
THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION 1981-86

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday February 28, 1984.

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

PRESENT

His Honour C. L. Bolden, LL.B., (Deputy Speaker)
Rt. Hon. E. W. Barrow, Q.C., B.Sc., LL.D., (Leader of the Opposition)
Hon. L. S. Craig, (Minister of Parliamentary Affairs and Leader of the House)
Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. Adams, Q.C., M.A., (Prime Minister and Minister of Finance and Planning)
Hon. H. deB. Forde, Q.C., M.A., LL.B.
Mr. L. E. Sandiford, M.A. (Econ.)
Hon. Miss B. A. Miller, (Minister of Education)
Hon. L. B. Brathwaite, (Minister of Housing and Lands)
Mr. J. G. Odle, B.Sc., (Chairman of Committees)
Mr. B. M. Taitt, B.A. (Hons.), M.A., LL.B. (Hons.)
Hon. DeL. O. Bradshaw, (Minister of Labour, Social Security, Sport and Community Services)
Mr. L. L. Sisnett, (Parliamentary Secretary, (Ministry of Trade, Industry, Tourism)
Mr. R. E. Brathwaite
Mr. L. A. Weekes
Mr. M. A. King, Q.C., LL.B.
Mr. W. O. Franklin, A.I.A.S., J.P.
Mr. N. K. Simmons
Mr. H. A. Blackman
Mr. A. Truss

Prayers were read by Mr. R. E. BRATHWAITE, M.P.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN and Mr. P. M. GREAVES entered the Chamber and took their seats.

MINUTES

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Minutes of the meeting of Tuesday, February 14, 1984.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that the Minutes of the meeting of Tuesday, February 14, 1984, be taken as read.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: If there are no objections or observations, let the Minutes stand confirmed.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am to announce that I have received the Accounts and Statement for the month of January, 1984, as prepared by the Accountant General.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am commanded to lay the following:—

The Annual Report and Statement of Accounts of the National Petroleum Corporation for the year 1983.

Statement showing Net Customs and Excise Receipts for six months ended 30th September, 1983.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following:—

A Resolution to approve of the compulsory acquisition of land at Whitepark Road, for the purpose of inclusion in the plan for redevelopment of the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation.

A Resolution to approve the granting of a right-of-way and the right to lay water mains and to erect public utility poles to General Traders Ltd. over Government-owned lands at Upton, St. Michael.

A Resolution to amend the Explanatory Note to Head 72 – Defence and Security.

A Resolution to grant the sum of \$413,352 from the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1983-84, Part I – Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1983-84, No. 23, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

A Resolution to grant the sum of \$1,944,010 from the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1983-84, Part II – Capital, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1983-84, No. 24, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

A Resolution to amend the Explanatory Note to Head 73.

A Resolution to grant the sum of \$3,306,703 from the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1983-84, Part I – Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1983-84, No. 25 which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. V. L. JOHNSON entered the Chamber and took his seat.

QUESTIONS

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following question:—

To enquire of the Minister responsible for Civil Aviation:—

1. Is the Minister aware that the runway at Grantley Adams International Airport is in a serious state of disrepair and constitutes a danger to jet aircraft?
2. If the answer is in the affirmative will the Minister state how soon government intends to take remedial action?

Hon. Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM entered the Chamber and took his seat.
12.25 p.m.

APPOINTMENT OF CHAPLAIN OF HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have never had to deal with a matter of this nature, it is a bit unusual, and I will be seeking Your Honour's guidance. This relates to the appointment of the Chaplain of the House, and at this stage of the sitting, I intend to make the motion that our nominee be appointed.

I spoke to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition over the nominee and I have been informed that they are not supporting the nominee. It is rather unfortunate that a person who the Government proposes to be Chaplain of the House is not going to be supported by the Opposition. I would think that we would have to take a vote on it, much to my regret.

I will also say this. I am going to try my utmost best to make sure that this type of appointment is done in the Debates Committee, rather than bringing a person who you are proposing to be an officer of the House to be held up to parliamentary discussion and a vote taken on the matter.

It is true that on the last occasion, there was a vote taken against Mr. Speaker. It is nothing unusual for the Opposition to oppose officers of the House.

I seek Your Honour's guidance. I should like to deal with this subject matter now.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES entered the Chamber and took his seat.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: According to Section 5 of the Parliament (Debates and Establishment) Act, Cap. 5, it says:

“The Chaplain of the House of Assembly shall be appointed by the House of Assembly.”
It does not give any special procedure in respect of an appointment.

If the Leader of the House has held discussions with the Leader of the Opposition and no agreement can be reached, my Ruling is that a Resolution be moved to propose the appropriate person and it will be subjected to the subsequent counter Resolution. The matter will have to go to vote and be carried by the majority vote of the House. It is a matter for the House, and therefore it has to be resolved in the House.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Leader of the House seems to be a bit apprehensive that there might be some discussion which may reflect on the nominee, or nominees.

We have no desire to ventilate our objections, or the reasons for them. Perhaps the best way for us to proceed, since this is a domestic matter, is for us to have an open vote and a secret ballot on the matter, without any debate. That will allay all fears on both sides.

We certainly cannot accept the nomination. It is a great pity that we are consulted with relative trivia such as the appointment of a Chaplain, and on matters of great pith and moment without designating any particular great matter that took place in the not too distant past, we are only informed of the occurrences some four or six weeks after the events have taken place. Anyhow, we do not want to go into past history.

I am strongly suggesting that this be an open vote. Certainly, we on this side would support that, since there is no procedure laid out. It is a domestic matter.

I remember that on a previous occasion, when the Reverend Coleman was nominated to be Chaplain, his nomination was supported by the Member for St. George, Mr. Freddie Miller, who was a member of the Labour Party. The leader of the Labour Party proposed a gentleman called Mr. Chappie Clarke, and the Senior Member for St. James, I think he was the Senior Member, the Hon. Mr. J. H. Wilkinson, said that if the Member for St. Joseph insisted on his nomination, he would move a Resolution that the post be abolished.

We intend to put forward no such Resolution today, but it shows that it is a matter on which, even within a party, there can be some kind of diversions of opinion. Let us put it that way. We have no diversions on this side, and I hope there will be none on that side when we put forward our nomination.

Thank you.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable Member suggested an open debate and secret vote.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, Sir: By that I meant that Members be free to vote according to their conscience. Perhaps I used the wrong word, Sir.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: What you mean is that you would like a vote with the whips taken off.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: That is right, Sir.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The English Parliamentary system.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I stand corrected, Sir.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I do not find anything in our Standing Orders which allows a secret vote, because

the voices of the "Ayes" and the "Noes" must be heard. You can only have an open vote with "Ayes" and "Noes".

Standing Order 41(2) says:

"At the conclusion of a debate upon any question the Speaker or Chairman shall put that question for the decision of the House. A question is fully put when the Speaker or Chairman has collected the voices of the "Ayes" and of the "Noes". No further debate may thereafter take place upon that question."

It is clear to me that even if there is a free debate on the matter, the voices of the "Ayes" and "Noes" have got to be heard.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Let me assure the Members on that side that there are absolutely no views on another candidate other than the one that I am going to propose.

On the events of yesterday, it is only another opinion of the right honourable Leader of the Opposition, who we know so well can forget things conveniently. I am not accusing his party or him of having one view now and then writing something else. That is a matter entirely for them, if that is what is referred to, Sir.

We consult them on matters which we think we should consult them on, and we pay them due courtesy. And that is exactly what a Government is here to do.

Aside

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: If you believe that every time the Government is to build a house in Spooner's Hill, I am to run down the right honourable Leader of the Opposition or his Deputy and ask them if we can build it, you are wrong. It would be Government-Government, not Government and Opposition.

(Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: That is correct. Put the motion and let us get on.)

(Mr. B. M. TAITT: Peace and harmony.)

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: We have to discuss very important matters with you. If you have a problem with one colleague of yours writing something contrary to what was expressed in here, that is a matter entirely for you all. I do not write the Caribbean Review.

Sir, the Government is proposing that Father Gilbert Vaughan, the Rector of St. Philip-The-Less Anglican Church at Boscobelle, St. Peter, be the Government's nominee. Father Vaughan was formerly a teacher. He was educated at St. Philip's Boys' School and

Codrington College. He has acted in this Assembly from 1976, and we feel that he is the obvious choice, since he has served here and has given us his spiritual guidance over some sittings.

I beg to move that Father Gilbert Vaughan be appointed Chaplain of this Honourable August Chamber.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: I beg to support that nominee proposed in the Resolution, and I reserve my right to speak.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise to make a nomination for the post of Chaplain; but before I put the nominee to Your Honour, I believe I ought to make a comment or two.

I do not believe that the appointment of a Chaplain for this august Assembly ought to be in any way informed, or directed, by any impending by-election in any parish in this country, or any general election. Nor should it be informed by any particular difficulties which the party in power may have with one or the other of its members.

I beg to nominate, and to propose to fill the office of Chaplain in this august Assembly, a young distinguished Minister, the Reverend Father Ivan Harewood, Rector of St. Ambrose.

12.35 p.m.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not know what his political affiliations are, neither do I care. I believe to the extent that he would have political affiliation, he is more than likely to be associated with the honourable Members on that side, but I can speak with authority as to his Christian counsel, his ability as a priest, and his capacity to fill the role as Chaplain in this august Chamber.

I see the role of Chaplain as not only being able to mumble the prayers from one or the other of the books of the various denominations in this country, but also that the person, by his example and by his constant ministration, can inspire the honourable Members in this Chamber, and those associated with it, to heights of morality which will allow them to carry on the people's business in the manner that the people would wish them to carry on their business.

I know that Father Harewood has not been involved as any returning officer, has not been involved as any canvasser, for any political party. I know that there is no one who can say that Father Harewood, at any time while presiding as an officer for an election, stole, or attempted to steal, hide or any other way interfered with the votes as they were cast by the people. I know that Father Harewood is a man who is respected by his congregation, outside his congregation, and throughout the length and

breadth of Barbados, as a priest who lives by example, and sets the examples of his convictions

Aside.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: The honourable Member is suggesting that I ought to live like Father Harewood. If the honourable Member who said that, and who is now walking out of the Chamber, and who is older than me by far, has never been able himself to come near to the quality of Father Harewood, he would understand that, in my striving, I may not quite reach the level of Father Harewood. But I can attest, from my personal experience, to the sincerity of purpose, the depth of knowledge, and the absolute beauty of his beliefs in the Christian faith which he professes.

I believe that all that I am saying about Father Harewood can be verified by the honourable Member for the City (Hon. Miss B. A. Miller), who I believe — I say "believe" — is a beneficiary of the weekly ministrations of that distinguished priest, whose parish happens to fall within the constituency which she represents. I believe there is at least one other Member who can speak of the attributes of Father Harewood, in even greater terms than I could. There are other Members on this side who have known him, as I have known him, from the time that he was eleven years old. He has always demonstrated the characteristics of humility, and he has always indicated by his demeanour and manner that he was concerned with the moral and spiritual development of all of those around him. I believe his entry into this Chamber will bring a veritable era of morality, if one is missing.

I recall that a number of things have been said about the last Chaplain we had, Father Cayless. I do not propose to recount them here today, but no one could accuse Father Harewood of participating, actively or otherwise, even when he preached from St. Michael's Cathedral, in any of the political struggles in this country. I think that if we should bow to what appears to us, and to those who follow both the paths of the Anglican Church and the development of politics in this country, in particular in the north, I think that we would hang our heads in shame if we did not resist any attempt to turn the chaplaincy of this Honourable Chamber into part of the patronage of any political party.

I am disappointed that the honourable Member, the Leader of the House (Hon. L. S. Craig), does not find it convenient to take the whip off and to allow the honourable Members sitting on that side to vote on a free conscience. I challenge him, and the Government to allow those honourable Members to vote their conscience. If there ever was a matter of conscience which came before this Honourable Chamber, the appointment of a Chaplain must fall within that sphere. Even on the matter of an

appointment of a Chaplain, distinguished Anglicans as the honourable Member for Christ Church West (Hon. H. deB. Forde) must find himself fighting against his innermost feelings in order to support his political party.

I do not believe that they ought to force any of their honourable Members to have this obvious collision between what they believe to be right and what they know to be expedient. I appeal to those honourable Members today, to allow themselves, in the presence of their colleagues in this Chamber and before the world, and especially in your presence, Sir, to show that on certain matters they are prepared to put the question of expediency behind them, and to do what they promised when they came to the people in this country in 1976 and put Barbados first.

This is not a matter on which we are going to gain any votes. The Democratic Labour Party has no position as a party on who should be Chaplain. I am hoping that all of my honourable colleagues on this side, who, I believe, were exposed to the abilities of Father Harewood on a recent sad occasion, and who spoke in glowing terms subsequent to that occasion about the manner in which this young priest inspired the people who gathered there, will see it fit to support this nomination which I am proposing to them.

I will say in passing that, among the things Father Harewood has been able to do in the short time he has taken over as Rector of St. Ambrose, at a time when that poor parish was in very serious sociological and psychological difficulties, is to create a counseling programme for married couples, an encounter session. I have met a number of couples who have benefited substantially from the Christian work which this man, perceiving it as part of his duty, has been able, along with his very devoted wife, to introduce into Barbados. He has brought untold happiness into a large number of households, Christian and non-Christian alike.

12.45 p.m.

I believe, with his nomination and his acceptance — as I have reason to believe that honourable Members, given the opportunity, will accept — that he will be able, through his inspiration and by his example, to bring a measure to this Honourable Chamber, and by definition a measure to the Government and the people of Barbados, of that higher standard of morality which, in recent times in this country, has been slipping, if it has not in fact slipped, to the very bottom.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, at a time when the Government of the day seems to have lost its way in regard to its responsibilities and duties to the ordinary people of this country; when, for example, you can look on the television and see a poor individual being held up to ridicule for all of Barbados to see because she was unable to pay a debt; when you can see that sort of thing being

glorified in television coverage; when you can have Ministers telling lies to the population.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I would not like to interrupt the honourable Member, but the Resolution before the House is the appointment of a Chaplain to this Honourable Assembly. The honourable Member has strayed and strayed and strayed, to television and all such things. I do not want to cut you in your speech, but I would be happy if you would stick to the substance of the Resolution.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: With respect, Sir, I suppose the reason why a Chaplain was at all appointed to this Honourable Chamber was to help to keep the honourable Members in the Chamber at that time and for all time within the ambit of what is the highest morality for persons who serve at this high level.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: If that is so, I would like to find out how the poor woman, as you said, who had been held up to ridicule on television for not being able to pay a bill, would have got within the ambit of the selection of a Chaplain for the Honourable House.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I was showing how the persons who represent people of that kind.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Chaplain does not represent anybody. He is the Chaplain of the House, he is free from the debates of this Chamber. The debates as to how people are represented lie between the Government and the Opposition, and we should keep the Chaplain out of these debates.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: As Your Honour wishes.

Certain remarks made at this stage by the honourable Member for St. Michael West (Mr. B. M. TAITT) were ordered to be expunged from the Record by Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: The Chaplain tried his best, Sir, and I have every right to believe that the nominee which I am putting forward will be able to inspire them, as they have not been inspired in the past, to higher heights of morality, the kind of morality which will not allow them to forget the people of this country.

I have no quarrel with the honourable Government members who sit on the front bench, who feel that they have to support the Cabinet's position no matter what the issue is. I feel sorry for them, that they are unable to vote today according to their conscience. Soon after we have had this vote, I hope to be able to congratulate them on rising to the occasion, just this once, if never before, or if never again.

It is with the greatest sense of humility.....

(Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Humility? You mean hypocrisy!).....

Mr. B. M. TAITT.....and at the same time pride.....

The honourable Member cannot be shouting across "hypocrisy", Can't I speak about the Christian Church, the Anglican Church? I am authorised to do so, because I have been a practising Anglican from the time I was seven years old, and I defy the honourable Member for Christ Church East Central (Hon. H. B. St. John) to call me a hypocrite, either *sotto voce* or on his feet. He cannot call me a hypocrite when I am talking about what I believe in.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG rose.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER rose

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: There are two honourable Members on their feet.

