year. At the same time, of course, we must ask all the producers in Barbados to do their best to produce more.

There is only one point I would like to answer. The hon. member raised the question as to whether Barbados is entitled to a share of the profits of the sale of gold. I do not want to anticipate the answer, but my understanding of the position is that those profits will go into the reserve fund of the International Monetary Fund, and that there are others who have primary claims to those funds. Apparently you get claims on those funds from the international classification and we are not qualified as among the world's poorest countries. Our per capita income is too high. The hon. member will get a specific answer, but the profits from the sale of gold go into the reserves and those reserves are segregated into special accounts and grants or loans are given to certain countries in the world. My understanding of the position is that we may be in the queue but there are others ahead of us in the queue and our per capita income puts us in a different point in the queue than countries like Bangladesh, Haiti and other countries which have a very low per capita income.

5.20 p.m.

It is possible that there are other funds which have been made available as a result of certain special arrangements made by the OPEC countries with the International Monetary Fund.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, my understanding is.....

Mr. SPEAKER: On what do you rise?

Mr. SANDIFORD: On a point of elucidation. It is my understanding that from the sale of gold by the IMF that the profits from that sale go into a trust fund, and that part of the proceeds of that trust fund has to be returned to members who paid up in some type of proportion to the amount that they paid into the fund and that secondly — and this is the point which was being made by the Minister — that the other part of the fund will go to countries that are categorised as deserving countries. I was really asking whether Barbados will benefit under this in terms of the amount of gold paid into the IMF.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: We start off by saying that we are all agreed. I spoke of the disposition of the profits. I said that our income does not make us eligible under that. They will be distributed on some kind of proportional contribution basis. I suppose that there will be some agreement among members of the IMF as to how you will dispose of it. The Hon. member has raised a specific question, and a specific answer will be given on that particular point. I am now just giving a general answer.

I do not think that there is anything more that the hon. member raised that I have not referred to, and accordingly I commend this Bill to the House because I am sure that many people will benefit and that the economy of Barbados will benefit particularly from the scheme which is now included in Section 40.

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

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 on this 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.

Clauses 1 to 7 inclusive of the Bill were called and agreed to.

Clause 8 was called.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, I must confess that as far as Clause 8 is concerned I was out of the Chamber when part of the measure was introduced so that I did not hear the reason for the amendment to Section 18 of the original Act as set out in Clause 8 of this amending Bill. As I understand this Section, it is to widen the scope of Section 18 so as to extend the area of secrecy relating to the persons employed by the bank and I am really asking for the reasons for this particular extension. I do not know that that bank has been too forthcoming with giving information to the public in terms of the operation of the bank. So what are the reasons for this particular extension of the blanket of secrecy. I wonder if the Minister could respond on this particular

matter and give us some explanation. It seems to include persons under contract of service with the bank. I wonder if there have been problems with persons in this particular area about those persons divulging information.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, originally Section 18 was interpreted judicially as meaning an employee in the sense that the person was under the direct employment under the relationship of master and servant; but there are some functions of the Central Bank in which the bank may want to employ persons under contract of service but not in the relationship of master and servant.

5.30 p.m.

It may have a special investigation into a bank, for instance, that the bank is going broke, or that it is carrying on policies which are inconsistent with certain rules laid down and they may want to have what is called an independent investigation. They may want to hire a firm of Management Consultants, or an Inspector who is not in the employ of the Bank, but he is under a contract of service with the Bank and not any relationship as master and servant. It is felt that, in those circumstances, since the object of the exercise is to do what would normally be done by an employee of the Bank on whom you could enforce the rules of secrecy against, you would want to extend it to include that person. That is the explanation that is given here, and that is why the definition has been widened to include a person who is under a contract of service with the Bank. You widen it to include these outside people who are not necessarily in the exercise of the relationship of master and servant with the bank.

The question that Clause 8 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clauses 9 to 11 inclusive were called and passed.

Clause 12 was called.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 12 stand part.

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

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, I hope you will exercise a little latitude here. I really wanted to find out whether the Minister could give us any information as to why it is

necessary for persons, who wish to purchase products from abroad of small value, to go through the tedium of journeying to the Central Bank, maybe, for the importation of products which may only come to \$60.00 (US) or in some foreign currency, and why this particular facility could not be extended to the Banks which actually issue the currency under certain conditions if those conditions are clearly set out to the Banks in order to remove this type of rigmarole and inconvenience.

As I understand it, persons requiring foreign exchange to purchase small items amounting to any sum for that matter under \$100.00 have to journey to a particular Department of the Central Bank to get that type of approval and then go back to the particular Bank in order to get the money. I am wondering if the Minister can throw some light on this matter to reduce the type of inconvenience and paper work which must be involved in this particular operation. I feel that the Banks could be given some type of discretion in this matter in accordance with specific guidelines for items of small value.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, I am a little surprised at this query by the hon. member, because many of us who had acquaintance with James Street and other area are perfectly familiar with the system that under the Exchange Control Act guidelines have been issued by the authority, which is the Central Bank, to the Banks and there are certain permitted transactions. There is a limit to those permitted transactions, so I am wondering how small is small. I always understood that once you carried your invoice or proof to the Bank the Bank itself, as an authorised dealer, was authorised to sell for exchange up to a certain value. That is the law. I know that things like subscriptions to magazines, to newspapers, and purchases up to, I think, \$1,000 — I can get the correct figure for you. I understand there is no limit once you have the invoice.

Mr. Chairman, perhaps I can explain the matter to the hon. member. You will get this sort of thing with the payment of school fees for children who are abroad. You have to get a *pro forma* invoice sent down from the people abroad which says that if you order this, this is what it will cost. You take it into the Bank and you can get the money. If it is above the Bank's limit they will clear it with the Central Bank for you, and you should not have to go to the Central Bank at all. That is the procedure.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I think there may be some mistake here. I have just had a case with Solicitors in Trinidad doing certain legal work. The sum of \$50.00 was involved and I still had to get Central Bank's permission for remitting to them \$46.00 and some cents. I had to fill out a form with an explanation of what it was for. It was a question of fees for serving a petition, etc. I have just given an example and, perhaps, you can explain why, with a little sum like that, the Bank could not remit it without my having to make this big application to Central Bank for this amount.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Before the Minister replies, Mr. Chairman. I obviously have the explanation. I do not have any experience in James Street, and I am not likely to have any. I am not in that league. Now the leading Q.C. and S.C., is the member on my right, the Leader of the Opposition. He is the most outstanding member at the Bar in these days. I do not know if the problem is that the Banks themselves are not aware of the provisions. I would hate to believe that the Foreign Exchange Department of the Banks are not familiar with this particular procedure. I do not know if that is the case that the Foreign Exchange Department of the Banks may not know. I am not really complaining about the Central Bank or saying that service is not given at the Central Bank efficiently. What I am saying is that there is a rigmarole involved, and for a sum, I believe, of \$22.00 (US) a commercial bank in this country — (*Asides*) I am speaking from personal experience now — sent me to the Central Bank, so I had to walk from Broad Street to the Central Bank Department and then back to the Bank for this small sum of money when the Banks could have been given, if they have not been given, the appropriate conditions under which small sums could be issued by the Banks.

5.40 p.m.

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: We are talking about two different things. In respect of import of goods and the payment abroad for goods imported, the procedures I outlined earlier are followed, but I am informed that in respect of payment for services abroad you must get specific permission, so the hon. member's case must have been classified as a service, somebody you had to pay a bill abroad to; but in respect of the import of goods from abroad, merely small sums, you can just get the pro forma invoice, the bill or a letter and the Bank itself can do it; but there is another point the hon. member must appreciate. We are lucky in this society with the latitude that

we give, but there are other societies in the Caribbean apparently that if you give permission for \$22, people will split thousands of dollars into specific small sums just for the purpose of getting it out, and you must appreciate that in order to monitor there must be some control. If the hon. member has a specific problem outside the scope of this, we will be glad to see if anything can be done, but I know we get some problems in that respect.

The question that Clause 12 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

On the motion of Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN seconded by Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN seconded by Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

Order No. 1 was called.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

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

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1977-78 NO. 6

HEAD 15 — MINISTRY OF EDUCATION AND CULTURE (2) SCHOOLS (ii) SECONDARY

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, the sum set out in this Resolution is to provide for assistance to Approved Independent Secondary Schools in Barbados. Earlier this year we came before the House and asked for a supplementary vote to make the salaries of the trained teachers in Approved Secondary Schools consonant with those in the Government Service. We are in this Resolution seeking to have additional aid to these schools in a three prong way. We sought earlier assistance with bursaries, but in this particular Resolution we are asking that the bursaries payable to the Approved Independent Schools be

increased from \$50 to \$75 per term up to a total number of 2,900, and we are also asking that there be increased subventions for certain special subjects.

The policy of the Government, Mr. Chairman, is to provide secondary education for all children of secondary school age, and by this we mean up to the age of sixteen. It is part of the programme as set out in the party's election manifesto, and very early in our term of office we set about putting back into schools children between the ages of 14 and 16 who were superannuated under the old regime. We are therefore in making available all these places to children at the age of 16 finding ourselves in extreme difficulty in finding available places. We know that the cost of providing new places for children in secondary schools is between four and five thousand per student and the cost of keeping a student in secondary school is in excess of \$1,000 per annum. In this regard we appreciate the work which the Approved Independent Schools and indeed the private schools have been doing over the years.