Certain remarks made at this stage by the honourable Member for St. James North (Hon. L. S. CRAIG) and by the honourable Member for St. Michael West (Mr. B. M. TAITT) were ordered to be expunged from the Record by Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable Member will continue his speech, but please keep to the subject of the Resolution. And the honourable Member must address the Chair.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: With the greatest respect, Sir, the Chair might not have heard, but "hypocrite" is an unparliamentary word.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Chair can only hear things which are said when a Member is on his feet and speaking. The honourable Member has been in this Chamber long enough to know that he should disregard asides.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Sir, I disregard asides. I did not hear any aside, I heard the honourable Member say "hypocrisy." I heard that, Sir. He was shouting, he was not making an aside. I am sorry Your Honour did not hear, but I will proceed. I just want to ask the honourable Member who got up and called me a hypocrite to withdraw that.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Both honourable Members were on their feet, and I asked whatever was being said at the time to be struck from the Record, because neither member paid any attention to the Chair. The Chair cannot

hear and rule at one and the same time if both members are going to be shouting across the Chamber.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Thank you very much, Sir. The fact is that on the question of the appointment of a Chaplain, we have to be serious. I repeat; we cannot have this business of the Chaplain being part of any political patronage. And the honourable Members on that side can pretend for as much and for as long as they wish to pretend but it is well known the role which has been played by some of the persons who support the Barbados Labour Party, some of them wearing collars, who have behaved in a manner that is despicable in the context of what a Priest should or should not be doing.

I would be the absolute hypocrite if, on this occasion, I did not deal with that aspect of the appointment to this particular post. That is why I am proposing the Reverend Father I am proposing!

There are a lot of people who think that when you are taking about Christianity, you cannot deal with a plus and a minus. There are some persons who believe that, because we are dealing with a Chaplain, we cannot talk about the wrongdoing of those who ought to be leading, but who have been in the middle stirring up trouble.

The Gospels dealt almost entirely with the wickedness of man; and so, in the same way that Jesus went into the temple and turned out the moneychangers, I am talking about some of the wrongdoings of some of the people who wear collars in this country. Some of them are not an inspiration to the population or the congregations which they are supposed to lead!

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is the honourable Member taking the opportunity to have a debate on the Priests in the island of Barbados?

Mr. B. M. TAITT: If the appointment of a Chaplain affords that opportunity, and you are allowing it, Sir, I will be happy to do so. I have not started on a debate yet, Sir. 12.55 p.m.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am not going to stop you, because, as the first speaker on that side, you have ample time.....

Mr. B. M. TAITT: We are on a free vote. This is not a first speaker. Anybody can speak on this side.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The House did not agree on a free vote. The honourable Member for St. John (Rt. Hon. E. W. Barrow) suggested a free vote and a secret ballot. If the honourable Members on your side have that idea, that is completely out of my domain. I can only carry the Rules of the House.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Sir, each one of the Members over here can speak for a half hour at least, and I have never had any difficulty with their ability to represent themselves, especially when faced by that motley group over there.

What we are saying, Sir, is.....

Asides.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. B. M. TAITT: We are talking about Chaplains and God. I do not know how the honourable Member for St. James North (Hon. L. S. Craig) got into that.

Asides.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Sir, since I have a Resolution before the House, the honourable Member can feel free to "rinse me out anytime." I can take his "rinsing out" anytime, once he gets a good rinsing out himself first. But I am not going to deal with that.

I am saying that the appointment of a Chaplain ought not to form the basis for political patronage and I am saying that the upcoming by-election in St. Peter, or the upcoming General Election, if ever there is one.....

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: On a point of order.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: As far as the Rules are concerned, a Member is not allowed to anticipate future things. I do not know of an upcoming by-election. Let us deal with the appointment of a Chaplain on the basis of the Resolution. Do not let us go in an exercise of fancies at the moment. If there is going to be a by-election, the honourable Member will have ample time to deal with that constituent when that arises.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, with the greatest respect, Sir, I take your ruling as given. I wish to draw to your attention, however, that potential by-elections can happen in any constituency.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable Member must not go into these fanciful ideas.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Very well, Sir. The difficulties in the parish of St. Peter are difficulties which the Government has been facing in the constituency of St. Peter, the parish from which their nominee has come

Asides.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: St. Philip-the-Less is in St. Peter.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am very surprised at the honourable Member taking this course in a debate. I do

not want to get into the debate, but I believe that too many people are misleading the population of this country about what is happening in St. Peter.

If this is a debate on the election of a Chaplain, I would request that this debate follows the substantive motion before the House, and you do not go into these avenues which are going to create more difficulties, or more debate than is absolutely necessary.

The honourable Member cannot talk about an upcoming by-election in St. Peter. You can talk about a by-election in St. Joseph or one in St. John, but I do not think the honourable Member for St. John anticipates resigning at this time, neither do I.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Sir, I notice that you said you nor the honourable Member anticipate resigning. Nobody has been trying to force either one of the two of you to resign.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: But it seems as if you are trying to force somebody from St. Peter to resign.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Not me, Sir! I would not force him to resign, Sir!

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The only authentic statement I have heard about that, is from you a few minutes ago.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Well, Sir, that is not the only time that you have.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Let us deal with the Chaplain.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: You would not be privy to what is going on, Sir. You have been elevated away from that sort of thing.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Let us deal with the Chaplain.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, they have proposed the Rector of St. Philip — The -Less. St. Philip — The-Less is located in the parish of St. Peter. In the parish of St. Peter, there is tremendous confusion.....

Certain remarks made at this stage by the honourable Member for St. Michael West (Mr. B. M. Taitt) were ordered expunged from the Record by Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am not going to allow the honourable Member to continue in that vein anymore. I have had enough of that. We are going to keep strictly to the appointment of the Chaplain for the House. We are now going straight down the line on the appointment of

a Rector for this House. It is about time. Those things can be dealt with under any other Resolution, Private Members' Business — under anything, but we are going to deal with the appointment of a Chaplain on the basis of the Resolution.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: The Leader of the House is going to get somebody put out now. He cannot put me out.

The point is taken, Mr. Deputy Speaker. If you are saying that you would prefer me not to refer to the parish of St. Peter at all, I will abide by your ruling. I do not have to refer to the parish of St. Peter.

Asides.

Certain remarks made at this stage by the honourable Member for St. Michael West (Mr. B. M. Taitt) were ordered expunged from the Record by Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable Member must continue. Let us be serious about what we are doing now.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Yes, Sir. I am proceeding.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: If the honourable Member would give way on a point of order: Sir, I think you have at your discretion a rule in the Standing Orders which says that you can ask a member to discontinue his speech? I do not feel very proud today as a parliamentarian, especially since the Member who is now on his feet has been my best friend for many many years.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: You are not proud? Were you proud when you said that all the DLPs should starve? You were proud then! Do not talk about proud!

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Will the honourable Member.....There are two honourable Members on their feet.

Asides

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Will both honourable Members please take their seats.

The honourable Member may continue, but I am not going to have the sort of debate which is

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: On a point of order: Perhaps Your Honour could tell us whether you could put the vote. If this debate is going to be totally irrelevant, you may wish to guide the Chamber on that.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Everybody on the Government side suddenly wishes to tell the Deputy Speaker how to

run this Chamber! It is very strange that suddenly everybody.....

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: On a point of order: The honourable Member is not entitled, in my submission, to say that when an honourable Member on this side gets up on a point of order that he is telling the Deputy Speaker how to rule. That is improper.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: The honourable Member is free to say what he likes that in the final analysis, it is the Rules of this House, and how Your Honour presides over this House, which counts. No honourable Member on that side or this side can tell Your Honour how to rule. They can suggest, but they cannot tell.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Let us deal with the Resolution.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: The Resolution has to deal with the appointment of a Chaplain, and if it is causing the honourable Members on that side some discomfiture, that, because of the proposal which I am making for the appointment of a Chaplain, there are matters which they did not anticipate or would not wish to be aired, that is their problem. But this is a matter touching and concerning the morality within this House, and therefore outside of this House, and I feel free to discuss these matters, because they are matters which need to be discussed in this country.

1.05 p.m.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Not today! I am not going to have any more debate stretching outside the substance of this Resolution. That is my ruling.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: The substance of the Resolution is the appointment of the Chaplain, and therefore I suppose I should get up and give his age, his height, his size and all of these matters — and that would be relevant! But if I talk about his wide experience in leading the congregation, if I talk about his wide experience in providing inspiration in the moral and spiritual life of this country, I submit that I am within the bounds of the appointment, because when a person is being appointed, or when it is proposed to appoint a person, one of the areas of the appointment which must be looked at very carefully is the capacity of the individual to fill the role to which he is to be appointed.

I submit that the appointment of Father Harewood would be a crown in the cap of this Honourable Chamber, especially during this Session. I believe that the appointment that has been proposed by the honourable Member for St. James North does not add up to or square with my understanding of the nature of a Chaplain.

I have said, and I wind up by saying that the appointment of a Chaplain ought not to be informed by, or form part of.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable Member is now about to repeat himself, and if he repeats himself, I will have to ask him to curtail his speech.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I am winding up, Sir, and I am summarizing what I have said. I believe that the Rules permit a person who has made a number of points to summarize those points in the closing stages of his speech, but I will be guided by Your Honour if Your Honour believes that my summary is a repetition.

I am summarizing, and I am saying that my position is as follows: (1) the person appointed as Chaplain ought to be free of any taint, believed or real; (2) the person appointed as Chaplain ought not to be the beneficiary, or appear to be the beneficiary, of the largesse or handout of any political party; (3) the person appointed as Chaplain ought to be someone who can inspire confidence in the spiritual and moral development not only within this Chamber but for those outside; (4) I submit that in Reverend Father Ivan Harewood, all of these things coalesce. He has demonstrated his capacity; he has not been known, as far as I know, to be affiliated to, or dependant on

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable Member is now repeating himself, and I would have to ask him to take his seat.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: As Your Honour wishes. I therefore move that Father Harewood be the Chaplain of this Honourable Chamber.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I beg to second the motion which has been moved by the honourable Member for St. Michael West, and I would like to reserve my right to speak.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, there is absolutely nothing that anyone on this side.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: You said you second the motion and reserve your right to speak. There is no right of reservation on that side. There is one Resolution in this House, and it is a Resolution from this side. You reserve a right to speak on the first motion before the House, but this is a counter motion.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Are you suggesting, Sir, that the Opposition does not have a right? If you rule so, then maybe we will have a private discussion, as lawyers, on a future occasion some time later this week. It is nothing to do with your ruling. It is one of the Rules, Sir. I would like to be enlightened.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am ruling that you are seconding a counter motion to a motion which has been put by one side, and therefore you have not the right to reserve your right to speak.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I accepted that, Sir. Can I not say that I look forward to a further enlightenment by you, having accepted your ruling, as lawyers, on a future occasion, in your office or my office?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: My rulings in this Chamber are recorded in Hansard, and any debate outside will not be recorded.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Right Sir! I always want to be enlightened. I accept your ruling.

When this discussion on this debate first started, I made a suggestion, which would have probably saved a lot of the rancour which has been generated. This did not find favour, according to the Rules of the House.

I think this is my 33rd year, and there are at least two occasions on domestic matters, — I am merely reciting history, I am not challenging Your Honour's ruling — on which the House saw fit to have a secret vote.

It would have been probably highly desirable if we did not have any debate on this matter at all, but if the House decides to have a debate, then the House must have a debate.

I wish to say that our objection is not a mere whimsical one, or a political one in that sense. If any other member of any denomination had been proposed other than the one which was put forward by the Leader of the House, whether Methodist, Moravian, Pentecostal — it does not matter because the Rules of the House do not stipulate that one has to be a member of the Anglican faith — we would not have objected. We never object to the honourable Member for St. Lucy (Mr. R. E. Brathwaite) saying prayers, and he is not a member of the Anglican faith. But first I should give my credentials.

I was at school with Father Vaughan some forty or fifty years ago. We got on all right at that stage. His brother is a distinguished former Minister and member of my party. My father, in his early priesthood as an Anglican priest, was the curate at St. Philip-The-Less, of which Father Vaughan is now Rector, and it was due to Father Vaughan's initiative and consent that, two or three years ago, at the age of 91, my father was buried at a very prominent place at the gate of that church. So I have given Father Vaughan all that he deserves. I thank him very much for his dispensation.

He did not distinguish himself particularly during the time that I was at Harrison College. He may have

eclipsed himself after I went away, either in games or academically, I do not know. Anyhow, he is an ordained priest and he is qualified for the office.

My objection to Father Vaughan is a very, very simple one. Father Vaughan took it upon himself not only to canvass and speak against the party of which I have the honour to be the political leader, and one would say that that is his democratic right, but on an occasion on which he was the presiding officer at Boscobelle, he excluded the candidate of the Democratic Labour Party, who arrived at the polls at a quarter to six with two or three people to have them cast their votes, and admitted at about two minutes to six, some thirteen minutes later, the candidate of the Government party, who also happened to be the Speaker of the House, with seventeen persons. This is an office of honour which he was performing as presiding officer. I can get affidavits to this effect.

I do not object to Father Vaughan having his political views, but certainly in the discharge of his office, particularly since he is a priest, I do not think that a man who acts in that way can have my confidence. That is the end of it. I do not have to get into any argument with the Leader of the House.

I am not going to do what the honourable Member for St. James, Mr. J. H. Wilkinson, did, because I cannot have my way and suggest that the office be abolished.
1.15 p.m.

Father Vaughan, as far as I am concerned, will be the Chaplain for the Barbados Labour Party — I state my views, I am a free person — he will not be the Chaplain for me. I cannot have any confidence in a person, who is a man of the cloth, and who acts in a manner which I do not consider either Christian or morally correct, and, therefore, I will not be entering this Chamber during the saying of prayers.

I do not often enter, it is true, even now, and I had nothing against the previous incumbents of the office. But I could not, in the circumstances, find myself constrained to attend the saying of prayers by a man in whom I have absolutely no confidence.

I thank him for his kindness to my father, who assisted him at church playing the organ, taking over services for him, of recognizing that my father wanted to be buried in the place where he started his priesthood and helping very generously in that respect. But he can be Chaplain to the Labour Party, he is not Chaplain to the Senior Member for St. John.

Thank you, Sir.

(Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: He will be Chaplain of the House.)

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, speaking on the Resolution which is before the Chamber, I can appreciate the feelings of the right honourable Member for St. John. Of course, he has on more than one occasion demonstrated his views on Christianity and the principles of christianity. I have heard him on that before. I have my views about the Member for St. John on Christianity; therefore, if he does not accept the nomination from this side because of his views, I have absolutely no quarrel with him.

The Member for St. Michael West, who spoke for almost one hour

(Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Said nothing.)

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I have been trying all along to find something to reply to in his speech. I think Members in here would know that I am never lost for words in a debate, that is a historical fact, but I find it difficult this morning to understand what the Member for St. Michael West was really trying to say.

Certain remarks made by the honourable Member for St. James North and the honourable Member for St. Michael West were ordered to be expunged from the Record by Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: In order for me to settle this matter, it is necessary for me to request the Clerk to obtain a copy of the Record to see what was recorded. I can only rule if we have it recorded in the Record, because there was a time when both Members were shouting across the floor to each other and ignored the rulings from the Chair. If it so happens that these phrases were passed during that time, one can only blame oneself for what has happened.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will suspend this sitting for five minutes to obtain a transcript from Hansard. This sitting now stands suspended until 1.30 p.m. today.

ON RESUMPTION

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: This sitting is now resumed.

I have been able to obtain part of the transcript of the proceedings this morning, and the record on the matters complained about read as follows:

"In the parish of St. Peter we have all sorts of problems including duppies."

Then I spoke and I said:

"I will have that struck from the Record."

That is what is the Official Record, Hansard.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Now, Sir.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Please.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: You have all sorts of problems in St. Peter.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not think it is appropriate, in view of Your Honour's ruling, that any Member may allude to something which has been struck from the Record.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will deal with that in due course.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Thank you very much, Sir.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Yes, Sir. I would hate, Mr. Deputy Speaker.....

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir: There is no Hansard Reporter at the table.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: We have to stop, unfortunately.

The above transcript was taken from the tape.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Now that the Hansard Reporter is here, I must also draw another matter to the attention of the Chamber. Matters which are struck from the Record cannot form part of the Record and, therefore, should never even have appeared in the Record. Based on that, I would request that no person should refer to matters which are struck from the Record.

The honourable Member may continue his speech, but try not to deal with anything that has been struck from the Record.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I said earlier, Sir, that it is difficult to reply to the speech of the honourable Member for St. Michael West. It is a speech in his normal evangelical style, whenever there is an almost full Gallery. It is also the type of.....