In Barbados in days long ago, Mr. Chairman, secondary education was the privilege of the social and intellectual elite and more often the social rather than the intellectual elite, but from the time Barbados has been free in terms of running its own internal affairs, there has been a move first under the regime of the old Barbados Labour Party and pursued by the Democratic Labour Party as a Government and continued by this Government towards the democratisation of education at the secondary level. If I may just take a look closely at the figures involved in this area, we find that in 1965 the Democratic Labour Party announced a new policy of assistance to Approved Secondary Schools, and it was amended in 1971 I think it was, and again in 1974. The position at the moment is that in commercial subjects subventions of \$600 a year are given, \$900 for science, \$400 for domestic science and \$400 per annum for arts and industrial arts.

5.50 p.m.

I believe that even hon. members on the other side will accept that these figures are very nugatory and very unrealistic according to the cost of education in Barbados today. So we propose to increase these subventions by as much as 500% in some cases, 150% at the bottom; so that we will increase the subventions for commercial subjects from \$600 per year to \$2,500 per year; for Science, from \$900 per year to \$2,500 per year; Domestic Science from \$400 per year to \$1,000; Crafts and Industrial Arts, from \$400 per year to \$2,500 per year.

Now we do not at all believe that these figures are enough to pay the way through in the schools, but we believe that it is a step in the right direction. And we also propose as aid to these schools to increase the teacher/pupil ratio. At present the Government pays for one trained teacher for every 100 pupils up to a maximum of 500 pupils, and thereafter one teacher for every 200 pupils or part thereof if the part represents not less than 60% of that figure. We propose to make the new figure as follows: We are going to pay for teachers at the rate of one for every 75 pupils up to 500 pupils and then one teacher for every 150 students thereafter. This represents a fairly sizeable supplemental vote to the extent of \$366,000.

Now it is important, Mr. Chairman, in the context of our additional aid to the secondary education, and indeed to the private schools, to consider all important factors; and as I have made some allusion to it already, the cost of secondary education in Barbados is increasing at a phenomenal rate. There are over 5,000 children in the approved secondary schools, and if those children were turned out of the schools because the schools had to close through no longer being economic units, it would mean that the Government would need approximately five new secondary schools to accommodate them. It is this consideration that has made it imperative as a reasonable and less expensive alternative to throw massive financial assistance to those schools to help take up some of the problems and burdens that now lie in Government. Further, we are also giving extra subventions to the schools in the areas of domestic science and crafts, as a thrust to our policy of shifting away from literary or academic education to technical, vocational or practical education as the alternative. I recall that when we put the fourteen-year olds back into schools last year there were some misgivings by some people, who I thought should have known better, about the wisdom of it. But I am happy to say, having seen some of the work done over the past few months, that they are in a programme that is useful to them and the community; to them in the first place because it is enabling them to do things of a constructive nature that will allow them to be able to support themselves after they have finished their training; and it is important to the community in that thousands of children between the ages of 14 and 16 would otherwise be roaming the streets while not fit or ready for serious employment, and will be causing many a social problem. So I am happy and I stand by my decision to have persuaded my colleagues that these children should be returned to school.

Now in dealing with the area of technical education I want to say quite clearly that, unlike what was happening in the previous Government when there was a lot of talk being given about the change of thrust from literary education to practical education, I intend to do something about it. I have heard for as long as I can remember anything about politics that the purpose of education in Barbados was to train people for a living, and in training them for a living you must be training them for gainful occupation. But for too long we have been continuing to build schools and throw into them heavy academic inputs at the expense and sacrifice of technical inputs. If I may refer to the old Aristotelean concept of education, Aristotle felt — and that was over two thousand years ago, — that education was for training people's minds so that they could fit in more harmoniously with a rational and orderly universe. Now all that is "passe" — perhaps not "passe" but somewhat irrelevant to today's needs. It was all very well in the time of Aristotle for people to be trained to think and use their mind and get involved in dialectics and discourse; that was very good in those days. But we are concerned today with having people trained to get jobs, trained in industry and manufacturing, trained in marketable skills, and it is for that reason that this Government is committed to the thrust towards technical education.

Now I think I heard when I was in the House earlier today a lot of rather pious remarks being made by members on the other side about dividing the country in half and about national consensus. I welcome those remarks because I propose at some stage not too far distant to set up a National Commission on Education, and if there is anything that requires national consensus it is that; and I am inviting the members of the Opposition to translate their words into action and join with this side and indeed with all sections of the community in working through analysis and enquiry towards a situation for educational advancement in Barbados that has been eluding us for a long time. I am inviting them not to make it a partisan issue, and I am sure that the hon. member for St. Michael South will go along with me in this. I make no reference to the hon. member for St. Michael South Central, but I have seen and heard many of the pronouncements of the hon. member for St. Michael South when he was Minister of Education; and indeed I heard the hon. member for St. Michael North Central repeatedly talk about the politics of cannibalism; and he himself is always asking for people to put their shoulders together on both sides and work towards the common national good. So I believe that I have

already started off with converts to the cause; and I am hoping that when the Commission is set up, as I hope before the end of the year, I will have the utmost cooperation of the members of the other side.

There has been too much adhoc and piecemeal planning in education over the last twenty five years or so. There have been too many instant answers to instant problems and too little rationalization of the entire educational system and its needs and relevance to a modern Barbadian society. And I believe that I will not be doing justice to the Ministry I have been asked to look after if I do not move away from the principles of adhocism in education; if I do not move away from those principles and try to establish for a long time the type of system that will inure to the benefit of the total community.

Mr. Chairman, just before I ask that this Resolution do now pass I want to make one other observation in respect of the approved independent schools which this Resolution is intended to assist. I don't know how many people in this country realize the great deal of sacrifice that has got to be made by the proprietors of these schools to keep the schools open. And I want as Minister of Education to extend my appreciation to the Heads of those schools and to acknowledge the difficulties and lack of finance they have been experiencing. Because of their love of people and their commitment to the cause in which they are involved, they have stood by their jobs and have made a significant contribution to the advancement of education in Barbados.

6.00 p.m.

I think I would be less than fair if I ask that this Resolution pass without paying my tribute to these people in those schools who in many cases beyond the call of duty have stayed at the top and helped the system from what it has been, absolute chaos.

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

Mr. BRADSHAW: I beg to second that.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, let me start by saying that these proposals introduced by the member for St. George South, the Minister of Education, do not go far enough in dealing with the problems of private secondary education in this country. On our side we are not going to oppose the proposals set out in this Resolution, and again, merely taking a leaf out of the book of the Leader of Government Business, the

Resolution has been introduced not in any particularly hostile manner, unlike the member for Christ Church West today who had a lapse, but it has been done in a way which recognises that significant contributions to the educational scene have been made by previous administrations. To that extent we would like to compliment the Minister for the way in which he has introduced this Resolution, but we again resist the obvious statement that what has been proposed today does not go far enough in dealing with the problem of education in this country, and in particular the problems of private secondary education.

Let me also say that the Minister has been so conciliatory that he has even appealed for the co-operation of the Opposition in terms of a national consensus on educational matters, and speaking for myself, let me say that if he sets up a national commission on education that I for one will not be opposed to that particular development of establishing a National Commission on Education, it will get my support, but I will come back to that matter a little later because he will find embedded somewhere in the Education Act passed by this Hon. Chamber the proposal for establishing a National Commission on Education so to that extent the bringing into being of a National Commission on Education will not get any hostility from the Opposition, it will get support from us on this side because we recognise the paternity of that measure.

Mr. Speaker, we believe that any Government which has responsibility for education in this country, or indeed in any country, must be concerned about the education of all children, and we welcome the statement of the Minister in this particular regard. We ourselves when we held the reins of Government in this country enunciated such a principle as the base from which all developments for the education of the people of this country should spring, and so there is agreement on both sides with this general principle that education must provide equal opportunities for all children in this country, and that is why over the past 15 years the Democratic Labour Party Government had to fashion a policy of assistance for the private secondary schools in this country. Make no mistake about it, Mr. Chairman, this policy of assistance to approved independent schools has a beginning and had a beginning in the days of the Democratic Labour Party Government. Whether this is called "ad hocism" I do not know, I do not know if this is the type of ad hocism to which the Minister was referring in his introductory remarks, but ad hocism or not, what we do know is that before 1961 there was no

policy or hardly any policy of assistance to private schools in this country. I believe this particular area might be excluded from the charge of ad hocism to which the Minister referred, because this was a proposal for assisting the private schools in this country at a time when previously no type of assistance was given to those schools, because the Government recognised what perhaps was not recognised previously by previous administration, that those schools deserved every possible assistance in contributing to what was a national problem in this country, the problem of providing education for all in this country in the face of very limited resources.
6.10 p.m.

That problem still faces us today; but it was from this recognition that those who gained admission into the then Secondary Government Schools, the so called Grammar Schools, should not be placed in any particular position of privilege in respect of those persons who could not gain admission to these schools; so that the fact that one was not able to gain admission to a Government Secondary School should not be any barrier to those children gaining access to education in accordance with the available resources; and so this policy was fashioned and the main plank of that policy was that assistance should be given to the teachers according to a certain formula — I believe up to the maximum of a qualified teacher scale was paid to teachers in a given ratio of teachers to pupils.

Exhibitions valued at \$25 were awarded to the successful students, and a certain number of subventions was made in respect of subjects such as Science, Domestic Science, Craft and Commercial subjects. That was the basis of the policy at that time. That was in 1965. Since that time, in recognition of the need for further assistance, the value of the bursaries and the value of the subventions have all been increased to the extent that the number of bursaries available for distribution would have been increased, I believe, from about \$1,500 to about \$2,900. The Minister can correct me if I am wrong on this.

There was an increase in the number of persons holding bursaries as well as in the value of those bursaries or exhibitions as they are styled now in the policy of assistance to the approved independent schools. Mr. Chairman, the problem that we face in this country today and that we faced in 1965, and indeed that we faced prior to 1961 was the problem of providing adequate accommodation for all of the children of school age; and it is a fallacy to believe that by some waving of a magic wand or

some magic formula that these problems can be solved overnight.

From that analysis it followed therefore that the only reasonable course for this country to pursue in terms of its young people was to provide assistance to those private schools which met the criteria. I do not think that you can fault that type of analysis which led to the development of this policy, and I am certain that in his reply the Minister would indicate to this House what is really the adhocism that he was referring to; because it was a policy that was set out and it was known not only to the Government of Barbados, but to the people of this country, and they recognised that this was one of the major innovations introduced by the Democratic Labour Party.

I am grateful for the opportunity of having had some small part to play in the innovation of this particular policy. I know that I will not get that type of credit from the member for St. James. He may smile. Mr. Chairman, this is the first occasion that we have heard a confession from the Government that the policy of re-admitting 14 year olds is creating certain difficulties. I believe that the word used was "extreme". That is something that we pointed out from this side of the Chamber.

What the Minister has not told us, however, is how this particular measure today will actually solve that particular problem. He admitted that they are certain problems involved in the re-admission, because the more that you retain children in schools the fewer children you are able to admit into those school places unless the total capacity is increased.

In any way, I believe that the member for St. Michael South East is the head — I am sorry, former head of a private school and is fully aware of this. (*Aside:* He is still head?) I said former head. This problem of retaining children in schools is one that we have to face. I would like to say, Mr. Chairman, that the private schools in this country are under financial pressure, under financial strain of the increased cost of operating, under the increased cost of providing adequate facilities which modern day education would require. They are under strain in terms of rent, salaries of teachers — qualified teachers who should be employed in order to give these children as good an education as possible.

The problems which the Government Secondary Schools have encountered as a result of increasing cost have not affected the

Government Schools, but they have certainly affected the private Secondary Schools. So these schools are under extreme financial pressure to provide quality education at a reasonable cost. The Government Schools are in a different position because the administration of those schools can make requests for increased allocations and grants to the Ministry of Education, and depending on how persuasive the Minister may be in the councils of the Cabinet, he may be able to satisfy some of the demands for increased provisions for Government Secondary Schools.

These are ultimately paid for out of the tax dollars of the people of this country. So they can make their request and part of the reasonable request will be met out of the tax dollars; but the private secondary schools are not in that particular position. Their only recourse when the cost of chalk goes up, when the cost of a lavatory bowl goes up, when the cost of constructing a desk or a chalk board goes up, their only recourse is to the pockets of the parents who have to pay these school fees. So to that extent the private schools are at a disadvantage when compared with the position of the Government Schools.

6.20 p.m.

We believe that a new look and a new deal will have to be given to and devised for these private Secondary Schools. I will come to this shortly. First of all, it must be pointed out that the solution to the problem of the provision of secondary education in this country as far as the quantity of education is concerned is twofold. I believe that it is beneficial, I would even say necessary, for this country to continue to have a dual system of secondary education. I believe the private Secondary Schools have been playing a very important role in education in this country, and I believe that every effort should be made to facilitate those private schools in continuing to play an important role in the development and evolution of education in this country. I would like to start from that particular position that we believe that the private schools should be allowed a particular role to continue to play a meaningful role in the development of education in this country.

We heard that in the general economic system that there is a mixed economy. I am saying that our educational system should be a mixed or dual system giving due weight to the role of the private Secondary Schools. That is why we evolved a policy of assistance to those private schools. That is why we improved the assistance given to those private schools, and that

is why we are calling upon the Government to make its position quite clear that it will enable those private Secondary Schools to continue to play a meaningful role in the evolution of education in this country.

Mr. Chairman, we would have liked to hear something more about the construction of additional Secondary Schools by the Government. You will recall that I indicated that the solution to the problem of providing education at the secondary level is twofold. I said that one aspect of that provision must be to enable the private Secondary Schools to continue to play a meaningful role in this country, but the second plank must be the construction of additional Secondary Schools and the extension of existing Secondary Schools. These were the directions in which the policy for education were tended under the previous administration and that was no *ad hocism*. It arose out of a sober analysis of the problems for Secondary Education in this country.

Maybe, the Minister will tell us what has happened to the proposals for the construction of an additional Secondary School in the parish in which I was born, St. James, and which.... (*Asides.*) I see the temporary representative for that particular constituency, the temporary representative over there — (*Asides.*)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

Mr. SANDIFORD: We would like to hear from the Minister what proposals he has for the construction of that Secondary School for St. James. We had proceeded on the arrangements and the plans for the Secondary School and, maybe, the Minister can tell us something about the matter. Maybe, the Minister can tell us something about a proposal for a new Secondary School at Ferniehurst, Deacons Road, St. Michael. Those plans were developed. The Ministry of Communications and Works was responsible for preparing the plans based on the specifications prepared by the Ministry of Education; the land was acquired and made available, and the Minister may be able to tell us something about that. Certainly the proposals for additional schools must require an additional Secondary School in the parish of Christ Church, one of the most populous parishes in this country. These are directions into which we were taking the educational system of this country.

Mr. Chairman, it must be a twofold development. Assistance for the private schools and the provision of additional places within the Government sector of education in this country. I

have indicated that what we need is a new deal as far as these private Secondary Schools are concerned, and this new deal will grow and develop naturally out of the policies that have been pursued by the previous administration, or should I say by previous administrations, because by no stretch of the imagination are we saying that educational development in this country started in 1961. I would not want anyone to get that impression that that is what I am saying, but we would like due weight to be given to the new direction and we do not believe that they should be dismissed under the umbrella term of *ad hocism*. We do not believe that that gives justice to a bold policy for education that was elaborated in 1961 — 1976.

6.30 p.m.

We cannot escape from the problem, Mr. Chairman. With the best will and the best intention and all of the support from over here the Minister must recognise that it will take some time before he can get the Government sector adequately provided with buildings for the accommodation of children of secondary school age in this country, and we are saying that he must seriously consider, and we are calling upon him now to reassess this programme of assistance to the private schools and make grants to these schools on the basis of a per capita grant in terms of the pupils in these schools. We believe that this is the method after having experienced the previous forms of assistance devised by the Government; we are calling upon the Government to recognise the role played by the private schools in terms of making grants to these schools on the basis of a per capita provision, that is, in terms of each pupil in the school.

We believe that this is the type of provision which would assist these schools best in dealing with the problems of providing education for the young people of this country. We believe and we call upon the Government secondly to establish an adequate inspectorate to ensure that the policy of assistance, that the facilities at the schools and that the quality of education in those schools reach the standards desirable by the Ministry of Education. We believe that this would be a necessary further development as far as these schools are concerned.

Thirdly we believe that the area of assistance to these schools should not be limited to these four areas of science, commercial studies, crafts and home economics, but that grants could be made for other activities in these schools which have a meaningful impact on the growth and development of the students attending these

schools. And fourthly, as part of this new deal for the private secondary schools we believe and we call upon the Government to implement the provisions of the Education Act passed by Parliament in respect of private secondary education in this country. And the Minister can tell us what is preventing him from implementing these provisions, but we believe after having studied the problems provided by the private secondary schools in this country - and I believe that today there are some 19 of them - that the provisions of that Act will or would go a long way towards improving education in these schools.

I speak, Mr. Chairman, from a position of having myself for a period taught students who attended private schools. I have laboured in that particular vineyard, and I am pleased to know that some of the children with whom I had some association have made a significant mark in this country. I am pleased about that particular development, and I have a passionate commitment to the role that these private secondary schools can play, and that is why I make this particular call for a four-point new deal for these private secondary schools.

Let no one say, because the argument is a very fashionable argument to come from that side, that we were in power for fifteen years and did not do these things. If that particular argument were to be advanced, let me nip it in the bud right now and say that we evolved a policy on assistance to the private secondary schools, a policy which was not there before, because there was no assistance to these private schools.