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, Sir! Is the honourable Member drawing attention to strangers?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Strangers?

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Yes, Sir. The honourable

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: No.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:.....member said there is an almost full Gallery, and, therefore, Your Honour would have to be asked for the Gallery to be cleared.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: It could be Clarendon Gallery.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Would the honourable Member please take his seat.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: This is strictly between us.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: No, this is not between us. It is in Parliament.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I said that for his benefit.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Would the honourable Member please take his seat now.

I do not consider those remarks as drawing attention to members in the Gallery. As far as I know, the parliamentary reference to drawing attention to members in the Gallery is, "I see strangers", and I have not heard those words.

The honourable Member may now continue.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: We are always subjected, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to this type of debate, in particular by the Member for St. Michael West — we have been spared today by the Member for St. Michael South Central (Dr. R. C. Haynes) — hence, I find it difficult to reply.

When the honourable Member for St. Michael rose, I was under the impression that he would have been proposing Father Blackett, Canon Rufus Broome or Reverend James Springer, or he might have hoped that Dr. Crawford from the Senate would have come down here as Chaplain. Those are the candidates I thought he would have been proposing.

I am not saying that any of these gentlemen of the cloth are members or supporters of the Democratic Labour Party. I would not say that at all. What I do know is that they have expressed their views, like any other citizen of the country making comments, when the occasion arose, in support of the Opposition Party. But I would never label them members of the Democratic Labour Party, or even supporters.

I thought that the logical choice on that side would have been one of the people to whom I have just made reference. I was a bit surprised, when I heard "Reverend Harewood", a Christian gentleman — all the qualities that one can think of, we heard of, Reverend Harewood.

You have already made clear the qualities of our nominee, and we have no quarrel with it. We thank you for telling us about his qualities. I cannot speak of Reverend Harewood. I have no doubt in my mind that all you have said about him is worthwhile, and that he is someone we should all be proud of as a priest, who can give us spiritual guidance. We have the same feeling about Reverend Vaughan.

I would hope that sometime in the future this House would examine the Standing Orders or whatever, I think it is in the Act of Parliament, so that we should no longer be subjected to the type of debate which we heard in here today, and have to take a vote on a person who we have recommended as Chaplain of the whole House. I would hope that in the future, a matter of this nature would be settled by the Debates Committee.

It is a very, very unfortunate debate that we have been subjected to today, to hear all of these things, whether they are true or not. There is not much more I can say in respect of the Resolution which was proposed by the other side.

All sorts of challenges were thrown out by the Member for St. Michael West. He challenged Members on this side to vote against our nominee.

1.35 p.m.

There is nothing strange in Members on this side voting against Government's policy; it has happened on more than one occasion. We are men of strength and character. If we feel something is wrong, we would vote against it; if we do not support it, we will vote against it. The honourable Member for Christ Church East, the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. R. L. Cheltenham), voted against Government's procedures, and it was not a domestic matter.

He is a Minister of Government. But if Members on that side, and they know it only too well, had opened their mouths — not vote — when they were in office, the Leader of the Opposition would have had them under a tamarind tree in a hurry. He would go on the radio and denounce them overnight, not even discuss it quietly with them. He always reminded you that the Lord giveth and the Lord taketh.

There is nothing more that I can contribute to this debate. I regret that it has taken this turn. I went out of my way to telephone the Deputy Leader of the Opposition on Saturday, and I told him whom we were going to nominate — so that we would not have this debate.

But you can hear the Member for St. Michael West asking Government members: "Are you going to support me"? Support you on what? On a domestic matter! He is all behind the Chair canvassing and asking the Members:

"Are you going to support us?" Support you on what? On a domestic matter of a Chaplain for the House, a post for \$800 or \$900 a month! If it were a million dollars a month, he would cut their throats!

Sir, put the vote and let the voices of the people be heard in here today!

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: (Christ Church West): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I wish to say, if you would permit me, that this debate quite clearly has demonstrated the need of the House to organise its affairs in a better manner, so as to prevent people, whose reputations are normally untarnished, being subjected by implications or direct reference, to the sort of imputations that have been implied in the debate.

The Anglican Church is replete with a large number of men of the cloth, unfortunately not women of the cloth, who are all distinguished in their ways, and who are all persons, I am sure, of the highest integrity. But like all of us, like every human being, each one of them also have their weaknesses, as indeed they have their strengths. I believe that when we start to throw stones in this Chamber, we should examine ourselves, because each one of us in this Chamber has our weaknesses and our strengths as well.

I think it is most unfortunate that we should find a person being subjected to the sort of debate which we have heard in here today. If I may speak of his strengths, there is no doubt in my mind, having seen him operate in the parish of St. Peter and others, that Father Vaughan takes the cure of souls extremely seriously. He has always found time for poor people, not only to minister to them from the point of view of the doctrine of Christianity as seen in the Anglican faith, but to minister to them as a human being and as a humanitarian.

Whatever criticisms one may make, for whatever purposes, I think that it is but fair that somebody should say on behalf of Father Vaughan that he has rendered yeoman service within the Anglican community, and within the community of Barbados, on many occasions. He has not been fortunate, like some of us, to have his praises sung abroad, but I am sure that there are many who have gone on, and many old people in St. Peter and beyond, who have appreciated his words that he has given to them.

Last year, I had the good fortune to attend his church, and he was running around during services at about three different services and looking after the interests of other people.

In this House, Mr. Deputy Speaker, Father Vaughan has found time, at short notice and great inconvenience to himself, to come here to say prayers in this House,

whether some of us would come and listen to those prayers or not. Sometimes I believe that, even when we are in here listening to prayers, we quite quickly forget them — we demonstrate our lack of charity, in the way in which we speak of people in this House.

Members of the House should make up their minds about whether they wish citizens to come forward for service. I believe that whatever political posturing may be current at this time, and as we get nearer to 1986, I am going to see a lot more of this, we should be careful that, in the process, we do not destroy people's characters.

Father Harewood has rendered very good yeoman service as well, and therefore any vote of this House, one way or another, cannot be interpreted as a criticism of the person who may not get the majority vote on this occasion. It is all right for certain persons to try to make it appear that when you have a vote of whim, or an open vote or whatever, if you do not vote for "X", you are criticising "Y".

There are several people, not only in the Anglican Church, and on this I agree with the right honourable Member for St. John, (Rt. Hon. E. W. Barrow), but of faiths other than the Anglican faith, whom I can think of who would willingly serve this House as its Chaplain, and would render yeoman service. The point is, we can only choose one of those persons. The fact that we have not, or will not, choose others, cannot be interpreted to mean that they are any less worthy of the vote of this House.

What is involved in being Chaplain of the House? A person who would be punctual, someone who would be really devoted to Christian principles, and someone who could guide the House if the House needs guidance.

The honourable Member for St. Lucy (Mr. R. E. Brathwaite) has said prayers on several occasions; and although he is in the political arena, no one can doubt the depth of his convictions. It may be said that he took more people to the polls than Senator Greaves did last time. I do not know whether that can be a criticism of him. But as far as being a Christian is concerned, no one can challenge the depth of his feelings and his convictions about christianity, any more or any less than one should question Father Vaughan's depth of feelings about Christianity.

I would like to join the Leader of the House in hoping that on the next occasion on which such a matter that has to be dealt with, the House's procedure will be informed enough to save us the agony of this debate which has taken place in this Chamber today.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I know that you ignore the comment, but when I intervened in the debate on a

point of order, I was not trying to be facetious in trying to tell you how to guide this House; you are more than competent so to do. It is that at the time I felt a little bit saddened at the manner in which the debate was being conducted. I think we have a responsibility, no matter what our partisan political convictions may be, on occasions such as this to rise to the occasion and point the right direction which the country calls for.

1.45 p.m.

If the appointment of a Chaplain can be equated with patronage, and talking about election matters, which, obviously, would have been an election fraud and a criminal offence, and accusing people along these lines, what next? I almost never entered public life because of the implied and direct criticisms of this nature. Perhaps that is why some of the women in this country never come into public life.

One could use the privileges of this House to make those sort of allegations against Father Vaughan, which if they were true, should have been made at the time and a criminal prosecution brought. It has not been brought, and therefore I reject outright the allegations which have been made about Father Vaughan. Even up to now none has been brought against him and proven. I am not saying they have not taken place, but why recount them on an occasion such as this?

It is obvious that there is a certain nervousness about the Opposition about St. Peter, because that is where he is from, for whatever reason they may be nervous. I know the people of St. Peter are not nervous about anything at all, and I hope that whichever candidate is elected, he will not remember this occasion, just as Mr. Speaker Hinds, although he has turned out to be one of the best Speakers in the history of this Parliament, obviously has blotted out from his mind the sad occasion when he was offered to the House to sit in that Chair.

I counsel honourable Members again that we must be very careful when we are speaking about people we wish to render service, that we do so without necessarily pulling them down. We have to learn to take the arrows as we take the praises of our colleagues and our opponents. It has not been easy. Some of us suffered more than others. The honourable Member for St. Michael South Central (Dr. R. C. Haynes) may say he suffered. I suffered. I am sure the honourable Member for St. John suffered. I am sure the honourable Member for St. Thomas suffered. Politicians at large suffer from the public. You pick up a paper and you believe that we are all a bunch of baboons, with no character at all, when people approach us. Sometimes, unfortunately, we ourselves encourage people in that thinking in the manner in which we approach subjects such as these.

I again, even at the cost of repeating myself a little bit, Mr. Deputy Speaker, pray that God's guidance will be on this House in the future, to give it the correct approach towards matters of this nature, so that although in themselves they may appear trivial, we will be able to deal with triviality with the importance which the occasion demands.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS (St. Thomas): Mr. Deputy Speaker, it was with some astonishment that I walked into the House an hour and a half after its opening hour, to discover that the House was debating the election of a Chaplain.

So far as I know, there has never been a contested election for the post of Chaplain, and so far as the memory of those whom I have been able to consult vouchsafes, and reference to Erskine May's suggest, the appointment of a Chaplain is virtually in the hands of the Speaker. The Speaker recommends a Chaplain to the House and he is accepted.

Certainly, the memory of those persons connected with the House, whose recollection goes back as far as 1951, is quite convinced that all previous Chaplains' elections have been on the basis of accepting the Speaker's recommendation. And I think that it is an open secret that the candidate proposed by the Leader of the House is the candidate whom you invited to act during the absence of the Chaplain, who has now resigned, and is the candidate on whom your favour has fallen.

I therefore have to seek outside the ordinary procedures of the House for an explanation of this debate, which I find fully as unseemly in its concept as does the honourable Member for Christ Church West (Hon. H. deB. Forde). I am not going to impute motives. I do believe that there is even an element in the nomination of the candidate proposed by the other side, of seeking to establish divisions in the ranks of the Government, since it is well known that the Reverend Mr. Harewood is the uncle of a member of the Cabinet, the Rector of one of the City churches and, as such, I believe, close to the honourable Member for the City of Bridgetown (Hon. B. A. Miller). Indeed he is a person very well regarded on this side.

As far as I am concerned, either of the candidates would make an admirable Chaplain for the Speaker and for the House. If I am forced to question the motives of those who have nominated Mr. Harewood, I am doing no more than they have done in introducing into the debate a theme which has been reported to me, and for which we must all have the greatest distaste.

There is one Member of this House, Sir, who has consistently put forward the view that the right of free speech of parliamentarians should be curtailed, that they

should no longer have the protection of privilege against the ordinary laws relating to defamation. There is one Member of this House who has proposed, specifically, that the Parliamentary Privileges and Immunities Act be amended in order to remove from parliamentarians the right to put a case without fear of an action for slander or for libel, should they have to make a written submission to a committee or other body of Parliament.

It therefore comes as some surprise that that Member should take upon himself to say that the reverend gentleman, as an election official, deliberately closed the polls 13 minutes before the closing hour, because he saw members of the Democratic Labour Party coming to vote. I would invite the Leader of the Opposition to write to me, as Minister responsible for Elections

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Since the honourable Member has called me

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: On what does the Member rise?

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, Sir.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: The honourable Member was not in his place. I still maintain the view that we can conduct debates in here without resorting to slander, and I am still prepared to say that we should have no greater privileges than the ordinary members of the public enjoy.

I did not say that the Reverend Vaughan closed the polls; I said that he denied entrance to the candidate of the Democratic Labour Party, and I said at that time that I was in a position to produce affidavits, if necessary, to that effect.

Now, to take up the honourable Member for Christ Church West, the fact that we did not institute

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable Member is dealing with a point of explanation. That is not a point of order.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: A point of explanation. Sir. The honourable Member won his seat, so we do not pursue or hound down people for misdeeds at the time of an election, but if the right honourable Member for St. Thomas (Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. Adams) wishes to prosecute the person who has been nominated, I can supply him with affidavits.
1.55 p.m.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: That is not a speech. I believe the honourable Member has explained his statement to the Member for St. John.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Because he was not present and did not hear what I said. I said that the vote was very much open, because 17 people arrived at one minute or two minutes to six and were admitted, but somebody arriving at 13 minutes to six was not admitted.

It is on those grounds that I oppose the nomination, not on any whimsical or frivolous grounds. He is allowed to canvas, as is his democratic right, but not to abuse his position as a presiding officer.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: If the honourable Member considers that what he has said is not defamatory of Mr. Vaughan, I would invite him to write to me and repeat the complaints in writing. I would also invite him to stand up on a public platform outside this Chamber and say that Mr. Vaughan had no right to abuse his position as an electoral officer, and let him try his hand with the affidavits in the High Court. Let him see if he is able to prove it!

I challenge the honourable Member to do it. I have every confidence.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is now 2.00 p.m. Does the honourable Member think he will be finished in 10 minutes' time?

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Yes, Sir.

I know perfectly well that the honourable Member is capable of saying anything. You only have to witness an article over his signature in the *Caribbean Times*, and read his explanation of that article, to realize that, to use a word, which he himself has used, when standing in this position, about a Leader of the Opposition, the word "doting", to perfectly well understand that the honourable Member is capable of any extravagance of speech now that he has reached years of maturing discretion. But that he should use his position as Leader of the Opposition, and the respect which he has built up over the years, to abuse the future Chaplain of the House of Assembly, and to accuse him of electoral malpractice, is as distasteful, I am sure, to the general public, as it is to honourable Members on this side, who are putting forward Mr. Vaughan's name.

I repeat, Mr. Deputy Speaker, both candidates are good men, worthy Fathers of the Church to which, I believe, 24 out of the 27 of us belong. I am sure there are at least as worthy members of that church as those persons who may be connected with the membership of the House of Assembly, and I regret that either of them should have been abused in this way, or had the opportunity taken of accusing them of improprieties, which, undoubtedly, would attract sections of the Criminal Law, if they were true.

If the honourable Member wishes to put his head in the noose to the extent that he would repeat the exact words on a political platform, I would be very glad if he would give me the opportunity to be present when he says so. He can either do that, or he can write to me. I would have much pleasure giving evidence in a subsequent action for slander against him.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to support the candidature of Reverend Vaughan to be your Chaplain and the Chaplain of this House.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Resolution which is before the House is as follows:

"BE IT RESOLVED that Father Gilbert Vaughan, Rector of the Anglican Church of St. Philip-The-Less in the parish of St. Peter be appointed Chaplain of this Honourable House with effect from March 1, 1984."

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative.

A division was called for and the bell was rung.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The question is that the Reverend Father Gilbert Vaughan, Rector of the Anglican Church of St. Philip-the-Less, in the parish of St. Peter, be appointed as Chaplain of this Honourable House with effect from March 1, 1984.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Is it not a rule that the last nominee should be put first?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have sought the advice of the Clerk on this matter, and I have been advised that, in matters of this nature, the first nomination goes first. If that is carried, that is the end of the debate.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: With respect, Sir, may I speak?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Yes, I would love to hear the honourable Member.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I want to make a point relating to that raised by the right honourable Prime Minister. I take the point that when a Speaker is being selected that that was the rule, but I would think, however, that since a Resolution was put up and this is a domestic matter, and ours is a counter Resolution, that

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: A division has been called for and there is no way, with Your Honour's guidance, that a Member can speak when a division has been called for. He is completely out of order and irrelevant!

Mr. B. M. TAITT: How come the other honourable Member was not out of order and irrelevant?