I would like to raise a related matter. During the budgetary proposals I believe the people of this country were told that parents who sent their children to the private secondary schools would benefit from the 1977 financial year through a rebate on income tax in respect of school fees paid for these children. I believe that was the statement made by the Minister of Finance. As I understand it, Mr. Chairman, one would first have to submit the income tax return, claim the new allowance for the school fees paid for those children of secondary school age and then get a refund perhaps some time after April 1978, a benefit for the year 1977-78. I hope that is clear, Mr. Chairman. I would like to raise a query on behalf of the underprivileged parents in this country who may not be paying income tax; they may not qualify to pay income tax, but they may have children or they may be guardians of children who attend these private schools, and I am asking this question now; how are these

parents to benefit from the provision announced in the Budgetary Proposals that one would get an income tax rebate in terms of school fees paid for the income year 1977-78.

6.40 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, I do not understand. I know you are following me but I would like to get this matter clear. The Budgetary Proposals indicated that parents with children in private secondary schools should benefit by means of a refund of the school fees paid after they have submitted their income tax returns, but on the binding commitment that their children did attend a private secondary school in this country - the Community High School may be, the Modern High School, Kayes Academy, etc. They may not qualify to pay income tax but they may nevertheless have children attending these schools.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You are repeating this over and over.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Thank you Mr. Chairman. We welcome the proposals set out by the Minister as going somewhere towards dealing with the problem posed to the Private Secondary Schools in this country, but our analysis indicates they do not go far enough and that is why we are seeking a new deal arising out of our experience of having evolved and developed a new policy of assistance for these private secondary schools. And with these words, Mr. Chairman, and assuming that the Minister is of the same frame of mind when he gets his National Commission on Education established, he can rest assured that having recognized the origin and fraternity of that particular measure he will get the support of this side as far as that particular measure is concerned.

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Chairman, in speaking on this Resolution I do so in a dual capacity; firstly, as a representative of the people, and secondly, as a parent.

You may be flabbergasted to hear that I still have four children at school and the age of the last one is five years. Consequently you will expect me to express my feelings and to display my interest in all aspect of education in this country.

Now in dealing with this Resolution I want to deal with one aspect of it. It is proposed to increase the value of the bursaries in the independent schools from \$50 per term to \$75 per term, or the total termly fee, whichever is less. As you know, Sir, this increase of fees for

these schools will benefit the masses, and they are the people who have caused us to be members of this ancient and honourable House of Assembly. I am therefore very happy to think that at this particular moment in the changing and improving of the standard of education in this country the Government has found it possible to alleviate a reasonable amount of the hardship which these people suffer at present.

Having said that I am a parent, you can therefore see that I take it upon myself to check on everything that is going on in education and to notice on all occasions if we are upgrading or downgrading the standard of education. I have no claim to being an expert on education, but I speak here today as a member of this ancient and honourable House of Assembly and as a parent, and therefore I hope those who are experts will forgive me for any suggestions which do not meet their approval.

Mr. Chairman, it is known that by this increase in the amount per term for each child the workers in the lower brackets will derive some kind of benefit financially.
6.50 p.m.

Every adult who is employed in this country pays taxes in a direct or in an indirect manner and therefore we as members of this House of Assembly must do our utmost to assist those, especially who pay taxes in an indirect way. While it is true to state, Sir, that I have been fortunate that my children did not have to depend on bursaries — I do not know who they have inherited the talent from — but what I am prepared to say is this, that I have a son who is a doctor and he holds the M.R.C.O.G., F.R.C.S. and he is a consultant in the United Kingdom, and I would go as far to say that I have been married twice, and perhaps I would say too that these children are my second crop, but I want to say this, that if I am allowed to say then that up to the present time I have no interest in bursaries, but there is one thing which strikes me about education in this island and I am hoping that the Minister of Education will make a note of this, I have found out that in this island we need more nursery schools.

Now imagine in the island of Barbados we only have approximately three or four nursery schools, that people in the rural area if they want their children to be given that training have to apply to those schools. I am going to say something which I know many members will be surprised to hear. It is as hard to get a

child into the nursery school in St. Michael as for you and I to get to Heaven.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The time is now 7 o'clock. I must progress and leave to sit again.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and Mr. CHAIRMAN reported progress and asked for leave to sit again.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. SPEAKER: The time is now 7 o'clock and this sitting stands suspended until 8 o'clock tonight.

RESUMPTION

On the resumption:—

Mr. SPEAKER: This sitting is now resumed. When the 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: The hon. member for St. Philip South will continue.

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Chairman, when the House was suspended I was drawing to the attention of the Minister of Education the importance which I attach to nursery schools in this island. Sir, in dealing with the improvement of education, and speaking as a representative of the people and also as a parent, I consider that the nursery school must be given top priority in improving the standard of education.

My reason for saying so is, Sir, that if we want to inculcate in the minds of the people of this country, and especially the youth, we must start from the bottom. Failing to do so, all of our plans will be frustrated in the long run. Now Sir, some people may argue that we have the day nurseries. I do not consider day nurseries as any substitute for the nursery schools. I think that the time has come when we must realise the inconvenience and the hardship which parents of this island are facing to get their children to the nursery schools.

Now, Sir, I want to point out this, that while it is true that certain organisations might have contributed funds for the building of nursery schools, I am asking the Government to

go into this matter because members of these various organisations, their relatives and friends get top priority in the selection of their children for various schools. Why? Because they have contributed to the building fund.

The time has come when, while we appreciate the help that these organisations give in trying to impress upon us that they are doing something to help the country, I am saying in no uncertain terms that there is an ulterior motive in doing such things; and I am appealing to the Minister to take all that I have said into consideration.

I see no reason why at this particular time in the development of this country why we should not have a nursery school in every parish in the rural areas; and the reason is that I have been fortunate to get two children at a nursery school and they had to travel at that early age from St. Philip to St. Michael. This creates a big problem for the children and the parents.

In the parish which I have the honour to represent, I will try to prove to you something which I have been thinking about for a very long time; and it is that we have a primary school in Four Roads, St. Philip with approximately 600 children, boys and girls. You have two junior schools, as they are called, at St. Martins with approximately 200 children each. One is for boys and the other is for girls.

Now, Sir, when it comes to education, speaking as a parent and a representative of the people, I am saying that in my opinion the time has come when these two schools should be amalgamated. At Four Roads you have one school, with approximately 600. Why cannot you have all these children at Four Roads and those schools could be used as nursery schools?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I would like to draw your attention to the fact that we are discussing secondary schools. I gave you a certain amount of latitude and you referred to nursery schools.

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Chairman, we are dealing with Education, and Education covers all aspects of the schools. To get children to the independent secondary schools, they must go to the primary or nursery schools; and therefore, Sir, I submit and I do hope that you will consider that in dealing with Education in general you will forgive me if you feel that my speech had nothing to do with other aspects of education.

If it is your desire, I will say in conclusion that I can only appeal to the Minister of Education to take what I have said into consideration, and give serious consideration to having nursery schools in the rural areas. I submit that this is something that he should try to consider as soon as possible since with the exception of St. Michael and Christ Church you have only one nursery school to serve the other parishes.

8.10 p.m.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman,

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am sorry. I am entertaining the hon. member for Christ Church. You will have your chance.

Mr. WARD: Mr. Chairman, I have, within the last couple of months, been favoured and been appointed on the Committee of the Hotel School. As you are well aware, Sir, everybody cannot make the Secondary School, and the Hotel School fills a very important place in this country. (*Asides.*)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

Mr. WARD: I regret to have to say, Mr. Chairman, that I find that the standard at this School is exceedingly low. I appreciate this opportunity to be able to mention this fact to members of Parliament. Now, I will state that I have been informed that there was a time when the standard was very high, but like everything else it has dropped and the usual attitude is that after something has got to a standard it will stay there by itself. Especially in regard to tourism, I think, Mr. Chairman, . . .

Mr. WEEKES *rose* --

Mr. CHAIRMAN: On what do you rise?

Mr. WEEKES: On a point of order or explanation.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Explanation?

Mr. WEEKES: On a point of order. Mr. Chairman, I have great respect for the hon. member, but I am wondering if you, Sir, have one method of dealing with a member of the Opposition and another method of dealing with a member of the Government. When I was about to continue my speech on Nursery Schools, you drew it to my attention that we were not dealing

with Nursery Schools. He is now talking about a Hotel School. With all due respect to you, Sir, and I apologise to you because you are in the Chair and I have great respect for you.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I would like to explain my action, if I may be allowed to do so. You had already made your point, and you were belabouring a point and making a debate of a subject which is not here for discussion. The hon. member who has just risen to speak is now developing his subject, and, as I did in your case, I will allow some levity. He has a chance to develop his subject. There is no need for me to give this explanation, but I hope you would benefit from it.

Mr. WARD: Mr. Chairman, after the hon. member for St. Philip gave such a strong case for the continuation of his line on this matter of education, he said that primary led into secondary, and he put it over so forcefully that not only were you carried by his argument, but every member in Parliament was carried by it. It was felt that he should continue on that line; therefore, I took the liberty to follow his example, Mr. Chairman.