I wonder, Sir, since ours was by way of an amendment to that Resolution, by the counter of another candidate, whether the other rule that the amendment to be taken first would not be more appropriate. I am just wondering.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I accept the statement of the honourable Leader of the House, that once a division has been called, there can be no comments except comments dealing with the matter before the House.

The matter has been proceeding on a counter Resolution, and not an amendment to the original Resolution.

Mr. Clerk, please take the vote.

The question that Reverend Vaughan be the Chaplain of Parliament was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:—

AYES: Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS; Hon. L. S. CRAIG; Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE; Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER; Hon. Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM; Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW; Hon. V. L. JOHNSON; Mr. A. TRUSS; Hon. H. deB. FORDE; Hon. H. B. St. JOHN; Mr. L. L. SISNETT; Mr. R. E. BRATHWAITE and Mr. J. G. ODLE — 13.

NOES: Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW; Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD; Mr. B. M. TAITT; Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN; Mr. P. M. GREAVES; Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN; Mr. K. SIMMONS; Mr. M. A. KING and Mr. L. A. WEEKES — 9.

ABSTENTIONS: Hon. L. R. TULL and Dr. R. C. HAYNES — 2.
2.05 p.m.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Father Gilbert Vaughan has been appointed Chaplain of this Honourable Chamber as from the 1st day of March, 1984.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is now 2.10 p.m. This sitting stands suspended until 2.45 p.m. today.
2.10 p.m.

ON RESUMPTION

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: This sitting is now resumed.

QUESTION TIME

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is now question time. There are no answers to questions.

We therefore move to Private Members' Business.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: There is one item on the Order Paper under Private Members' Business. The honourable Member in whose name that item stands is not in his seat. We therefore move to Government Business.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Deputy Speaker, before we proceed, I have a supplementary Notice Paper, which I did not have before and I am asking that I be allowed to give notice of these new measures now.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable Member is seeking leave to give further notices. If there is no objection, leave is granted.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am commanded to lay:

The Betting and Gaming Duties Order, 1984.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following:

A Resolution to grant the sum of \$35,000 from the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1983–84, Part II — Capital, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1983–84, No. 26, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

A Resolution to grant the sum of \$113,251 from the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1983–84, Part I — Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1983–84, No. 27, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

A Bill to make provision for the insurance of certain persons employed abroad and for an improved method of collecting unpaid national insurance and other contributions.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

On motion of Hon. L. S. CRAIG, seconded by Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE, a Bill to make provision for the insurance of certain persons employed abroad and for an improved method of collecting unpaid national insurance and other contributions, was read a first time.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT
STATION HILL, ST. MICHAEL

Order No. 4 was called – To move the passing of a Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Station Hill, St. Michael for extension of Glendairy Prison.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE (St. Andrew): Mr. Deputy Speaker, in moving the passing of this Resolution, I should just like to say that the major portion of this land was offered to the Government many years ago, about 1974 according to the records, by the late Mr. Maughan, who owned approximately four and a half acres in that area. The land was offered to the Ministry of the Attorney General with a view to utilisation by the inhabitants of Glendairy, and it was being looked at continuously all during that time.

Government has now come to the conclusion that the land can be made use of by way of farming, by the inmates at Glendairy. There is also the possibility of the construction of an area for the female prisoners, who are dwindling in number at the institution, but the land is mainly for the prisoners to grow food and become self-sufficient in vegetables, which they can produce for their own consumption.

This is a straightforward matter. Between the two parcels of land which the Maughans owned, there were a few pieces of land. In order to make the land useful to the Government, the Government had to acquire three additional pieces of land in that area, and this Resolution seeks to have that land added to the property at Glendairy Prison.

With those few remarks, I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. A. TRUSS: I beg to second that and reserve my right to speak.

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN (St. Philip North): Mr. Deputy Speaker, this is not so much to deal with the Resolution. I would like the honourable Minister to inform me if there is any problem presently being experienced by the Ministry of Housing in the settling of acquisitions, particularly those involving sums over \$50,000. I also want to know whether it is a fact that the already tedious mechanism for compensation is further lengthened now, by all compensations for sums over \$50 000 having to go before the Ministry of Finance before they are finally settled.

If this is so, I should like to find out what were the reasons behind such a procedure. The procedure is already lengthy and time-consuming, and to add

another bureaucratic leg to it is going to further frustrate the intentions of the Ministry, and everybody, to get these matters dealt with as speedily as possible.
2.55 p.m.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the body that looks after the pricing of lands is vested in the Ministry of Finance, and I think that it might be a good idea for the Ministry, in the final analysis, to deal with money matters, even though the negotiations are done by the Ministry of Housing and Lands. I myself have no problems at all with any arrangement where the vetting of matters and the final settlement of values can be dealt with by the Ministry of Finance. In fact, the money must come from them, and if they need to scrutinize the values which are arrived at, I have no quarrel with that.

I have actually suggested that this is how it should be done, because, all too often, we have had situations where people were complaining that they were not getting sufficient money for their properties. In addition, it was thought that in certain areas, which were instanced in the past in this House, people in one district received one valuation, while others, with land contiguous, got a different value. All of this has created quite a lot of confusion amongst people.

So it was thought that it would be reasonable to have the Ministry of Finance, due to the fact that they control the Valuation Section, look after the final payments. We do the negotiations in terms of the price structure, but we feel that whenever a price is arrived at, for the satisfaction of the Ministry of Finance, which would finally finance the purchase, the matter can go there. I have no quarrel with that, because I am not particularly keen to be too involved, or have the Ministry itself unnecessarily involved, in the pricing of land and negotiations.

Somebody has to do it and there must be some formula for doing it, but the Ministry of Housing and Lands is not particularly concerned about who negotiates or what formula is devised, so long as an equitable formula can be found.

I support your view that there can be a long delay in the process of compensation. I deplore it. I have spoken continuously about that system. I feel that the money should be made available as soon as the negotiations are completed. It can be as long drawn out as in the case from 1974. It is not that the Government was trying to purchase, it was that Mr. Maughan was offering and the Government was not too keen on purchasing. But these are different cases, from those the honourable Member for St. Philip North has in mind.

I assure him that I share his concerns to a great extent, I will do all that is possible to ensure that the process of compensation is speeded up, and whichever Ministry might be looking after the final compensation, I will urge as much as I can to ensure that compensation is met adequately and promptly, because the view is always expressed that unless the interest that you are set up to serve is served promptly and quickly, the interest is not at all served.

I do not know if that will satisfy the honourable Member, but I assure him that the points he raised are points which are holding the interest of the Ministry. With respect to the mechanism, I do not think that he has to be particularly worried about that.

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

INCOME TAX (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1984

Order No. 3 was called — To move the Second Reading of a Bill to amend the Income Tax Act, Cap. 73.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS (St. Thomas): Mr. Deputy Speaker, amendments to the Income Tax Act, following on proposals relating to income tax invariably takes a long time, and these particular amendments are no exception.

In the Budgetary Proposals made on April 27 last year, I proposed a new principle, taxing benefits payable upon termination of employment other than standard retirement benefits. A number of other small matters were also proposed, relating to repairs and interest payments and so on. Opportunity has been taken in the Bill now before the House not only to provide for the new principles set out in the Budgetary Proposals, but also to make a number of small corrections.

Those honourable Members who follow these things will no doubt prefer to take the opportunity of debate in Committee of the details rather than deal with the overall Bill at great length in debate.

The Commissioner of Inland Revenue is in attendance and I would do my best to deal with any details which honourable Members raise. But I think I will reserve that opportunity for the Committee stage.

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

Hon. L. R. TULL: I beg to second that.

Mr. P. M. GREAVES (St. Michael North): Mr. Deputy Speaker, a close examination of this Bill to amend the Income Tax Act shows that the major amendments that have been proposed relate to severance

payments, in a way that would limit the amount that a worker would normally receive if, on this very day, he is receiving his severance payment benefits.

This amendment could not have come at a more inopportune time. It comes at a time when unemployment, according to the latest published reports, is almost at an unprecedented high level, when there have been layoffs in the private sector, particularly in industry, and layoffs, in the public sector — when workers would need every cent that they would normally get in order to meet the future. But this legislation is not a surprise, because we understood from the honourable Minister of Finance, at the time of the Budgetary Debate, that these proposals here would be forthcoming.

There have been two pronouncements made over the past year which interfere with workers' entitlements under the severance payment laws. The first came in a release from the Government Information Ministry, I believe, saying at that time that Government had proposed limiting severance payments to a maximum of \$25 000, or to one year's salary, I believe it was stated at the time, whichever was less.....

That created quite a furore among the workers and workers representatives of this country. Then we subsequently learned of the new proposals, such as we are debating today, when the right honourable Minister of Finance made his Budgetary Proposals.
3.05 p.m.

It would appear to me that the Government pays very little regard to the history of severance payments, or to the principles of tri-partite relationships, in this country. The Severance Payment Scheme began in the early 1970s. In the late 1960s, the Democratic Labour Party Government set up a committee to examine the problems of redundancy and to make recommendations, particularly with regard to making terminal payments to those persons who lost their jobs through no fault of their own.

The committee at that time comprised representatives of the workers, employers, and of the Government, and it was set up under the chairmanship of Canon Layne, then Vicar of the St. Matthias Church. That committee reported, and the legislation that we have today is a product of that committee.

Today, all on its own, and unilaterally, as I understand it, without the consultation of the representatives of the workers or employers, Government decides to change the severance payment entitlements, in a way which now reduces the amount a worker will normally be expected to take home. It is ironic.....

Asides.

Mr. P. M. GREAVES: If you tax the worker's entitlement, you must reduce it. If the sum to be received is \$100 000, and you tax that excess over \$25 000, you are, in effect, taxing the amount that a worker is going to take home. It is not a question of it not being true, because it is true. It may not be so in every single case, that I grant you, but it is so in the case of persons who receive in excess of \$25 000.

It is very ironic that at the very time that the Government is now proposing to limit the terminal benefits that workers would normally be expected to get, is the very time that it is proposing to increase the rebate that is to be payable to the employers.

When we set up the scheme in early 1973, at that time we had proposed that the employers should receive a rebate of 50 per cent. The Government, within a year of assuming office, in its wisdom decided to reduce the employers' rebate to 10 per cent. I do not know what was the reason for that reduction at that time, but that is exactly what happened. Now, that the Government is reducing the benefits, in some respects, that will be payable to the workers, at the same time, as I understand it, it is increasing the rebate payable to the employers by 15 per cent. In other words, Government is making a rebate of 25 per cent payable to the employers, who normally would have received 10 per cent.

Government is now proposing to extract this money from the workers by way of tax, and I am beginning to wonder what is the reason for all of this. Can it be that the Government has fallen upon such hard times that they have now got to crawl back on the shoulders of the workers? This would certainly come as a surprise to me, and to most of us, because the propaganda machinery of the Government has been, for some time, painting a rosy picture of the economy of this country. Whether this is the case or not, we all know of the propensity of the Minister of Finance to tax anything in sight that is taxable.

These proposals come very suspiciously close to the negotiations.....

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of explanation, Sir: The honourable Member is surely aware that these proposals are almost a year old.

Mr. P. M. GREAVES: I do not know the reason for that intervention. I do not believe that there is anybody who is not aware that these proposals are about a year old. But this does not mean that, because they are a year old, we on this side are going to accept them. We on this side are opposed to these proposals in principle. We were opposed to these proposals a year ago, and we stand opposed to those same proposals today. So it does not make any difference.

A year ago, the Government was negotiating with Cable and Wireless. Today Government is still negotiating with Cable and Wireless. I want to make the point that these proposals have come suspiciously close to the negotiations being conducted with Cable and Wireless for the Government to take over Cable and Wireless, and to take shares in the successor company, for there to be no connection.

The Minister of Labour, during the last Budgetary Debate, vouchsafed the information at that time that there were no more than about twenty persons who would receive over \$25 000 by way of severance payment. We are now in the twelfth year of this scheme, and if in twelve years, or eleven years, if you want to go back one year, we have only had twenty persons receiving benefits in excess of \$25 000, why do we legislate or impose tax on an average of two persons a year? Is it worthwhile for us to legislate for two persons per year? How much would such taxation yield on a mere two persons per year?

I honestly do not believe that the Minister of Finance, prone as he is to taxation, would introduce such legislation and impose such taxation on a mere two persons. That is why I come back to the point I was just making, that I believe there is a strong connection between this legislation and the negotiations that were being conducted with Cable and Wireless. I believe that the Government would want to catch the thirty or more workers, in this trap who will be laid off by Cable and Wireless this year.
3.15 p.m.

(Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: This year? They were laid off ever since).

Mr. P. M. GREAVES: Yes, this year. The honourable member for St. Philip South is a Cable and Wireless man, he will tell you about it; he will tell you about all the layoffs from Cable and Wireless ever since — and those to come!

I accuse the Government of using its powers of taxation to tax and extract from the workers at Cable and Wireless money that the Government will itself use in paying for its equity in the shareholding of the new company. This is precisely as I see it, and how I see what is going to take place, because there can be no other reason for this taxation at this time, or any other time for that matter, not to deal with two persons.

I am not in a position to say how much money the Government is going to get in taxation from the 30 or 40 people who have been laid off from Cable and Wireless. I cannot say precisely how much, not even approximately how much, I just do not know, but I imagine that the proceeds of this tax will go some way

towards paying for Government's equity in that new company.

Why should money of the workers of Cable and Wireless be used to pay for shares for the Government of Barbados?

(Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The answer is no).

Mr. P. M. GREAVES: Do not tell me the answer is "no". It is the people's money, to which they are entitled, according to the laws of this country.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will not allow an argument to develop about whether or not the people's money will be paid in the interest of Cable and Wireless. We are looking at an amendment to the Income Tax Act which includes severance payment. It does not go that far.

Mr. P. M. GREAVES: I am showing, Sir, the effect that this legislation can have upon the workers of this country generally, and I am using, in this case, a particular class of workers to show how this legislation can affect them and, therefore, affect

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: You can show how this legislation will affect anybody who is entitled to severance payment, but you cannot go on to create a debate about the use of the funds thereafter.

Mr. P. M. GREAVES: I am not going on to do that, Sir, I have already made my point in that respect. All I want to show is how these people who are employed by Cable and Wireless, some who were of long standing, some who would have expected because of their years of service, in some cases over 30 years of service, will have their entitlements would be affected by this new legislation. This will not only be so with Cable and Wireless, this will be so with any worker who should have been receiving a stated amount of benefits, but will not now receive that stated amount because of this taxation.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: If the honourable Member will give way, on a point of explanation, and deal with a principle now, not Cable and Wireless, could the honourable Member deal with the fact that if the people had not lost their work, had stayed at work and worked for the money, they would have to pay tax on the money? In other words, that what they are getting is a commuted wage tax free? That is what severance has been.

Mr. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the people have not lost their work, and that is precisely what the Severance Payment Act was about, to deal with people who have lost their work, not stayed home. As a matter of fact, it was even widened at the time of its

introduction to include persons who had lost their work by reason of the Cave Shepherd and Fogarty fires, and it was made retroactive to September 1, 1969.

This is the principle of the whole Act. The Severance Payment Act was for people who had lost their work, because it was intended to be a support for those persons who had lost an income, probably in more than one way. It was intended to be a support out of the corpus of the sum paid to the worker — I call him the victim — and his family. It was also intended to be some form of protection and security for that worker, so that worker could take that fund and invest that money; and out of investments from that money, that worker and his family could live.

Many of the workers at Cable and Wireless who would be made redundant, because Cable and Wireless has not been taking on many workers in recent years, would be in their high forties and may be persons who have had specialist training, persons who would have been telegraph operators. When they have been made redundant, who is going to employ those workers, and to do what? Who in this country is going to employ a telegraph operator?

Many of them could have looked forward, as I understand it, to the receipt of about \$100 000 in severance payment. This legislation today would legislate out of the pockets of those workers at least \$32 000, so that worker, instead of taking home \$100 000, which he might have been expecting to take home will now be taking home \$68 000. The \$100 000 would seem a large sum to some people, to me it seems a large sum, but remember, those are persons who are out of work, and because they are persons who are out of work, they will need that money to make an investment so that they can derive a return from that investment for the support of themselves and their families.

But what is the position with that today? The position now is that the Government is taking out a portion of that money and letting them have the balance, and is telling the worker that if after six months he is still unemployed, we will give you back a proportion of the money that we have been withholding from you. Could that be equitable? It means that if that worker remains unemployed for a year, he would be entitled to receive the whole, or almost the whole, not always the whole, because the amount refunded cannot be the whole if you understand the Bill. The maximum refundable is \$25 000, therefore it might be the whole, but it need not be the whole.