Now, there is a general feeling, Mr. Chairman, and I would like to voice it here, that as far as tourism is concerned anybody can do anything. In truth and in fact we had better get in our minds immediately that the tourist industry is a professional career and, as such, we cannot afford to have a low standard of teaching in the Hotel School. I would just like to mention that there is no Principal or Deputy Principal. Both offices are held by people who are acting, and I regretfully have to state that neither of these people, the Principal nor the Deputy Principal, is suitable for the job. Quite frankly, I might as well get straight to the point, Mr. Chairman. (*Asides.*) If it is so that we should not discuss this matter at this time, it is so important that I do not mind leaving it out right now because it is of vital importance to this country. I was of the impression, as we were debating education, it could be brought in here. I have two other matters to speak on in this regard, but if you feel that it is not bearing on anything that is immediately before us — (*Asides.*) I heard the hon. member for St. Michael South, and he covered every aspect of education. Of course, he was not repeating himself.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, on a point of elucidation. The member for Christ Church North Central said I covered everything under the sun. I never spoke about the Hotel School.

Mr. WARD: Not under the sun. I said every aspect of education. Mr. Chairman, I would like to hear from you if I can continue with this. It is very important that I should get across a few points.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: No. I will not permit discussion on the Hotel School.

Mr. WARD: All right, Sir.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I should like to say that the Opposition is not opposed to this Resolution. As a matter of fact, we are very relieved to discover that, in spite of the depletion of the Treasury that we have heard so much about in the last few months, the Government finds it possible to grant a certain degree of alleviation to the parents as well as to the School Administration in this very important field of education. I had the honour to be the Minister of Education for about eleven months, and I was only too appreciative of the part that the Independent Secondary Schools were playing in trying to meet the needs of our Government's policy as it then was and still is to give every child the opportunity of a Secondary Education. With the number of Secondary Schools which we had, and the Government endeavoured to build as many as possible, we could not but understand and appreciate the part that these schools were playing.

I would like to say at this point that I think the community itself is appreciative of the part which my colleague, the member for St. Michael South, played during the period that he had the honour to preside over the Ministry of Education. I think that if anybody is an architect of a new thinking in education and is devising, from the time he took up the Ministry, an opportunity for the masses to share in education, then I think that tribute should be paid to the member for St. Michael South.

As I have said before, education is a constant evolving process. You are dealing with the minds of the young generation and you are dealing with people. I have said it before, and I have said it at Speech Days when I had the honour to preside, that when you are a Minister of Communications and Works and you want to stop a road or building, you issue instructions that no more marl, no more grit, and no more tar should be dropped and it can be stopped. In education you are dealing with people's minds and you are dealing with long-term and short-term projections and, therefore, it is vital that in the planning for education you have

some ultimate goal. What the Minister has told us today of his endeavour to increase and improve both the facilities of the private Secondary Schools as well as for assisting parents in meeting the constant increasing demands in terms of school fees, I do not think anybody could really oppose that. I would like, as Leader of the Opposition, to commend the Government for their step in this direction. It is obvious to me that the Minister himself and the Minister of Finance must be satisfied that the Treasury is getting filled up from the new Budget and from the taxation on almost everything which he has imposed.

8.20 p.m.

I would like to say to him that he is following in the good footsteps of my predecessor, the hon. member for St. Michael South and myself, and I am glad that in this area we have a very worthy successor. I think I can say of the Attorney General himself that he seems to be following in the footsteps of a worthy predecessor. I do not know how many steps back, or how many steps he will care to go, but I would like to assure him that he is following good footsteps. The Opposition is not opposing this, but there are one or two matters I would like to draw to the Minister's attention. I think the Minister will find on the files that the Government was committed to providing more secondary schools for the people of this country. I would think he would agree with me on that. His party was committed to the idea of extending the school age, but I think he will now have discovered that his action was a bit precipitous and that he acted a bit fast, because I think he will find that our growing population for secondary education is increasing at such a great pace that in the absence of school places, I sympathise with him, and I am sure he may be having a problem for the September term, because when I was Minister of Education we had three secondary schools planned, one in Christ Church, one at Trents and one at Ferniehurst, and I think he himself will discover that the cost of establishing a secondary school as we learned when we established the Garrison and St. George Secondary schools is extremely high. I am sure the Minister himself must be looking at the possibility of devising schools for expansion which will probably cost less than those two schools which we had to build.

I think the Minister will discover that if he is expanding secondary education in this country that Barbados has got to look to its own resources for this expansion, because unless he is more persuasive than I am, in my discussions with the Inter-American Development

Bank for funds to extend Harrison College, Queens College and Lodge School to bring them to 800 odd which is a reasonable figure, the Inter-American Development Bank was not biting, and they were constantly telling Barbados that it had such a high standard of education that they were a bit doubtful whether education was a Barbadian priority in contra-distinction to Latin American countries where the primary school system was not even meeting the demands of all the people at the primary level, and here we in Barbados had a high literacy rate and therefore they could not really seriously consider giving us money for secondary school expansion. This is why I hope the Attorney General will come in with the revised Treaty and the agreement on the American Base that he can bring us in some millions to assist the Minister of Education in expanding our need for secondary school places, and I wish him luck. Any millions you do bring in would certainly assist the Minister of Education in meeting the demands both of your Government and of our Government which at least in this area I think, with certain variations, desire to see that every child in this country gets an opportunity to develop its potential to the maximum. I do not think that at this point in education we are at any cross purposes, and therefore I see the question of secondary schools as costing a fortune. I think until the Government has enough resources to build at least three secondary schools which are immediately needed and expand other secondary schools which we have got, Harrison College, Lodge School and Queens College, I think the Minister after every common entrance examination will find himself in difficulties.

Now I understand, and I speak subject to correction and the Minister can enlighten me on this, that even in this common entrance examination — and I do not know whether our policy was right or wrong and perhaps he can tell me it is not true — he has had to leave back in the primary schools more children this time than have ever been left back in the primary schools for another year for remedial reading and trying to bring them up to a certain standard. I have heard teachers saying that this year they have got eight, they have got fourteen or sixteen, and although I am not quarrelling with the leaving back, I am asking whether he will tell us the schools at which he has had to leave them back and what provision the Government is making for improving the reading, writing and arithmetic of the children who are being left back in the schools where formerly these children went on to secondary schools where they went into the "C" stream,

vocational or otherwise. I would like the assurance because this is what I have been told by the teachers. I have not been going to the Ministry because since I have been accused of trying to undermine the Minister, even although I have the right to go there as a citizen and a taxpayer, I have avoided that. I have heard head teachers saying that they were keeping back 8, or 9 or 14, so I would like the assurance from the Minister that even although this is necessary both from the point of view of the pupils and from perhaps the point of view of school places, that he is making preparation in terms of transfer, not just ordinary teachers who are coming into the system for the first time, but experienced teachers to spend a year with these children so that eventually they can transfer to the secondary system having benefited from the year remaining in the primary school system.

I want him to assure me that this year where this is happening that he has made, is about to make or intends to make provision for the proper further education of the children who are being left behind.

Now I would like just to touch a very thorny point. When I was Minister of Education naturally they invited the new Minister of Education to Speech Days, and I have had the pleasure of visiting most of the secondary schools either at Speech Day or on other occasions, and this is a very sad commentary on the social system of Barbados, that when I sit on the platform of Combermere and look up in the gallery I can only see one or two white faces; when I sit on the platform of St. Michael's again I can only see one or two white faces, but when you go to Queens College or Lodge School or to Codrington High School and Presentation or even to Foundation surprisingly I can find sprinkled among these black faces a vast number of white faces. Now what is wrong with Combermere? What is wrong with St. Michael's? I am not blaming the Minister and I do not want to get into any heated argument, but I am showing you what the Barbadian society is. It has nothing to do with the hon. member for St. Michael South or the Minister or myself. I am just showing you what society we live in, that the moment they pass an examination Queens College is A-one, Lodge School is A-one, they will try Foundation, but when it comes to Combermere or to St. Michael's Girls School, they would prefer Codrington High School, St. Winifred's, Mapps and other schools in Barbados in 1977.

I think the Minister will agree that the schools I have mentioned St. Michael's

Combermere, Parry-Coleridge, and the Alleyne School do not reflect the percentage of distribution of population in terms of colour or race, and this worries me that even in 1977 we can get situations where parents are prepared when given a secondary school place at St. Michael's, Combermere or at Alleyne School would prefer a bursary to pay for the children to go to Mapps or to Presentation rather than to accept the place in the Government secondary school where the Government is paying teachers reasonable salaries to teach the children.

8.30 p.m.

I am not blaming the Minister, because the parent is free to send his child to England or to Timbuctu; but I am only saying that we live in a society where we have constantly got to be on the watch to notice what is happening in our society, because it seems that because certain racial sections opted out of the political system they have begun to choose the system to which they are sending their children. This is the experience of the Minister; we cannot do anything about it, except that it was obvious to me during my tenure of office and I had commented about it to headmasters; not to find the ethnic derivation or ethnic group, but it was obvious to me when I looked on the platform upstairs and could only see two white faces in a school of 700. Now don't tell me the population distribution in a school like Combermere is that low. And it has always worried me, and I am glad of the opportunity to draw it to attention. The Minister cannot do anything about it, but I am glad that he must have noticed it too, that all of our best schools in this country, Combermere as well as St. Michael's Girls' School, do not reflect the racial distribution of our population and do not truly reflect all the children who must have passed for these schools over the years in the Common Entrance Exam. I think you should reflect and see the society in which we live as an indication of the thinking even in 1977, and I think we should stop bursaries for people who get places to schools like St. Michael and Combermere but who try not to use these places; and I think the Minister should give some thought to this, that if you get a scholarship to a Government Secondary School and you write in to the Minister and say you do not want it, then you do not get anymore; give it to somebody else. You will find that the moment some children don't get into Harrison College, Lodge School or Queen's College, their parents say, "Give

me a bursary; I will send them to Presentation College or St. Winifreds. This is something the Minister should look at. If you are going to opt out, let them opt out for good, and do not encourage people to perpetuate in our system the racial distinctions which we have up to now. I think the Minister should give serious consideration to people who are given places in the Government Secondary Schools but instead try to get the \$75 being given as bursaries to private secondary schools. The policy should be if you win a place you take it, or you pay for your child if you do not want the place. I am not criticising the Minister, for I still believe in the right of a parent to send his child to whichever school he wants to, for this is a matter of freedom of choice. But what I am saying is, if the parent does not accept the place offered in a Government Secondary School where the Government is spending a fortune for education of the children, the parent should not be given money to send the child to a private school. Some people may get annoyed with me about this, but I am speaking of my experience as Minister of Education attending Speech Days and seeing this complete change in social thinking, in distribution in terms of our population. I don't want you to think I am preaching race or preaching anything, but to me it was noticeable and I had to comment on it to headmasters during my term of office as Minister of Education. So the Minister should decide a policy on that and try to correct this discriminatory aspect in our system.

I do not want to embarrass the Minister, but the Manifesto of the Barbados Labour Party has promised to the children of this country free school uniforms. Now I always thought that was a foolish promise, like the removal of the sales tax; but the Government got in on these terms, and I would like to know from the Minister whether this promise to give free uniforms to the children of secondary schools is likely to start for the September term or whether if, for various reasons, economic or otherwise, or whether it is a 1979, 1980 or 1981 promise, to tell the people they will get uniforms and then give them a year or two before elections; because if you have promised this in 1976 in your Manifesto, then the people of this country are expecting the Government to honour the promise as soon as possible. I always thought it a foolish promise myself. I would think it better to give the money to Social Welfare to spread the net further to assist more people to get uniforms. This would be a

good thing, but to promise every school child in Barbados — rich, poor, middle-class, upper-class, lower-class, — to me was a pie-in-the-sky promise to win votes.

Mr. SIMMONS: How would the Leader of the Opposition classify the promise of the Democratic Labour Party in 1961 to have a flour mill and to have plastic shoes at five shillings a pair, and sea coast houses for workers, and still waiting to have them implemented?

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I agree with the hon. member for St. Philip North. He is waiting for them but we are not in power to implement them. And the people dealt with us, as they are going to deal with you if you don't give them the uniforms; that is all I am saying. We did not fulfil our promises in 1961, but we got in in 1966 and 1971, and we lost in 1976. But all I am asking the Minister to explain, since the school year has just been finished, and the new school year begins in September, to say now — it may be a bit short, for to give all these children uniforms calls for the importation of a lot of material — but if he cannot say now, at least to say to the public of Barbados that they will not be getting free uniforms for the beginning of the 1977-78 year in school; that is what I want him to say; that either for economic reasons or because at this stage it is not practical, or for whatever reason, Government cares to give. But my constituents have come to me telling me that the Barbados Labour Party promised them school uniforms in their 1976 Manifesto. It is true you got in on the eve of the schools' opening in September, last year, because you got in on September 3 and schools were opened about September 7 or 8. Now you have been in power, and I think you have a token vote in the Estimates for the provision of uniforms, and I would like the Minister to tell the public and the parents who have got to buy new uniforms, either because the children are moving to a higher form, like my son, — he has to go into long pants instead of short pants; I have already ordered his long pants, I am not waiting on you because I realize you cannot honour the promise, but I would like you to tell the public that for the school year 1977-78 the Government, for whatever reasons, — I don't know — but the people are asking because it was in your Manifesto, — when they can expect to get new school uniforms. There may be good reasons, but just tell them whether it is this year or next year or that you will review it. But I think people have been worrying as to when that promise of yours will be fulfilled. I am not saying the economy will be able to do it, but they want to know, and I think the Minister if he is not in a

position to do it should let them know early so that they can go ahead and get uniforms for the children.

As I said, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say to the Minister quite clearly that I do appreciate this particular resolution and I am glad to see that he is in a position to bring some alleviation to the masses, because the Government's educational system is not equipped to service this particular area of education and I think they are playing a very important part in the educational life of the entire community. And I think it is the Government's responsibility to give to every child the opportunity to develop his potential to the maximum, and in this regard the private secondary schools have come to our aid.

8.40 p.m.

I, like him, would like to pay tribute to the private secondary schools, not only during the period when I was Minister of Education, but even now as a citizen for the part which they are playing in the education of Barbadian children, and when you look, as he will know, at the Estimates for the cost of educating a child at Harrison College, at Combermere, at Lodge, at Alleyne, and you look at those pages at the back of the Estimates and see what it costs us to educate a child at Harrison College and Combermere, even at our new secondary schools, you can appreciate the economic strain under which private schools, purely dependent on fees, not depending on any Government subvention, must be undergoing. As a matter of fact, it is not surprising if in some cases private secondary schools are forced for economic reasons to short-circuit and try to make ends meet by not being able to meet the full demands of the educational system and of their pupils. Because when you look at Harrison College with 700 children costing nearly \$1,000 per child — I may be wrong with these figures — but I think the Minister will agree that when you look at the number of pupils in the private secondary schools and you compare them with the numbers in the Government secondary schools, and when you look at the cost per child in the Government schools in contradistinction to the fees that the private secondary schools are forced to charge, even when they may seem exorbitant in the private secondary schools, they bear no relationship whatsoever to what it costs the Government to educate a child at Harrison College, Lodge, Combermere, Alleyne School, and therefore like the Minister himself I should like to pay tribute to the private secondary schools for their contribution to the educational standards and for the educational contribution they are making to our community.

I have had doubts about some of them. I think the Minister will agree that all are not up to the standard that we as Ministers of Education would require. We would hope that a lot of the secondary schools would be able to improve their standards, to increase the staff and to do much more for the children who are Barbadian citizens and are the children of Barbadians, and I think he knows too and he will agree that one of the things the last Government required was that the private secondary schools should submit accounts to justify the subventions, to justify the money the taxpayers were giving them, and I think if we look at the statements and the balance sheets of some of these private secondary schools we will appreciate that they were operating under an extremely difficult system with the necessity for fees to increase was almost inevitable, and I think you could appreciate that in some areas it might be thought that the children were not getting the type of education that we as Ministers of Education would have desired for them. That is why I will say to the Minister again today in bringing down some measure of alleviation and increasing the assistance to them is something which the Opposition appreciates and which the Opposition is very glad to notice, that the Minister is as aware as my colleague, the member for St. Michael South, and myself were aware of, that in this field and in this area of education the private independent schools were doing a wonderful job, and as the economy of this country expands we have to give them assistance, provided we monitor and make sure that they give for the assistance we grant them the education that we would wish to see them give, so I hope that the Minister does not think that my system or my speech is any criticism of him, because in this area and in this field this Resolution is worthy of unanimous support, because the children and the persons to whom this amount is being given are the children of Barbadian citizens, and I think our mere presence in this House indicates, and to some clearly indicates, that it is as a result of the educational system that we have been able to break through the racial and social barriers which have enabled us all to sit in here today in our own independent rights as free citizens with professions, with an ability to express on behalf of our fellow citizens our opinions on matters of education, and I hope the Minister now it is getting late understands that I am not criticising him, because on this I am giving him full marks. I will take off one or two marks, I will not give him 100%, he might be a 2:2 instead of first class honours, but he is in a first on this particular Resolution and he has the complete support of the Opposition on this particular matter.

Mr. BRADSHAW: Mr. Chairman, in rising to support this Resolution I want to make a few comments, after listening to the hon. member who has just sat down, and the hon. member for St. Michael South. The Resolution before this House seeks to increase the subvention to the independent secondary schools as well as to increase the amount of money payable to a bursar, but, Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out here that these same demands, what we are here asking for today, were contained in a pack of resolutions submitted by the Barbados Independent Secondary Schools Association way back two years ago to the former administration. Representatives of that body, BISSA, met with the member who just sat down and asked that he consider the 1:75 ratio as well as the increase of bursaries, and absolutely nothing was done, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: If he will just give way. We accepted the submission, but because you submit it do you mean pronto, abra cadabra you must get something? It is just a question of the economics and working it out. I am glad the Minister could bring it. Nobody is quarrelling with it, but because you submitted it two years ago, we lost power, the economic situation is steady, do you mean you do not give us any credit?

Mr. BRADSHAW: Mr. Chairman, things have got worse, the economic situation is very narrowly improved, but as a matter of priority this Government has found it fit to look after this desperate situation. This is important.

I have heard the hon. member for St. Michael South make the point that the independent schools are existing under adverse conditions, increased costs and very unsavoury conditions. I want to put it in perspective today, because the hon. member for St. Michael South when he was Minister of Education introduced an Act, the Education Bill of 1975, and that Act made it imperative and compulsory for the independent schools to have independent desks and units. It called upon those independent schools to improve their conditions, but what was worse the Minister did not find it possible to give them the additional grant.