Government is withholding a sizeable portion of benefits and entitlements from the worker, and will be returning them to him in instalments — and he will not be paid any interest. If the worker had received that money

at the very outset, the worker would have been able to invest all the funds and get a return on them. I am submitting to Government that the least it could do when it is making a return of workers' monies to the workers, because the Government in returning it, is acknowledging it is the workers' money, is to pay them an interest of at least 6 per cent of the amount that Government had refunded. I think that that would be equitable.
3.25 p.m.

But history has a strange way of repeating itself. In 1964, I remember very well, the Barbados Labour Party mounted a campaign in this country against the investment of workers' money by the Barbados Workers Union at that time. That campaign was led by none other than the Leader of the Barbados Labour Party, Sir Grantley Adams, and that money was being invested for the workers. But today, this Government is extracting money to which the workers are entitled, from the same workers, and is not investing it for those workers. That money goes into the Consolidated Fund, like any other monies paid into Government. That is the position that we find ourselves in today.

I am opposed in principle to the policy of this Government of taxing the workers' benefits. It may very well be that not many workers would have built up an entitlement of \$25 000, therefore taxing the excess over \$25 000 is not in fact doing much damage to many people. But there is a principle involved, and what we are in fact doing is that we are taxing the benefits of the workers. Today it is \$25 000, but who can say that, come the next Budget, the allowance would not be reduced from \$25 000 to a mere \$10 000, and everybody who receives a terminal payment by way of severance pay in excess of \$10 000 is taxed? Who is to say that would not happen?

The point is that you are establishing a principle, a principle which we believe to be wrong and a principle that we cannot support. Furthermore, it can never be right for the Government to stand to benefit from the layoff of workers that have to come because of the actions and the policies of the Government itself.

Many a business has come to grieve. Many a company has gone into liquidation because of Government's stringent economic policies, the credit squeeze and high interest rates. Must Government then, after bringing this.....

Aside.

Mr. P. M. GREAVES: This is what has been taking place. Anybody who has eyes to see can see. Senator David Seale has spoken about this recently, and it was reported in the newspapers. This is what has been taking place, and anyone can see it. Bankruptcy in this country has been running at an unprecedented rate. Never before

has this country seen so many bankruptcies, so many companies being wound up, and not voluntarily — never before! — but this is what is happening. Must the Government then, because of these harsh economic policies, stand to benefit, because persons will gain severance payments and therefore Government can tax the severance payments? That has got to be wrong in principle.

The purpose of severance payment legislation was to give the workers of this country some form of protection and to provide them with some security when they were out of work. It is Government's responsibility to enhance this security, not to take some action that would reduce it. They should remember what they found, and what they found was a solid bit of social legislation left by the Democratic Labour Party Government. But this Government is now taking steps to whittle away the little that the workers salvage for themselves when they are put out of work.

When this severance pay was debated on its introduction in the early 1970s, the honourable Member for Christ Church West (Hon. H. deB. Forde) at that time was strong in advocating an extension of the scheme to cover all workers who had been laid off and would otherwise have been entitled, not necessarily workers who had been made redundant. I am wondering what is the position of the Member for Christ Church West today, now that we are taking steps not to extend the scheme, but to limit it in its scope, and to extract from the workers a tax that, normally, they would not have had to pay.

It is clear that the right honourable Prime Minister sees everything in money terms. It is evident from the wide range of taxation that he has seen fit to impose from time to time, and his vision is so clouded now that the Minister of Finance has turned on the workers.

We on this side can never support an imposition on the workers. We can never support any curtailment on the workers' rights or on their entitlements. This is a Bill that we on this side will oppose.

Applause.

Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN (St. Philip South): Mr. Deputy Speaker, the question of severance pay is a very current and immediate issue at Cable and Wireless at the moment. Being a worker of Cable and Wireless, a technician, I would like to declare my interest at this point.

Those of us who would care to recall the last Budget Debate in this Honourable House of Assembly, would recall that when I was speaking about the tax

imposed on Cable and Wireless, in conjunction with these income tax amendments, and I mentioned.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am not going to allow a debate on Cable and Wireless today. I will not allow a debate on Cable and Wireless today.

3.35 p.m.

Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I began by saying that the question of severance is very current and immediate at Cable and Wireless. In my humble opinion, this Bill deals with severance, and I say that at Cable and Wireless there is a question of severance which this Bill pertains to.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am not going to say again that I will not allow a debate on Cable and Wireless today. That is my final ruling on that point. You are dealing with an amendment to the Income Tax Act. That is the substantive Bill before the House.

Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN: I propose to show the effect that this Bill will have on workers at Cable and Wireless, and other places as well. I am very sad today, not for myself, because I have not yet been severed, but because this Bill is going to be passed today, regardless of what we say on this side. This Bill will be passed today because for the past two weeks severance money was to be paid out, and could not be paid out because this amendment to the Income Tax Act had not been passed. The Inland Revenue Department advised those persons who were to pay out the severance that they could not take the sums that were taken out, and so the persons who were to pay out the severance were unable to keep the money that they took out, and therefore payment to those severed has had to be held up until this Bill is passed. That is why I believe this Bill is going to be passed today regardless of what we say on this side, and that makes me sad.

We have to understand certain things. If you reduce the amount of severance to the worker, and in the same amendment you increase the rebate to the employer, in fact what you are doing is allowing the employer to keep more of his money; he is increasing his profits.

What has this Bill done to people in working positions in Barbados? On \$25 000, there is no tax. If a person was working for only ten years or so, \$25 000 as severance pay seems like a big amount, because in any case he will not qualify for the \$25 000. But what will this Bill do to persons who have been working for 35 or 40 years?

Asides

Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN: I am telling you that there are persons working with me who have been working for

35 years and, in some cases, 37 years, and I will show what this has done to people.

Any person who has been working at an organisation for 30, 32, 33 or 40 years will be either 50 or nearly 50 or just over 50. There are persons I know who have children at Harrison College, at Combermere, children whom they would like to send to University, to educate them overseas and that sort of thing. Those persons believe that if they were severed at age 50 or 51, they would get a reasonable sum. What you are doing to these workers is that you are taking away almost half of the severance pay that is due to them. You are saying that on anything between \$25 000 and \$50 000, you are taking out 30 percent, and on anything over \$50 000, you are taking out 50 per cent, you are taking out half. So many persons, who thought that they could get a reasonable sum, will end up with just about half of what they should get.

What you are telling those persons, in effect, is that they will have to go out and look for work at age 50, 52 or 53. You are making boys of these senior persons. When a man reaches 53, he does not want to go and look for a job. There is no dignity in sitting down and writing a letter saying: "I was educated at Combermere School and I hereby apply for the post of....." and state whatever post it is. That is what is happening today. You are stripping big men of their dignity. You are telling people to go out and look for work, because they cannot live on the severance you are paying them.

I would like to hear in this Honourable Chamber today those honourable members of the Cabinet who agreed to this Bill. That is what I am interested in, because if members of a Government care about the workers and can sit down and agree to this, then something has to be wrong. I want to know what kind of workers they care about, because you cannot tell a person, after he has worked for 35 years, that \$100 000 is too much money for him. What yardstick are you using to determine this?

As the last honourable Member who spoke on this Bill said, the present Severance Payment Act was arrived at after consultation between the workers' representatives, the employers' representatives and the Government's representatives, and they came to the conclusion that what is in the present Act was equitable and fair for the workers. Now, the present Government is coming and changing all this. I want to know what yardstick they use to arrive at these figures. How did they determine that \$100 000 or \$80 000 is too much for a man after he has worked for 35 years? I want them to tell me how they arrived at it.

I will go back again and say that these are the Cable and Wireless amendments, and there are lots of reasons

for this Income Tax Amendment Bill that I dare not go into, for fear of being stopped, but there will be time and there will be place. I will go on.

I mentioned that this amendment to the Severance Payments Act was part of a trade off. When you tell a company to pay you \$750 000, and in the same breath you say you do not have to pay out much severance, and that most of the severance you will have to pay out you will get back, so you can afford to pay me the \$750 000, as I mentioned from the beginning it is a trade off, and I am still convinced that it is a trade off.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN (Christ Church East Central): On a point of order; the honourable Member is alleging that the Government, in particular, the Minister responsible for dealing with Government's relationship with Cable and Wireless, made a trade off, that in return for passing this legislation, \$750 000 would be paid to Cable and Wireless. The honourable Member said that.

I ask for Your Honour's ruling as to whether it is proper for a member of Parliament to make an allegation in here that the Government made a trade off with respect to the passing of legislation in a particular form. I submit it is an imputation of an improper motive.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I heard the statement, and the honourable Member did make the statement that it was a trade off. I did not hear him say a trade off by whom or to whom. I believe that it is in the Government's interest to deal with that when the time comes.

3.45 p.m.

My views have always been that if an honourable Member makes a statement and he cannot justify it, and then he gets the retort which does not satisfy him, he has to take it.

(Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: We will say what we have to say about him. We will deal with him personally when we get to him. Personally!)

Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I will give you an example of the negotiations which have gone on.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am not going to allow you to do that. If you would take guidance from your two members, who are trying to advise you how to conduct the debate, I think you would be better off. I will not allow you to bring Cable and Wireless into this debate.

Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I was only using an example to lead up to how we got to the point about severance pay.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable member...

Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN: Your ruling must be accepted.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:..... must remember that he declared an interest in the matter before the House. He should remember his own statement, and operate within those confines.

(Hon. V. L. JOHNSON: He is putting a case for himself.)

Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have not been severed from Cable and Wireless, and there is no question of my being severed.

(Hon. V. L. JOHNSON: Put me in authority and I would look after you.)

Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN: I just wanted to make that point clear.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable Member must not bring the issue of Cable and Wireless before the Chamber at this time.

Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN: The question of my being severed does not come into this at all. That is the point I want to make, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

I will proceed. I have some figures here, Mr. Deputy Speaker. This has nothing to do with any particular firm, it has to do with this amendment. If an employee was due \$80 000 in severance, he will get \$57 500; the Government proposes to take out \$22 500. If an employee was due \$100 000, he will now get \$67 000; the Government will take out \$32 500. If an employee was due \$120 000, he will now get \$77 500; the Government will take out \$42 000. If that same employee was due \$140 000, he will get \$87 500; the Government will take \$52 500 out of his money. That is what this Amendment is all about.

(Mr. B. M. TAITT: O Lord!)

(Dr. R. C. HAYNES: That is terrible.)

Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN: I want to be told, I will repeat it, what yardstick was used to arrive at these figures.....

(ASIDE: Yardfowl yardstick!)

Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN: In this sort of situation, one sits down and works out these things with the workers' representatives, the employers' representatives,

with the Government's representatives; all of those persons sit down and come to what they believe is a reasonable tax or a reasonable figure. What sort of criteria was used here? No one has explained to me the criteria used for this.

(ASIDE: You would not understand it!)

Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN: The amendment to this Act says at 48C(2):

'The tax rebate payable by virtue of subsection (1) is 1/6 of the tax paid by the recipient, in respect of the termination payment to which section 48B refers, for each month or part thereof of unemployment after the qualifying period, subject to the payment of a maximum single or cumulative amount of \$25 000,'

(Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Stealing!)

Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN: I have just given a figure where the Government will be taking out \$52 500, and you are saying that the maximum to be paid is \$25 000. That is the sort of thing that this Amendment is doing. Regardless of what points we bring here today, no matter how we speak here today, this Bill has to be passed, because persons are being held up from paying. That is what is happening. What bothers me is that persons who say that they are all for the workers, that they are workers' spokesmen, that they are looking after the working class in Barbados, those persons can sit down and agree to a Bill like this, those persons can buy that they are going to speak on this Bill, when you are taking out half of the money that a man is due when he has reached probably the age of fifty or fifty three years old. You have decided that that man does not qualify for that sum of money and you are going to take \$50 000 from it. Those persons who agree to this Bill make me sad.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES (St. Michael South Central): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I wish to make a very brief contribution on this matter, having replied substantively to the Budget earlier last year.

We must express our usual dissatisfaction that the enabling legislation for Budgetary Proposals should come before this Parliament after almost an entire year has lapsed, when almost a new Budget is due, when the International Monetary Fund has completed the provisions which it wishes to be included in the Budget.

I wish to challenge one or two fundamental principles relating to this piece of legislation. In the Budgetary Statement, which is already a document of the House, the honourable Minister of Finance stated that severance payments can, in fact, be regarded as future streams of income received in a present lump sum, which if received

as income, would have been subjected to the appropriate rates of income tax.

Certain remarks made at this stage by the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central (Dr. R. C. Haynes) were ordered to be expunged from the Record by Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: It seems to be the consequence of some mental gymnastics which would lead someone to assume that when a person is severed, any benefits that accrue to him at that point in time can be deemed to be future earnings and therefore subject to taxation. It is my humble submission that that reasoning is fundamentally false.

If the electorate were to sever the honourable Member for St. James North (Hon. L. S. Craig) at the next election and he is entitled to a gratuity, are you going to tell me that that gratuity would be taxable and be regarded as future streams of earnings? It is my humble submission that that is fundamentally false reasoning. In my view, the liability to severance payments, once it exists in a country, is a liability against the assets of the employing authority, and therefore, all the considerations in terms of levels of wages paid

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, on a point of explanation, because I think the honourable Member is about to make a useful contribution to the debate: Would the honourable Member take the point that what we are dealing with in this Bill is severance and what he is talking about in connection with a parliamentary retirement is a commuted gratuity on account of pension, and that there is a difference? This Bill makes a difference between a gratuity paid and a reduced pension, such as civil servants and parliamentarians get, and a severance, which is a payment in lieu of wages after termination of employment.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I take the point, in terms of the fact that in the contract of employment, these things are clearly defined. But I hope the honourable Member would also take the point that, in the determination of the wages' structure within a corporation, the managers of that corporation must take into consideration, if they look at the macro-economic and micro-economic situation in the environment in which we are operating, that at some point in time there might be a liability for severance payments; and therefore, to that extent, wages, as one of the cost factors in the operation, might have been reduced in order to cope with that potential liability at a later stage.
3.55 p.m.

This is a philosophical argument. It is certainly not a clear cut-case where you can say that this constitutes future streams of earnings.

I think that there is also a built-in situation where it can be regarded to some extent as a gratuity, or a convertible payment, such as a retirement pension plan, where one would enjoy the tax benefits early on and postpone the tax payments for later on in life, a very common thing in the United States. Unfortunately, we do not have that kind of philosophy here in Barbados, and the incidence of income tax falls very heavily on the higher earning group, such as those in the \$100 000 bracket range, like the honourable Member for St. Thomas, for whom I plead, because of the large amount of tax which he has to pay.

I think the other matters have been dealt with very effectively, but I am sure that that particular point is one, from a tax point of view, which should be debated.

The second point is that it is my suspicion that this Government knew that the past Administration had entered into a gentleman's agreement with the National Union of Public Workers and the Barbados Workers Union, whereby the employees of statutory boards would be entitled to severance payment. They fired left, right, and center when there was no need to fire, replacing people whom they thought were Democratic Labour Party supporters with their own; and then, in later years, they found themselves in a situation where they had to send home thousands of workers from the statutory boards.

I suspect that this is an attempt to reduce the liability of those statutory boards to the workers, to the extent that a proportion of severance pay will be withheld and paid to the Commissioner of Inland Revenue at the time of severance. In other words, what the Government is trying to do is to reduce its liability to find severance payments for those people whom they have fired, and whom they have to fire in reducing the cost of the non-financial public sector in this country.

I do not wish to get into details. We on this side are satisfied about our position. All of this sort of taxation which has been placed on the working people of Barbados will have to be reviewed. In due course, the Democratic Labour Party, having completed a detailed review of the incidence of the tax burden on the working people of Barbados, will be making its proposals to this country, at the appropriate time, which will result in a substantial reduction of the incidence of taxation to those who are working and those who are severed. So we are not bothered too much at the moment with this sort of thing. When an election comes, you will hear our proposals on taxation.

We believe that this falls into the category of tax levied by a Government on the verge of bankruptcy, one which has had its sovereignty in the allocation of the resources of this country wrestled from it and, therefore,

has to reduce its fiscal deficit by a particular percentage of Gross National Product.