8.50 p.m.

Now this is the situation.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: That Bill has never been proclaimed. It is not law.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member will take his seat.

Mr. BRADSHAW: Mr. Chairman, when the Bill was introduced in 1975 I was a member of the Business schools. There were the Co-operative School, Wakefield School, the Modern High School, the Federal High, Lynch's Secondary, The Lynch High and Unique High. All of us sat down, and there was general concern over the introduction of the Bill.

The schools decided that in order to meet the conditions set out in the Bill to ask the Minister for additional funds to help them. They were in a desperate situation then; and that is why the schools have found themselves involved in the extra cost today; because most of them went about getting new furniture to meet the deadline when the Bill was to be finally implemented, that is why the Modern High School had reached the stage where it was going to be closed down; that is why I must say thanks to the Minister of Education who came to them, realising the situation, and so the Modern High School will continue from September to open their doors.

The situation is grave today; and it is as a result of the measures taken by the former administration that has created a state of chaos and panic within these schools. We have contended as far back as 1971 that \$40 which was allocated to a bursary holder was inadequate; because my contention was that the schools were charging between \$80 and \$100 a term, and therefore \$40 was inadequate because parents would have to put their hands in their pockets to find the extra \$40 or \$60.

What I also pointed out was that it took at that time \$175 to keep a child in a Government Secondary School, including Harrison College, Lodge School, Combermere and Foundation. If it took that amount of money to keep a child in those schools, and the child had passed the same common entrance examination, it was my opinion that a fee of \$175, or whatever it took to educate a child at a Government run school should be given to a child as a bursary holder.

What I found out was that if you continued to give a child \$40 towards his education, you were asking the private schools to provide a lower level of education; but my contention was that the Minister of Education did not understand the real problem, and nothing that we suggested to him and his Government he took heed of. It is, not that we are seeking this money today. Let us face it. I am not satisfied that the \$75 which is going towards a bursary holder is adequate since these children pass the same common entrance

examination, and the school fees at the independent secondary schools are not \$75 a term. Very few of these schools have a basic fee of \$75. They start at \$90 and \$100. My contention will be that there should be given at least \$100; but due to the economic situation we can give no more than \$75.

What is significant about \$75 is that the former administration moved from \$25 to \$40. They then moved from \$40 just before the elections of 1971 to \$50; but the present Government is moving away from \$50 to \$75 — a full 45 per cent increase. Mr. Chairman, I must say that this problem arose from the mere fact that there has been an *ad hoc* system of education. When the Minister used the phrase “ad hocism” this brings to my mind the system which was perpetuated during the regime of the former Government. That is the common entrance system.

I must say that we have got to realise that all these problems that we are having today have come through the lack of proper educational training at the primary level; and it is time that we address ourselves to the situation. In 1974 the former administration had the hon. member for St. Michael South as Minister of Education. He knows very well that they had a system of education applicable to the common entrance examination whereby you had to have English and Arithmetic marks, then the marks converted and then you had to have few score marks, whatever that might mean. There are many teachers who did not understand what it meant.

In 1975 they change the system into English and Arithmetic, and in 1976 they reverted to the system of 1973, so that instead of Part I and Part II, they had one examination. So you will see, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister has quite rightly used the term “ad hocism” in education.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: It is now 9 o'clock. I must report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Mr. CHAIRMAN left the Chair. Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

Mr. SPEAKER: This is the moment of interruption. Is the matter under discussion controversial?

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I am seeking a clarification here of Rule 6(4) of the Standing Orders. The last sentence in that particular Rule states “Any other business, if unopposed, shall then be disposed of, and the

Order Paper for the next sitting fixed.” Is it at this particular point that we propose to fix the Order Paper?

Mr. SPEAKER: Does the hon. member wish to fix the Order Paper now?

Mr. SANDIFORD: I would like, Mr. Speaker, to know if I may raise this as a matter of Private Members' Business in relation to the Order Paper for the next sitting.
9.00 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: Now, the hon. member for St. Michael South. We are so happy in the knowledge that he reads and that he understands, and he wants us to follow the Standing Orders. The Standing Order, to which the hon. member refers us specifically states:

“Any other business if unopposed shall then be disposed of before we reach the fixing of the Order Paper.”

Mr. SANDIFORD: So we will dispose of the unopposed business first and then come to the fixing of the Order Paper. That is why I asked for the clarification, and whether it was at this point. I will wait for that, Sir.

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

Mr. BRADSHAW: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to prolong this debate, because I would like the Minister of Education to make his reply, but I want to make two final points. One is that.....

Hon. F. G. SMITH: On a point of order. I would like the Speaker to tell me.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Speaker is not here. The House is in Committee.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I would like you then. You are the Chairman. According to Rule 6(4), which was read by my friend, the member for St. Michael South, it says, “Any other business.” We are doing the same business we were doing before the moment of interruption. I am calling on you, as Chairman, to deal with this matter. You are Chairman of Committees, and if you cannot rule you can summon the Speaker. It says:

“At 9 p.m. hereinafter referred to in these Orders as the moment of interruption the Speaker shall interrupt the business under discussion.”

Which was the Resolution by the Minister. That was the business under discussion. It goes on to say:

"If the House is in Committee at the time....."

Mr. CHAIRMAN: As it was.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: ".....the Chairman shall interrupt the business....."

Mr. CHAIRMAN: As I did.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: "..... and shall leave the Chair forthwith to report progress to the House....."

As you did.

".....and ask for leave to sit again." As you did.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: At that point.....

Hon. F. G. SMITH: "Any other business....."

When the Speaker comes back now. The Speaker comes back because you have asked him to report progress, and for leave to sit again.

".....if unopposed shall then be disposed of....."

Is this any other business, or the same business?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Having reported progress, and having asked for leave to sit again.....

Hon. F. G. SMITH: No. He cannot give you leave to sit again. That is what I am pointing out to you. You report to him:

"Mr. Speaker, I beg to report progress and ask for leave to sit again."

He goes in the Chair and then he disposes of any other business.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: We are still on Government Business, and this matter is being pursued.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I agree with you that any other business can be Government Business, and I am not arguing about that. If the Leader of the House and I decide that any other business still on the Order Paper is

non-contentious, we can dispose of it. What you are doing now is going over the same old business where you had reported progress and asked for leave to sit again.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have done it already before this evening.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Leave to sit again is not in this same matter. Leave to sit again is broken off at that point. If the House is in Committee as it was, then next week or tomorrow morning you can sit again. What the whole Rule intends is that for the next half-hour between 9 p.m. and 9.30 p.m. we dispose of any business on the Order Paper which is non-contentious. Otherwise why report progress at nine, if you are going to sit back down in the Chair? We could as well finish at 9.30 p.m. You must observe the Rules of this House.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You have asked for a ruling on this matter. I will now give my ruling.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Just let me finish my point of order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I rule that..... (*Asides.*)

Hon. F. G. SMITH: You get people shouting "Sit down. Sit down," when the Rules of this House are being abused. I do not care.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have ruled on this, and the Hon. Leader of the Opposition will please be seated. Will you take your seat! Will you please continue. The hon. member for St. Michael South.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. You do not rule in this House by asking me to sit down. You are Chairman and you have to rule me out of order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will you be seated, please!

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I am going to sit down, and I am going to get back up again. Mr. Chairman, you are Chairman of this House and, therefore, you have to rule. You cannot treat me with that discourtesy.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I call the attention of this Committee to the behaviour of the Hon.

Leader of the Opposition, and I will tell him that he must sit and not stand again, or I will have to ask him to leave this House.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Ask him to leave.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You must sit. You will not be heard. Be seated.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I want a ruling from you.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I say be seated. I gave a ruling.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: That I am out of order!

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You are not listening.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: You can tell me that I am out of order, but you cannot tell him to speak again. I did not come in here by a donkey cart.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will you please take your seat!

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: You cannot get on so, man. Send him out, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I say be quiet! Order in here. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition is very much out of place, and his conduct is most unparliamentary, and we will not have that type of behaviour in here. When I gave my ruling he kept on talking and how could he have heard. My ruling further is that you will just sit and not be heard again as long as this House is in Committee.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: That is no ruling. That is illegal and.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! Be seated.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: You rule and I will sit. You cannot tell me that I cannot be heard in here. You did not vote for me.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will you please sit down! You cannot speak to the Chair like this. Will you please sit down! You cannot be heard again!

Hon. F. G. SMITH: You cannot tell me that man.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Put him outside.

Mr. BRADSHAW: Mr. Chairman, I was saying. . .

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I would like to draw to your attention the scathing remarks made by the Leader of the Opposition. I am appealing to you, Mr. Chairman, to have those remarks expunged from the records. I think it is an attack on your credibility in the Chair; it is a reflection on your ruling in calling on the Leader of the Opposition to take his seat, and the Leader of the Opposition is in turn telling you that you cannot make him take his seat neither can you send him out of here.