We are in a "rake-and-scrape" situation. You are taxing those who are working, you are taxing those who have been fired, you are taxing the unemployed, you are taxing the old age pensioners under the provisions of taxation introduced by the Public Utilities Board — so everybody is being taxed.

What we have to do when we assume the reins of Government is to remove all of those taxes, which are burdensome to the working people of Barbados. We are not going to get into detailed arguments about tax credits and this and that.....

(Hon. L. S. CRAIG: And replace them with what? No tax?)

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: With a progressive form of taxation, which will substantially reduce the transfers from the private sector to the public sector, and will once again restore the capability of this economy to respond to the challenges of individual effort, so suppressed at the moment by the burdensome, onerous and ill-thought out tax policies of the present Administration.

I thank you very much, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I hope that I would have given the Government some reason to rethink that question of future streams of earnings.

Hon. V. L. JOHNSON (St. Michael West Central): In rising to support the recommendations contained in this amendment before the House, I want to deal with some of the assertions that have come from the other side. I think we should start out by setting it straight that this Bill does not seek to impose any hardship on the working-class of Barbados, as has been said by virtually all of the speakers on that side. This is a measure which seeks to regularize something that has been obviously a solitary condition prevailing, perhaps, only in legislation of this sort in Barbados.

The legislation dealing with Social Security as it relates to severance payments was exhaustively researched by me when I was Minister of Labour and Social Security. I discovered that Barbados was perhaps the only country that had a Severance Payments Act with the kind of generous provisions that we see in our legislation. The legislation was drawn in some considerable measure from that of the United Kingdom, but unlike the legislation of the United Kingdom, severance payments were allowed to accrue without hindrance, whereas in the United Kingdom there is a bar against severance payments beyond a certain point.

This amendment to the Income Tax Act, among other things, provides for severance payments beyond a certain figure to be taxed. I do not really think that, when

we look at this measure dispassionately, that is an unreasonable proportion at all.

Much of the emotion that surrounds discussions on severance payments legislation, and particularly this bit of legislation, derives largely from the fact that there is a misconception that every person in Barbados, who might in the future become subject to redundancy legislation, will automatically find himself being denied the right to his severance payment, or that he will have a large and substantial portion of his entitlement taken away by virtue of this new provision in the Income Tax law.
4.05 p.m.

The honourable Member for St. Philip South (Mr. H. A. Blackman) started by declaring his interest in the matter, and then proceeded to debate what he considered would be his peculiar position *vis-a-vis* the company which employs him.

Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN: On a point of elucidation, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I specifically stated that the question of severance does not concern me, because the firm for which I work has stated that technicians and engineers will not be severed. The honourable Member is misleading this House.

Hon. V. L. JOHNSON: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the honourable Member said "I am sad today not so much for myself because I have not yet been severed." That would suggest to me that, at least residually in his head, there is a possibility that he will be severed, and he is stating a case in the event that he is one of those persons who will be severed by the company for which he works.

He has conjured up in his mind images of \$150 000 and \$250 000 in severance payment, and he is upset at the prospect of having to pay as much as 50 per cent towards taxes. I put it forward to you that the honourable Member for St. Philip South is in that very minuscule percentage of Barbadians who find themselves in a position to even contemplate the possibility of being severed and given a cash payment of \$100 000.

Ninety per cent or more of the persons who come under severance in Barbados, fall in the category of persons who receive severance payment in the area of \$2 000. That is the model figure for severance in this island. This means that the vast majority of Barbadians who are severed, not ever, and will not ever, be in a position to contemplate the possibility that they will be paid more than \$3 000 as severance.

There is another category of Barbadians who will go up to as high as \$15 000 in severance. This matter has been gone into extremely carefully.

Certain remarks made at this stage by the honourable Member for St. Michael West Central (Hon. V. L. Johnson) were ordered expunged from the Record by Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.

Hon V. L. JOHNSON: I am sorry, Sir. There are only a few persons who have been working for companies long enough in Barbados to be in a position to expect \$150 000 if they are severed. There are only a very minuscule number — those at Banks perhaps, and places like that — senior executive officers, and I could count them on my two hands. Those are the persons who these are in here putting a case for. You are putting a case for that minority of Barbadians who find themselves in very secure and comfortable upper middle class niches, and who are sitting down and praying God that they will be severed so that they can walk away with such high sums.

First of all, I think as a matter of principle, that it is unreasonable for any worker who has been employed with a company for any prolonged period of time, and who has been paid wages in consideration of that service, to sit down and believe that they have an automatic entitlement to something called severance, particularly when you realise that the people to whom we are referring are persons who will have been severed perhaps in the prime of their working life, and will then be able to leave job A and walk into job B.

(Mr. P. M. GREAVES: Not today).

Hon. V. L. JOHNSON: I am talking about today. I challenge any one of them on that side to point to any man of substance in this island who has worked for 40 years of his life — let us say he is at age 45 — finds himself severed and then finds himself unable.....

Asides.

Hon. V. L. JOHNSON: I am not talking about people like the honourable Member over there; I am talking about people who can go and present themselves as suitable people for employment in virtually any company in this island.

There is a type of Barbadian who believes that he must sit down and expect that a company in redundancy, which is liquidated, closing down, is entitled to put itself further in chancery by having to contemplate paying out sums such as I have been discussing.

Let me tell you something. We might be in a position of believing that this question of severance will only apply in cases where you are dealing with large corporations. But I think, and the honourable Member over there knows, that people like the General Secretary of

the trade union are in a position where they cannot contemplate laying off a maid, because they cannot handle the amount of money which they would have to pay under the Severance Payments Act.

There are some entrepreneurs in this island who have fallen on bad times. I can think of several whose companies have gone sour, and who find themselves in a position of not being able to meet their debts. For the privilege of closing up their business so that they do not end up in the poor house altogether, they have to pay sums of money which are entirely beyond their means.

What happens is that they cannot pay the severance, they do not pay the severance, and then the National Insurance Fund, which is an insurance fund for genuine cases, has to be gone into in order to liquidate the responsibility, under the Severance Payments Act, of those companies which are not in a position to pay for themselves.

What is happening in Barbados increasingly is that the vast majority of companies are not paying severance. They are opting out, and it is the responsibility of the Minister responsible for Social Security, through the National Insurance Board, to pay that severance. The employees pay a contribution of one half of one percent of insurable earnings towards severance pay.

When this Barbados Labour Party came into power in 1976, by 1977 the National Insurance Severance Payment Fund was broke, did not have any money to meet its legitimate obligations under the Act, and the Minister responsible at that time was the honourable Member for St. Michael North (Mr. P. M. Greaves). It was the responsibility of the Barbados Labour Party in those circumstances to amend the regulations in order to reduce the amount of rebate to which the companies were then entitled, from 50 per cent down to 10 per cent, and it remains at 10 per cent today.
4.15 p.m.

When a company severed an employee under the Democratic Labour Party, they were able to get back 50 per cent. The present situation is 10 per cent, but companies were then able to go and get a rebate of 50 per cent of the severance, and what happened was that that was an incentive for companies in Barbados to engage in a cavalier activity. It was an incentive to dismiss people, and that is why the fund was broke. It was easier to do that then, than having to pay damages for any unlawful dismissals, so they used the route of redundancy to get rid of people. That is why the fund was broke, and that was at the time when the honourable Member was presiding over the portfolio of Social Security.

What we need to do is to provide for the National Insurance Fund to have priority of claim in relation to

genuine cases of liquidation. Where a company goes into liquidation, the National Insurance portion should be met.

We have a situation in Barbados where a number of employers refuse to pay over National Insurance money, many of them are in arrears. The honourable Member for St. Michael West (Mr. B. M. Taitt) does not want me to call out the names of all those companies in default, so he has run out of the House. I will not name them, but there are a whole bunch of them, and the honourable Member for St. Michael West would know that. He is connected to one of the companies which figures very prominently on that list of delinquents who refuse to pay over the National Insurance funds. But he is going to come in here now and be heard saying that he is not going to vote for this measure.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir: The honourable Member chooses to indicate that I am associated with a company that is on a list of delinquents. The honourable Member in so doing seems to suggest that I am improperly participating in a debate since I am associated with a company.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: He did not say that. He said that you sought to absent yourself from the debate and said you would not vote for it.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I have not absented myself. I am right here. I am entitled, as every honourable Member is privileged, to go outside of this Chamber during a debate. I think it is not proper to cast aspersions on the fact that I am not in the Chamber at a particular time.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I do not see anything particularly wrong with that.

Hon. V. L. JOHNSON: I am not casting aspersions, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I am just saying that certain companies do not pay over the National Insurance, and that the honourable Member knows what I am talking about. I would like to suggest, as a point of departure, that the National Insurance and Social Security Act, or the appropriate legislation, should be amended to provide for priority of claim on behalf of National Insurance.....

Asides

Hon. V. L. JOHNSON: It does not provide priority of claim. Any person who is aggrieved under section 43, I believe, of the Act has to resort to the Minister.

Asides

Hon. V. L. JOHNSON: Any aggrieved person, who does not receive his severance, will have to go to the Minister, who, through the Board, can sue on his behalf. But I am saying that that is not good enough, because

that is *ex post facto*. What we should do is to provide for the severance payments arrangement to be sorted out so that when the assets are being apportioned, severance payments are provided for early in the winding up of a company.

I would like to allay the fear of Barbadians. I do not think that there are any genuine fears, but I am saying now, and I am saying categorically, that 95 per cent of persons who are likely to be severed in this island, anytime at all, the average man in the street, who earns \$300 a week, is not going to be affected by this legislation. This legislation is going to affect persons in the income bracket of \$25 000 to \$50 000 a year. The big shots who work in commercial banks, and those who work in other places which pay enormous salaries, and who feel that they will be paid large portions of money without having to make a contribution to the Treasury.

If that half of 1 per cent on the part of the employer was not paid over to the National Insurance, it would either be taxable under the company's profit — if it declared a profit, it would be subject to the 45 per cent taxation — and if it had been paid to the employee, it would have been subject to income tax. I, therefore, cannot see how what might otherwise be regarded, at least that is how people regard it, as deferred income — they believe it is income set aside, and if they so regard it, I do not see how any reasonable Barbadian can lay any claim to not being subject to tax under the provisions that we are bringing now. It is unreasonable and greedy.

Greed is increasingly becoming evident in our society. There are people under the mistaken impression that they can go to work, if they have been working for 15 or 20 years, provoke their employer day after day, do work callously or carelessly, do not go to work when they should, and if they are dismissed for cause, they would then be subjected to the Severance Payment Act.

This is a fallacy that resides in the heads of too many Barbadians. And they are a lot of people who go and coach people — they tell them to act up on their jobs, do a lot of foolishness and challenge their employer. When the workers are fired, they then tell them that they can go to the Ministry or to the National Insurance Office — to waste people's time — and say that they are subject to severance payments.

There are two different things altogether. The law provides for severance for those persons who are legitimately severed, because the company no longer needs that particular category of employee. If you do not need a clerk any longer because you are now going into computers, it would be unreasonable to expect the company to keep that class of employee. You can offer him alternative employment, or you can sever.

4.25 p.m.

I cannot contemplate a situation where a person at the level of clerk would be drawing \$25 000 as severance unless he is virtually ready for retirement. Those gentlemen on that side who say they are not going to vote for these provisions, are making noises on behalf of a very special minority of highly placed executives in this island, who believe that it is their divine right to sit down on people's jobs and wait patiently, like the honourable member for St. Philip South, for that eventuality when they will be sent home with a large amount of money, and then step outside the next morning with their skills intact, sign on to a new job and laugh their way down the road. It is immoral, it is unreasonable for people to expect to be treated in that kind of way, and I make no apologies for saying it.

I do not believe that a reasonable Barbadian has any business feeling that he has a right to draw that kind of money and not pay a cent on it. As a matter of fact, when a man is in his working tilt, fully able to work, to make a useful contribution to his society, he sells his skills wherever those skills can be marketed, gives satisfactory service and he is compensated in consideration of that service at a level that he accepts during his working life, with all the other ancillary benefits that attach to that particular job — and he still has his skill when he is severed to go and look for work.

I can think of some small drug stores where the owners had to sit down and shiver at the prospect of severing the employees who had been with them for 20 years. They had to try to persuade the person who was purchasing the business to keep on those persons whom they had had in their employ for that long period of time, because severing those employees would have put them in chancery.

A domestic servant may be employed by a family, with which, over the years she has built up a rapport that makes her almost an extension of the family. At some point in time, they will become old and will no longer require the services of that domestic, and will have to look at the unhappy prospect of paying severance, which they will not be able to provide out of their own resources. Those cases fall back to the tribunal for settlement.

I commend these amendments. I hope that the honourable Members on the other side would be able to see the wisdom that lies in these submissions, recognise that a great deal of thought has been given to the legislation, and in fact what is being proposed is reasonable in every sense of that word. They ought to desist from trying to persuade unsuspecting persons, who look to them for enlightenment, that this is something terrible, and they should stop trying to frighten them into believing that the Barbados Labour Party is an ogre trying to steal bread out of their mouths. The vast majority of Barbadians, those working-class people, are

not likely ever to be affected by the provisions contained in these amendments.

Mr. M. A. KING (Christ Church West Central): Mr. Deputy Speaker, the honourable Member who just spoke, the honourable Member for St. Michael West Central (Hon. V. L. Johnson) did raise what one may regard as legitimate concerns about the problems of employers, who have employed workers for a large number of years, and who, suddenly being faced with the problems of severance, probably would find themselves in difficult positions if they reach a position where they had to pay out severance pay. But on the whole, when one reflects on the overall statement of the honourable Member for St. Michael West Central, one cannot help getting the feeling that his views did not come across as being all that progressive in their totality. The honourable Member for St. Michael West Central seems to be concerned with one side of the picture, the problems of the employer, without necessarily addressing the other side of the picture, the problems of the employees who are concerned in the operation.

In relation to this amendment which is now before this Honourable House, the honourable Member for St. Thomas (Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. Adams) did not open on this line, but in the course of one of the contributions by one of the honourable Members over here, he did make an intervention which repeats the position which was articulated in his Budgetary Proposals, that severance payment can be regarded as future streams of income received in a lump sum. If you accept that premise and acknowledge that if you had received them as income they would be taxable, and therefore if they would have been taxable as income, what is wrong with taxing them as income now that they receive them in a lump sum, then the argument and the presentation of the right honourable Member for St. Thomas is impeccable. But I suggest that a different approach has to be adopted.

Philosophically we have to depart from that point of view, that severance payments are regarded as future streams of income. I prefer to regard severance payments, and I suggest this is the better way, as compensation for the loss of a person's right in his job, loss of a right in the property of employment.

Employment, traditionally, has unfortunately been one of those areas which has not received an awful lot of protection under the law. Persons may have been employed by companies for a large number of years, and the old traditions of the law, if such persons had been dismissed even after working for 30 years, would have been that the maximum obligation of the employer would have been to give him no more than a week's wages, if he were a weekly paid employee, or a month's wages, if a monthly paid employee, and so on. So the traditional position as far as employment was concerned

was that a worker had no right of the property whatsoever in his job.

If you accept that principle, that a worker has no right of property in his job, and you terminate his job, then, as far as you are concerned, once the job is terminated, all rights to any compensation consequent on that termination of job thereby come to an end. If you follow logically from that, if you compensate him after that and if you regard the compensation which he gets as compensation for future loss of earnings, then you fall into what I consider to be the fallacy of being so easily able to regard it as being taxable, because if it were income it would have been taxable anyhow. If, on the other hand, you regard it as compensation for loss of right in a property, then it must be reasonable to conclude that if you are taxing a person's loss of a right in property, that tax has got to be burdensome.
4.35 p.m.

If you take an analogy in relation to a person's property in land, a lot of Resolutions come to this Honourable House dealing with the compulsory acquisition of people's property, and the law provides for compensation for acquisition of people's right of property in land.

If you regard a right to employment as a proprietary right similar to a right in property, in land or in chattels of any other kind; and if you accept that if you take away a man's property in land or in chattels, he should be compensated for it, equally so, I suggest that if you take away a man's right to property in his job, he should be compensated for that loss of right — I think, too, that to tax him on top of that for the compensation which he receives is unnecessarily burdensome. It would be, if we take the next step, as if we are taxing persons for compensation which they receive for land which has been compulsorily acquired by Government.

I think that in this modern day and age we have to move away from the old philosophical concepts in which we regarded a man's employment as being something of passing value. We have, I suggest, to move gradually into the direction where a man's job means something more than a mere contract, and where a man, who has been employed in a job, can be seen as having contributed substantially to the development of the enterprise where he works.

Without the man's labour in building up that enterprise, the enterprise could not have achieved the growth which it achieved, and we have to regard the whole development and building of the enterprise as something which has been contributed to, by the person. We also have to see, following on that, that the person has a proprietary right

in any loss where he is severed from connection with that which he has assisted in building up over the years. So if we accept as our basis, then, that severance payment is compensation for loss of right in a job, it is clear that any tax on that compensation for the loss of that right would not necessarily be as simple and straightforward as the right honourable Member for St. Thomas would have us to believe.

There is another concern which I have about the legislation which is now before us. The statement has been made in this Honourable House that severance payments only in excess of \$25 000 are to be taxed. But the tax is not only on severance payment, but also on compensation for loss of earnings for wrongful dismissal or unfair dismissal.

It seems to me from looking at the provisions of the Income Tax Act in its entirety, that by virtue of part of the provisions of this amendment, certainly the amendments relating to Section 8 of the Income Tax Act, that any sums which are received by a worker on termination of employment fall to be considered as income which has to be included in his assessable income. That, as I understand it, is what the amendment to Section 8 says. So irrespective of whether the severance payment or the damages for wrongful dismissal is in excess of \$25 000 or not, if you have an income from employment which is assessable to tax, and you get a severance payment after that, even of \$1 000, it seems to me, by virtue of the provisions of these amendments, as if that amount has to be included in the income which is assessable for tax.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: That is something which should be debated in the Committee.

Mr. M. A. KING: It is a matter of principle, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I agree that the detail is a matter for discussion in Committee, but I do think I have to make the general point of principle that the measure seems to go further than a taxation of income in excess of \$25 000 which is received for severance payments and damages for wrongful dismissal. It seems to include, and cover also, severance payments which are awarded of a lesser amount than that, and which fall to be included in the assessable income of a taxpayer.

The honourable member for St. Michael West Central (Hon. V. L. Johnson) made a number of points about the Bill seeking to regularise a solitary condition in which the legislation of Barbados finds itself. This suggests that the Barbados legislation is the only legislation which does not provide for taxation on severance payments.

The original English legislation did not provide for taxation on severance payments. But in the United Kingdom, the whole milieu of industrial relations has been going through considerable change, examination and

re-examination, and there have been a whole series of issues which come to be considered when the financial position of workers falls to be considered and altered from time to time. So we find that in the United Kingdom, there are a whole number of benefits which are available to workers in employment situations which are not available to workers in employment situations in Barbados.

We have got a Redundancy Payments Act, which follows the provisions of the original United Kingdom Redundancy Payments Law. But we are now seeking to amend and alter some of the benefits which have been provided by that Redundancy Payments Act without necessarily taking into consideration some of the other ancillary benefits which, in the meantime, have been granted to workers in the United Kingdom, and which have been totally absent in the development of our industrial relations legislation.

The honourable Member for St. Michael West Central says that we have an anomalous situation and that most of the legislation all over the place does provide for tax on severance payments. I want to remind the honourable Member for St. Michael West Central that in Trinidad, and this was done recently, I believe that the first \$90 000 in severance is tax free. I believe that is so, but I speak subject to correction.

(Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: They do not have a rebate.)

Mr. M. A. KING: Yes. But I think the workers get the \$90 000 tax free. And there has been, I believe, a lot of argument in Trinidad that the tax on severance payment should be removed altogether.

I think we have to look at all the individual circumstances. I have not looked at the legislation in all the countries in relation to the incidence of tax on severance payments, but I am sure that we have to consider our position, consider what we conceive to be the philosophical approach which we should adopt for the working class of Barbados, look at the direction in which we want to see the development of workers' rights and obligations, and determine what, in the final analysis is best for us.

The honourable Member for St. Michael West Central said that it is unreasonable and greedy for a worker to expect that he should, on termination of employment, have \$100 000 tax free. Let us take the situation, for argument's sake, where a worker has been employed in a job for forty years.

(Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: He would get pension.)

Mr. M. A. KING: All workers do not get pensions.

(Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: You would get 33 1/3 years.)

Mr. M. A. KING: Are you talking about National Insurance and Social Security Pensions? We are talking about people at the lower end of the income ladder. If a man who reaches sixty years old and suddenly discovers he is severed, and could use his severance payment to provide some sort of security in his old age, are you saying to me that the type of compensation you think he should get is that he should be provided with a pension, and should be condemned for the rest of his life to draw the pittance, which, is in fact, the National Insurance Pension?

4.45 p.m.

I am not unnecessarily knocking the level of National Insurance pension because, obviously, one cannot compensate everyone in the society to the level of pensions which we would like to see given eventually; it would be a terrible drain on the economy. The point I am making is that if you provide funds for a person's retirement, or for persons who have been thrown out of jobs through no fault of their own, and you are saying at the same time that you need to tax them, I think it is a little unfair and unkind, especially to the lower income earners, to say that they are unreasonable and greedy if they expect to receive compensation.

Hon. V. L. JOHNSON: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of elucidation: The honourable Member, I am sure, will be able to recall that I particularly went to great lengths to exclude the lower income earners, whom I was at pains to point out, will very hardly ever be in a position where they would be coming under the ambit of this legislation.

Mr. M. A. KING: The honourable Member for St. Michael West Central says that he took pains to point out that ordinary workers are unlikely to come under this legislation. I am not convinced on that. I would like to have this matter addressed more fully, particularly in relation to that section of the law which, in my view suggests that all severance payments, or money paid as compensation for loss of earnings for wrongful or unfair dismissal, are taken into account in calculating one's assessable income for tax purposes. I wish to have some clarification on that issue, and I wish to know if my interpretation of that particular aspect of the amendment is in error.

There are other aspects of the honourable Member's contribution, which I do not propose to dwell on at any length, with which I disagree fundamentally. I was looking through the debate on the Budget, and my thoughts on this are fully articulated in there, so I will not repeat them on this occasion.

In summary, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we on this side feel that, philosophically, severance payments have to be regarded not as any future streams of earnings into the

workers' pockets, but as compensation for the loss of rights of property. We feel that the time has come in this society where we have gradually to give better recognition to the rights of workers. We have to consider that workers develop rights of property in their jobs, just as employers have rights of property in the assets of the corporations which they own, and we feel the present method of taxation is a retrograde step in that development of what I consider a desirable goal in the concept of law, which I think is the one to which we should aspire. It is against that background that we find it difficult to support the amendment which is before this Honourable House.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE (Christ Church West): Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Bill before the House applies to the Tax Act. Honourable Members have quite rightly, concentrated their debate on the substantive amendment, which will make redundancy payments for loss of earnings, and payments for wrongful or unfair dismissal, now taxable, but I think that it does provide this Chamber with an opportunity to look at the whole administration of the Income Tax Department and to consider logically, and objectively, what has been happening in the tax world in Barbados.

There is a certain growing sophistication in tax matters in our country. The taxpayer is no longer prepared to rely only on such advice as he may get at the counter of the Inland Revenue Department. Invariably, he is supported in his contentions by an expert in the field of tax, maybe an accountant, sometimes an attorney-at-law, and he is prepared to manage and organize his financial affairs in such a way that, whilst he "renders unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's", he will minimize as much as he can those things that must be rendered unto Caesar. In the Inland Revenue Department, they are therefore being confronted more and more with sophisticated tax planning, and a battery of persons knowledgeable in taxation matters.

I am not always satisfied or persuaded that this point has been fully analyzed for its implications in so far as tax administration is concerned. The Government ought to give serious consideration to looking at how the department is set up and to provide the necessary support services for that department.

In the last few years, the department has lost, some of its most experienced personnel, some of whom have been trained in detecting tax evasion, as distinct from tax avoidance. In fact, I think that, at the senior level, it has lost between five to eight people over the last 18 months to two years. It is difficult to replace people with several years' experience, and, therefore, one occasionally finds a backlog of cases which probably demand attention.

Those of us who deal on a regular basis with the Inland Revenue Department must have the greatest sympathy for the Commissioner and his very hard working staff. I sometimes wonder how they manage to organize a day in that department, because not only are they called upon to render advice to the Minister and to the governmental authorities on policy matters, to plan for double-taxation agreements, to hear objections, to pursue tax evaders and to examine the implications of tax avoidance, but they also have to do the administrative duties which confront any large Government or private sector department.

4.55 p.m.

I think that the Minister should give some consideration to looking at the staffing of that department. He should perhaps make it a department in itself, in which there is sufficient promotion that people would not look outside of the department for promotion, and, more important, reward those persons who have gained the necessary experience and, in many cases, degrees, which are necessary for proper tax administration.

Unfortunately, some specialist departments of Government, like the Income Tax Department and the Legal Department, get classified with the general Civil Service, and the amount of money paid to the people in such departments does not always reflect their value to the country as a whole. However, whenever the pressure is on to improve Government finances, invariably that pressure is reflected on the Inland Revenue Department, which must more and more tighten up its procedures and seek out those who may be avoiding the tax net.

Since I have returned to the private sector, I have been able to see quite clearly some of the snags and bottlenecks which are occurring. Sometimes it is not a question of people deliberately evading tax, it is sometimes that the department has not itself got the time to even educate the people in tax methods, something which I am sure they would like to do. I hope that in the next financial year one would see adequate provision for staff, and that some means would be found of maintaining adequate qualified staff in that department.

In terms of taxation policy, I believe the time has come when we need a total revision of the current Income Tax Act. The last revision took place, I think, in 1968 or thereabouts, when we had technical assistance from Canada, and a reasonably good job was done. Every year, certainly at Budget-time, and sometimes beyond Budget-time, amendments such as these are coming before this Honourable Chamber, and some of them are merely piecemeal. There is no complete review of overall policy on direct taxation, and sometimes there is not the simplification of the language used in tax legislation, which is necessary if taxation is certain and must be administered in a certain way.

I believe that we do have the expertise in Barbados to undergo a complete tax review and a simplification of the language used in tax legislation; some of it is in the governmental sector and quite a lot of it is in the private sector, among accountants and lawyers. I am quite sure that the private sector would be prepared to sit on a small committee to have a comprehensive review of the tax laws in Barbados, the income tax law in particular, and come up, as indeed they came up with recommendations on family law and other areas, with a Bill that would do justice to the peculiar financial and fiscal conditions existing in our own country. I would like to commend that to the Minister.

It is obvious that we have not got the time to study the area of double taxation treaties carefully. I am aware that the honourable Minister of Agriculture (Dr. R. L. Cheltenham) is heading a team composed of governmental and non-governmental persons, supported by outside technical assistance, which is looking at a review of our double taxation agreements with the United States of America. I think that, despite the expertise available to us, it is obvious that we are up against some very tough political decisions being made by the United States Government for its own internal fiscal and revenue purposes.

The fact that we may have good relations with the United States will in no way soften that country's negotiating stance when its vital interests, as seen by it, are affected to what it considers to be its own disadvantage. Likewise, we must understand quite clearly that unless we are well versed in all aspects of taxation policy, our negotiating position will not be as strong as it ought to be.

I am not satisfied that the existing taxation treaties with the United Kingdom, or indeed even with Canada, contain all of the concessions that we should look for as a developing economy, and it may well be that we will have to rely for some time on outside assistance and our own resources in order to strengthen our own negotiating position. Even within the Caribbean, our double taxation treaty arrangements are not as up-to-date and as satisfactory as they ought to be.

With the termination of the United States/Barbados double taxation agreement, we lost overnight, I would reckon, in excess of 120 to 150 international business companies. That is a serious matter. Most of them left and went to Panama or other places; but the revenue and foreign exchange we gained from them is significant to this country. I believe we have become more conscious of this.

We have to create within the department itself legal expertise at the level of that seen within the United States and other Treasuries. This may be an area in which

the OECS countries and ourselves, together with some of our other CARICOM partners, may be able to collaborate to the benefit of us all. I would strongly urge the Government to give the deepest and most urgent consideration to these aspects of our tax policy.

With respect to the specific amendments, I will be speaking on these within the Committee in so far as they raise questions of drafting and interpretation. I believe that it is the very piecemeal amendments which can create problems that may affect even the very policy considerations. For example, on the basis of the draft before me, I believe it is doubtful whether a person receiving severance in income year 1983 will not find himself being taxed, although he may be severed in income year 1980. If his case is still pending, he may conceivably find himself worse off, and being treated differently to someone whose case may have been determined before his. It does seem to me that we need some clarification in the legislation to put this matter beyond doubt, so that there could be no argument on the matter later in the law courts to the disadvantage.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: That is not the matter under discussion at this point, that is for the Committee stage.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I accept your ruling, but the point I am trying to make is on the drafting policy and the revision of the Act as a whole, so I must illustrate it by an example rather than by a specific provision of the Act.

When it comes to the question of the taxation of damages for wrongful dismissal, severance payment, or unfair dismissal, the international practice seems to point reasonably heavily to some level of taxation. I believe that my distinguished colleague from the Bar, who has just spoken, the honourable Member for Christ Church West Central (Mr. M. A. King), will concede from research that developed and developing countries have tax on what is called the "golden handshake", and there is taxation in socialist countries as well.

We may argue and disagree genuinely on the level at which the taxation should be placed, or the percentage of taxation which should be placed on those lumpsum payments. In the United Kingdom, taxation applies after £7 000. In Barbados, based on the level of the pound today, that would mean taxation after \$21 000: in some countries it is slightly higher. Recently, in the peculiar oil economy of Trinidad, and having regard to negotiations with the Toseru, the Government reversed its position and levied taxation at TT\$100 000 which is some Bds. \$72 000 dollars. I do not believe that there is one single country, other than Antigua, which has unfair dismissal or severance payment legislation and there is not some form of taxation. The reason why there is none in Antigua at

the moment is because Antigua has abolished income tax completely, but in the other countries there is some level of taxation.

Having said that, I agree with part of the argument of my colleague for Christ Church West Central. I have to say that the whole area of employment has moved from the position of contract to the position of status. It is a development that is not genuinely recognised until one day it is stark before your face.

No longer do employers in countries that are progressive have the right to terminate employment merely because they disagree with you or merely because of an isolated incident, or even more than an isolated incident, of disobedience or bad manners. More and more the right of the employee is being seen as a matter of the status and as the equity in the business, and I think Government's policy, therefore, must more and more respect and reflect this developing role which an employee has.

Sometimes this is the worker's only investment, and it is important for us to remember that. The worker may not have the capital, and even when he has the capital, he may not be allowed to invest his capital in that business. But he has invested several years in the business, and because of his investment, the business has strived. Therefore, he has an equity in the business, an equity which we must increasingly recognise; and although we have already begun to recognise that investment by way of the Redundancy Payments Act, our law is still deficient.

I am glad to see that this Bill forecasts an Unfair Dismissal Bill. Such a Bill is extremely vital. In that area, too, there is need for compensatory treatment if there is unfair dismissal. But in the United Kingdom there is a limit, as there is in severance payments, on the level of compensation payable for unfair dismissal.

I want to stress the corresponding duties which will arise. One must expect a higher level of productivity, and one must also expect a higher recognition of one's loyalty in the job. Too many people believe that they are not part and parcel of the establishment, and they ought to be.

I wish, before I conclude, to make a few suggestions to the Government, to the Minister of Finance, which I think must be borne in mind. Having brought down the policy of taxing damages for unfair dismissal, damages for wrongful dismissal, and compensation for redundancy, the Government must now look at enabling people to provide to pay those damages.

I heard the honourable Member for St. Michael West Central, the honourable Minister of Transport and

Works, (Hon. V. L. Johnson), speak of several cases where the employer was unable from his or her resources to pay compensation. That is a fact. Some are genuine cases and some are not so genuine cases.

I left the Bar to become a Minister while I was doing a case for a gentleman on the waterfront. I came back to find that the case was not concluded, so that is a delay of some six years. In the meantime, the owner of the company has emigrated to New Zealand, taken the company's books out of the hands of the liquidator, removed the money — I do not know how he got exchange authorisation — and has not paid severance. And there was no interest payable to the employee who had been severed.

5.15 p.m.

Government must amend the Severance Payments Act to make interest payable on compensation or redundancy payments if the settlement does not occur within a set period of time. I believe that this must be done to deter people from delaying the payment of compensation to workers. At the same time, Government must ensure that the worker is compensated for being without what is directly due to him for the period of time.