Sir, since you have failed, in my opinion, to send the member out of the Chamber, I am appealing to you to have those remarks by the Leader of the Opposition expunged from the records. This is my submission to the Chair. I will even go further, Sir. I am calling on you to ask the Leader of the Opposition to withdraw, if you are prepared to be lenient. You will ask the hon. member to withdraw the scathing remarks he has made. It is a reflection on the Chair. It shows a lack of respect, and a member who has been in here for so long should have known much better. I am ashamed of you. This is a black day.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Be seated. It certainly has been. Will you please continue.

Mr. BRADSHAW: Mr. Chairman, I am asking the Minister to carefully consider the request which I would like to make at this stage.

9.10 p.m.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I have appealed to you. It is my submission that the remarks made by the Leader of the Opposition should be expunged from the records. If you do not think it should be done, I will bow to your wishes.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I will just ask that all hon. members observe the Rules and let us carry on with the debate. The remarks you referred to did not catch my ear or maybe they slipped me, and if you would repeat them I may have to reconsider it, but I would rather we go on with the business of the House. Let the hon. member carry on.

Mr. BRADSHAW: As I was saying, Mr. Chairman, I would like the Minister to consider

what is now a practice, and I would like him to consider too that children, whether they go to the Government assisted schools or Approved Independent schools or the private schools as long as they have passed the Common Entrance age, should be considered for free text books. I am making this appeal because I feel strongly that children who have passed the 11+ age are all sons and daughters of Barbadian parentage and that all of them should be entitled to the textbooks if they are not entitled to the bursary of \$75. I think the time has come when we must eliminate this sort of discriminatory practice in education, and I am calling on the Government and the Minister to consider an appropriate time when this will be implemented. That is all I have to say on this matter.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: If there is no other hon. member who wishes to make a contribution, then the Minister may exercise his right of final reply.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, there is very little time left for me to reply to the number of contributions made on both sides of the House, but if I may just address myself to some of the comments made by the hon. member for St. Michael South, and I will say that my reply to him would be more in sorrow than in anger, and of course that would apply to the hon. member for St. Michael South Central, not from his contribution on the substance of the Resolution, but on the subsequent behaviour. The hon. member for St. Michael South went on the defensive in the middle of his contribution and he actually asked that he should not be told that when they were running the show why didn't they make these suggestions that he could have implemented, and it is difficult although he threw it out not to throw it out not to make this type of criticism.

Anyhow I shall not belabour that. I will answer in view of the shortness of time some of the rather more interesting points he made. In respect of the aid to these schools, the hon. member has said that this is a good Resolution, well intentioned, but it is not enough. We have seen a 500% increase in some of the subventions, and the hon. member says that is not enough. We are currently spending in this financial year more money both in dollar terms and in percentage of the national expenditure on education than has ever been spent before, and only in the last four months I have come before this House and have requested supplementary funds of just under \$½ million for the Approved Independent Schools, and the hon. member says that is not enough. Well I agree with him and I agree with the hon. member for St. Michael South East too, that it

would be good when we can give the Approved Independent Schools more money. We are looking forward to the day as my colleague from St. Michael South East suggested when we can pay the total amount of school fees for the people in the private schools; but just as hon. members on the other side found that the financial constraints did not allow them to raise the bursaries to over \$50 nor indeed to increase the subventions from \$600 to \$700 a year which are extremely trifling, now that we are making what I consider a serious attempt at trying to solve this problem by giving assistance, the hon. member for St. Michael South should be ashamed to say that we are not doing enough.

When the hon. member was a Minister of Education there were 12,000 and upwards in private schools and there are now about 5,000. If he appreciated the role that these schools were playing and if he appreciated the fact that there were no places for them in Government schools, why didn't he not do something to keep the numbers at 12,000 instead of 5,000. What has happened is that the 7,000 children have been thrown on to the Government schools of failure to give assistance to the independent private schools at the time when they desperately needed help; so the criticism of the hon. member ill befits him; it does not suit him to come in and make that type of criticism in here.

Now I do recall and I got a lot of evidence subsequently to back it up that it was the policy of the hon. member for St. Michael South, as the expression goes, not to throw good money after bad, that prevented them from giving more assistance to the Approved Independent schools. They felt they were wasting the money by throwing it out in these schools because they said they were providing sub-standard education and that they might better be spending their money in creating places in Government schools. We are playing both and we are developing *pari passu*. But let me tell you what we are going to do in relation.....

Mr. SANDIFORD: On a point of elucidation, I would like to point out that I am not aware of having that type of policy that the member for St. George South is indicating that I had. When we went to the Ministry of Finance for funds for additional support for the private schools, it was that Ministry which placed a lid on additional finance because of the state of the country's finances, but it was no policy of the Ministry of Education not to provide continuing assistance to the private schools.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, if I may just advert to the comment that the hon. member made, he said it depends on how persuasive the Minister is in Cabinet and if this particular Minister is sufficiently persuasive to get his Cabinet colleagues to come up with the money and to persuade the now existing Minister of Finance to come up with the money to give assistance to the schools, then it shows the difference between the two Ministers. I would like the hon. member to understand that when he talks about a dual system, a little bit of private schools and providing more Government places, we have in the Estimates of Expenditure for 1977-78 funds voted for extension of St. Lucy's school, West St. Joseph, Princess Margaret, St. Leonard's Girls', St. Leonard's Boys', Queen College, St. Michael's Girls', Alexandra, Combermere, Alleyne, Boys' and Girls' Foundation and Harrison College. And there is also provision in the Estimates for construction of a new school.

9.20 p.m.

It was way back in 1971 that the hon. member for St. James in a Question tabled in this Hon. Chamber enquired of the Government when they were going to construct a school in St. James; and for five years they did not build any school. And now they have got the nerve to come ten months out of power quarrelling about a school for St. James. But I will tell them this: we will start to build a school at Trents in St. James early next year. And I will tell you more; we will build a secondary school in Christ Church and we will build a third secondary school not at Ferniehurst, because we do not believe in clogging up central St. Michael with more traffic; we believe that the children should move out of central St. Michael to the environs of the parish boundaries, and we never felt that Ferniehurst was the ideal location for a school anyway, because there is very limited space at Ferniehurst and very little room for a playing area. But we will build a school and at this juncture I would like the hon. member for St. Michael South to understand this. You said you could not build schools because you could not get any money from the Inter American Development Bank to build schools. One accepted this. But the Inter-American Development Bank is not the only international funding institution, and the International Bank for reconstruction and development has as its policy the granting of loans for secondary schools and has done it in many parts of the world. So if the hon. member did not know where to shop around or was too lazy to shop around, he must not come in here and believe that his successors in office have the same type ...

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, on a point of elucidation, is the Minister indicating that he had a loan for secondary education from the World Bank?

Hon. L. R. TULL: Everything will come out in the fullness of time; just like the uniforms for children in secondary schools will come at the appropriate time. The hon. member for St. Michael South comes up with what he calls his four point, new deal plan for education, and all the points he raised were made to the hon. member for St. Michael South Central as Minister of Education by the independent schools. Now I don't know who is copying whom, but since the hon. member for St. Michael South comes second last in time suggests to me that he is copying from the people who preceded him, so I do not take that very seriously.

In view of the time, Mr. Chairman, although there are many other points to which I would like to reply, I will end my remarks at this stage and ask that this Resolution do now pass.

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

The question 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, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair.

On the separate motions of Hon. H. B. St. JOHN, seconded by Hon. L. S. CRAIG, the Resolution was read a first and second time and passed.

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, earlier today a supplementary notice was given and circulated to the other side about notice of a Bill which forms part of the Budgetary Proposals, and we want it to be printed so that next week it can be dealt with; and I am asking for leave to give notice of this Bill, a Bill to amend the Estates and Succession Duties Act.

Mr. SPEAKER: There being apparently no objection, leave is granted.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, may I in like manner ask for leave for a Resolution which I submitted last week through the office of the Clerk under Private Members Business, and I resubmitted that Resolution again today to the Clerk, and I am asking similarly for leave that this Resolution be printed for appearance on the Order Paper for next Sitting.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill be read a first time.

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

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

Mr. SANDIFORD: I am waiting on your directions, Mr. Speaker; may I proceed to give notice of this Resolution now.

Mr. SPEAKER: My instructions from the Clerk are that he has not had time to process the Resolution.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, with all due respect, this is a matter which was

Mr. SPEAKER: With all due respect to the hon. member's rights, if I have been so advised I can only tell the member the instructions that have been given to me.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, it is the rights and privileges of the members that are being trampled upon now I am sorry, Mr. Speaker. Let me say what I was saying. I do not wish to reflect on your ruling, but here you have given the Leader of the House permission to deal with a matter ...

Mr. SPEAKER: You are now reflecting on a vote of the House.

Mr. SANDIFORD: I am not reflecting on a vote of the House; I am mainly reciting a fact and I am seeking to have ...

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the hon. member please take his seat.

Mr. SANDIFORD: I will sit.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I understand that at 9.30 according to the Rules.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Just a minute. I will warn the hon. member for St. Michael South that as long as the Chair is constituted as at present I will not tolerate any thumping of the table or anything of that sort when a member is called upon to take his seat. That type of behaviour will not escape my notice while I am in this Chair.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the House do now adjourn until August 1, at 12 Noon.

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

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