Under this legislation, if a worker delays to pay the amount of tax, interest is going to accrue against him at 1 per cent per month, but he has no equal right to claim from his employer who may be delaying that same 1 per cent per month. Perhaps this matter has escaped the attention of the Minister. There must be some amendment to the Severance Payments Act so that where the delay in paying the tax is due to no fault of the worker, then the worker should not have to submit the interest accrued for income tax purposes — that should be on the employer.

There are several small employers, husband and wife, for instance, who may have someone in their employment for 15, 20 or 30 years. Overnight, the husband dies. Now they may not be very rich people, they may be two people who are going out to work and who may have very little insurance — in fact, their only savings might be the very house they are living in. But the estate is being settled, and the widow is confronted with a severance payment which must be made to the employee.

The widow would want to pay, resources permitting, having had so many years of faithful service from a very kind employee. But the problem we have is that there is no proper system, no system in fact, no provision, which allows people to write off against profits or against earnings the amounts that you are providing for severance payment.

If I have machinery, I can write down my income and expenses over a period of years. I get not only

initial allowances, but I get annual allowances. I can provide against bad debts and be allowed bad debts in such instances. But I am not allowed, under the existing tax legislation, to provide for what is obviously, and can be, a real contingent liability, indeed an actual liability in due course. As a result, one has not seen here the building up of insurance policies enabling people to insure against their liabilities for compensation. No doubt this has led, in turn, to a strain on the Severance Payment Fund, because some employees cannot meet these liabilities as they accrue.

I think that the Government has to give very serious consideration to these major policy issues which arise. The fact that the Government has taxed the workers' compensation should not be seen simply as a short-term politically attractive issue. I think such matters are much more fundamental for the society as a whole, and they are matters to which the Opposition certainly, the Government, those of us in public life and both the employers' and the employees' unions must seriously address.

What looks, on the face of it, as only a measure of budgetary significance raises many more fundamental and far-ranging issues of policy for this House, and they are matters to which the Ministry of Finance and Planning and the Ministry of Labour must, of necessity, turn their urgent attention. I am sure that they will do that, and I believe that the solutions, some of which I have outlined from a cursory study of the situation, can be easily found and applied to the betterment of all persons concerned.

Mr. B. M. TAITT (St. Michael West): Mr. Deputy Speaker, my contribution to this debate will be necessarily short, because a number of points which needed to be made have been made. I wish, however, to deal first with the principle of the Bill.

I think that the honourable Member who has just sat down has tried manfully, and perhaps successfully, depending on one's point of view, to put the position of a person who does not quite agree with the proceedings which are going on, but perhaps does not disagree sufficiently to be against them. He indicated that the honourable Member for Christ Church West Central (Mr. M. A. King) would have to concede that the tendency internationally is towards taxation of the golden handshake. I think that is peculiarly true. I think, however, that that skirts the question as to how we in Barbados will arrange our affairs, notwithstanding the position that is taken in other places, and bearing in mind our peculiar circumstances in Barbados.

When the whole question of Social Security, including severance payments, became part of the Barbados scene in the orderly progress of our development in this

country, these matters were gone into in great detail. As my colleague, the first speaker on this side, the honourable Member for St. Michael North (Mr. P. M. Greaves) has said, the tripartite committee which was set up made a number of recommendations, and then the Government of the day added one or two enhancing provisions to those recommendations; and for the last 12 years or so, the policy has been that severance payment and payments received along those lines would be taxable.

We have a fundamental difference between us. It is clear that the Government, after, I hope, mature consideration, has decided that they wish to tax those benefits, or, as they seem to be saying, from what the right honourable gentleman for St. Thomas (Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. Adams) said, those payments of salary which have been received prematurely.

I think that that is a fundamental error which they are making as they approach this question, and I think I have to join with those who suggest that the error which they are making has been precipitated by certain activities concerning their acquisition of certain properties, which they had hitherto not been involved in. I believe that if that is the case, that they have been badly mistaken.

If, as could have happened to me, I had remained working at the place where I first went to work, I would have put in thirty years' service by now, and the chances are that I would be in the same category of a number of my very close friends who find themselves operating not even at middle management, but at, in fact, what is the lower end of the totem pole in the structure of that peculiarly — structured company where I used to work. The result of that is this: although those persons have worked for a long time, they have not been exposed during that thirty years to any kind of managerial or even mid-managerial activity, and therefore they retain the same skill, thirty years later, that they had acquired after the first eighteen months in that particular job.

5.25 p.m.

They are peculiarly-skilled people, who are, nonetheless, lowly-paid workers in the context of the industry they are in. It means, therefore, that severance for them is a special problem, because, unlike other workers who are severed at various levels of their development, and who might be able to switch to other fields of work, they find themselves boxed into a position, where, because of the peculiar nature of their employment, they are unable to find employment of a similar kind or of an equal kind anywhere else.

When a man goes to work, or a woman for that matter, at a relatively young age, he or she has an expectation as to where he or she is likely to be, at various stages in his or her life.

My understanding of severance payments is that they are compensation for a disruption of the normal expectation of the individual in a particular job. The abrupt cessation of their expectation is not merely the coming to an end of their job, it is not merely that they are not working any more, but there is an entire disruption of their entire life schedule.

So I am submitting that it cannot be what the right honourable Member for St. Thomas has sought to suggest, that they are being paid their wages in advance, as it were. It has to be something entirely different. It is compensation for the sociological and psychological damage which occurs when a person, at a certain point in his development, and in peculiar circumstances, finds that his life has been disrupted in a particular way, to wit, severance.

Hence, my first point is that taxation of the golden handshake must be seen in the context of the peculiar circumstances of each single country. And whereas, in the United Kingdom, to take the example used by the honourable Member, the golden handshake is accompanied by a number of other ancillary benefits, as part of the social structure of the society, we in Barbados do not have a number of those ancillary benefits in place. It is in that context that the Government, twelve years ago, decided that severance payments ought not to attract income tax.

There is something else. I believe that this amendment in its present form will lead to a form of double taxation of the individual. My understanding, from the Income Tax Act.....

(Hon. V. L. JOHNSON: You do not understand it then.)

Mr. B. M. TAITT: My understanding of the Income Tax Act.....

(Hon. V. L. JOHNSON: Your understanding is that you do not understand it.)

Mr. B. M. TAITT: My understanding of the definition in the Severance Payments Act is that, for the purposes of severance, the computation of a payment is based on the definition of salary at the basic rate. In other words, there is a term called, "basic pay", and that means, according to the law, the net rate of pay of an employee.

Now unless these words have a special meaning.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I would suggest that the honourable Member deal with those in Committee.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I am dealing with the principle. I am just trying to deal with the philosophy, the principle, of double taxation of the employee.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: In that case, I believe that what you just spoke about is not what the law says.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Well, without reference to the actual words, Sir, let me say that, given the definition in the Severance Payments Act, and the computation which is normally used when a person gets a severance, it would seem to me that when a person gets a severance now that that money is already included in his income tax. In other words, it has already been taxed.

(Hon. V. L. JOHNSON: How?)

(Mr. P. M. GREAVES: It is on your net, not gross.)

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Therefore, if now what he was to receive as part of the severance is to attract a further taxation, then it seems to me that a person may have a form of double jeopardy in the context of tax. We may disagree on the interpretation, but that is what appears to me on a first reading of these sets of legislation put together.

(Hon. V. L. JOHNSON: Read it again.)

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Even if that is not so, based on what I have said already.....

(Hon. V. L. JOHNSON: It is not.)

Mr. B. M. TAITT:..... the principle that when an individual is receiving compensation for psychological and sociological damage, he is to pay taxation on that, is alien to the fundamental and original concept of progressive taxation. The progressive taxation in income tax presupposes that he who is paying the tax is earning, literally earning, the money on which he pays the tax. Either he is working, or he has invested, or in some manner he is actively engaged in some form of economic activity which allows him to receive a benefit — and on-going benefit. That is why, generally speaking, in all countries income tax, or taxation, is attracted from profits and also from monies received from certain kinds of activity.

In this legislation, the Government has gone into a new area. They are encroaching on the area of awards made by the court.

Again, it has been traditional that awards made by the court, however calculated, would not attract tax. This will be the first time, as far as I can make out, where the courts will award what in essence are damages — because if I receive an award from the court for unfair dismissal, the award comes by way of damages and those damages,

according to this legislation, will attract income tax. Even though the method of calculating those damages does allude to the same method that is used for severance, I think, and I issue it to the Government for what it is worth, that they are entering into an area which, while it may not be dangerous now, may open the way for future Governments to see this whole area of awards by the court as a source of revenue.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The honourable Member may never have practised, but he must surely have heard of the case *Gourley v. British Transport Commission*, under which the House of Lords held that damages given in court suits, where they sound in loss of earnings, shall be reduced by the amount of taxes that the recipient would have expected to pay had he earned the money, or had he not been prevented from earning the money.

The difference is that that creates an unfair advantage on the tortfeasor, because although the tortfeasor pays the damages net of the taxes, he does not have to pay the taxes to the Government.

It is the intention of this legislation that in future, the tortfeasor will pay the whole amount, but the Government will take out its taxes.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: There are two points about that intervention. First of all, the honourable Member is dealing with two principles. That the House of Lords dealt with how awards are to be made is not to be confused with the Government's taking taxes. There is a very fine point.

If the House of Lords decree that in the award of damages certain things shall be taken into consideration, that is fully within the prerogative of the court to make that decision. The point I am arguing is that that area ought not to be seen by the Executive arm of the Government as an area for revenue.

Secondly, I will refer him to another House of Lords' case, in which the Government of Trinidad sought to take the monies of a man called Sereeram and put them into a cess.

5.35 p.m.

The House of Lords said that that is property, and that the Government cannot take money from a small sector of a community. And they said that money was property, and that under the Constitution of Trinidad there is protection from the deprivation of property without compensation, and, therefore, they could not cause the cess to be made.

We can all cite cases, but that does not prove anything

Asides

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Sir, I am not going to enter into a legal discussion with the honourable gentleman, because you would not allow it.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: And I will not allow a debate on court cases.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Precisely, Sir, and that is why I am not going to enjoin the honourable gentleman down that road; he will not divert me from the point that I am making. The Government has said that there are few persons who fall into this category. If there are very few persons who fall into this category, that is all the more reason why the Government should eschew the temptation, for whatever reasons, noble or otherwise, to bring legislation which might suggest that they are taking revenue in areas such as severance and, secondly, in areas such as court awards.

It is clear that, no matter what the debate says, the Government has fixed its eyes on taking these taxes. If a man, who is not normally operating in the high bracket of \$120 000 to \$130 000 per annum, gets, as it were, a bonanza, which he would prefer not to have, a one-time bonanza, a once-for-all bonanza, and the Government feels that they have to put that once-for-all bonanza into the same category of those who earn \$120 000 to \$130 000 every year, then, no one can tell the Government what to do. We can only suggest to the Government that a person who comes into a once-for-all bonanza ought not really to be treated in quite the same way as a person who is earning large sums of money per annum.

The two situations are different. If one takes the average individual in the company which I described earlier, who will receive \$120 000 each year, he is different from the man who will receive \$120 000 as severance. That is the last time in his life-time, barring hitting the pools or some other stroke of luck, that he will see sums of that nature; and to tax him on that specific amount at that time seems to me, to be a dangerous precedent.

I want to ask the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance if any provision is made in Barbados to do what, obviously, should be done in these circumstances, if persons are to be saved from this onerous taxation. Suppose I am to receive \$100 000, does the Government have any objections to my receiving it over a four-year period? Why can't I receive \$25 000 one year and \$25 000 in the second year, and so on up to as many years as necessary. It would seem to me that if he is going to bring in that kind of legislation, at least he could bring concomitant legislation which would allow a person to receive the money over a period. In the United States, for example, if one comes into a lump sum payment

suddenly, one is allowed to receive that lump sum over a period of time, so as to assist in preventing, and it is precisely the point that I am making, having taxation which will operate at 30 per cent between \$25 000 and \$50 000 and 50 per cent thereafter.

I believe that it is the Government's business to try to ease the burden of the individual. It is also the Government's business to collect taxes, and no one can disagree with the payment of taxes. But no one looks forward to being severed, and I believe that, in the context of this society, when persons are severed, we ought to be extending sympathy to them, rather than giving them the impression, and in fact, acting out the syndrome of putting additional burdens on them.

One has to agree that the Government has moved away from the initial concept which seemed to have been motivated by their desire to reduce the amount of severance payment the individual could get. The initial recommendation of a maximum of \$25 000, however, I believe to have been a kite, which was flown to soften the blow, for when this final legislation came to the House, so that persons can feel relieved that they will now be able to get more than \$25 000, while not recognizing that, in fact, they are going to lose, in some cases as much as \$32 000, \$38 000 or \$46 000. That is a classic situation of hitting your head against a wall because you like the way it feels when you stop.

But the Government does a lot of that, and there is nothing anybody can do about the Government in the context of legislation. The system we have ordains that we will divide, because we cannot support this, and they will vote and we will vote, and the legislation will come into place. All that will happen is that at such time as it falls to us to preside over the affairs of this country again, we will have to review the matter and make the commitment that persons who are severed will once again find themselves, not in a most favourable position, because it is not a position which anybody looks forward to, but at least we will try to restore the *status-quo*.

I think that is but all one could do after offering suggestions and views on this from this side.

We cannot support this. There is a fundamental difference in principle. Twelve years ago we instituted a concept that severance ought not to attract income tax. We still believe in that. The Government does not believe in it and therefore, we will have to disagree.

I thank you for your indulgence, Sir.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN (Christ Church East Central): Mr. Deputy Speaker there are only a few points which I would like to make in relation to this matter. I feel the points are of great relevance to the principle of taxation

of severance benefits, and of relevance, in my opinion, to the total impact of severance in Barbados.

I do not think that any of us question the principle of severance. I believe that when the Act was first introduced, it was introduced as a result of considerable consultation, and the fact that we had witnessed a number of disasters in Barbados which resulted in unemployment for a number of workers, and there was no provision to cushion the impact of the loss of earnings.

5.45 p.m.

The Severance Payment Bill not only dealt with that contingency, it also dealt with certain provisions which one would normally find in unfair dismissals legislation. So although the circumstances and the contingencies which prompted the passage of the Bill were very clear, the Bill itself attempted to deal with a very large number of situations.

From the very inception of the Bill, it was recognised that some provision had to be made to provide for the reduction in the cost on employers and on the cost of operation of businesses in Barbados, and therefore provision was made for a severance fund to come into operation. The principle of an indemnity was therefore brought into play. Regrettably, as a result of collusion between employers and employees in Barbados — a few outstanding examples were certain family companies — the principle of the indemnity was broken at an early stage, and the fund which was set up was in danger of bankruptcy, or inability to satisfy the claims on it, from as early a date as 1973.

I am sorry that the honourable Member for St. Michael North (Mr. P. M. Greaves) is not in his place, for it was during his tenure of office as Minister of Labour that the National Insurance Board, in 1975, commenced a review of the Severance Payments Act, and its impact on the Severance Payment Fund. Indeed, in 1975 the National Insurance Board sought the views of employers, of workers' organisations, as to what changes they considered desirable. It was pointed out that Parliament had to be brought into the act in 1975, and a sum of \$750 000 was appropriated from the General Exchequer Fund, the Consolidated Fund, to go into the Severance Fund, because the severance fund was not able to satisfy the liabilities or claims being made on it.

A number of points were very clearly made. One was that four weeks per year, with a maximum of 33 years' service being taken into account, made Barbados one of the countries with the most generous severance payments funds in the whole world. Secondly, while an employer paid contributions to the fund on maximum insurable earnings of \$100 per week, the liability of the employer to the fund and the liability of the fund exceeded that; that is, the person being severed earned more

than the \$100 per week. So the principle of insurance and the principle of indemnity was, from the very beginning, bound to get into trouble, because of the fact that the basis for the contribution was different from the basis of the payment of severance.

By January, 1976, before this Government came into power, in order to stem the tide of the potential bankruptcy, the rates of contribution were increased, and it was thought then that, with the increase in the rates of contribution weekly, the fund would be able to provide the claims that would arise. Indeed, the view was expressed that the revised rates would be adequate to enable the Severance Fund to achieve solvency and to accumulate a reasonable reserve, equivalent to about two years' payment, in about five years.

But 1975, and I am sorry again that the honourable Member for St. Michael West is not in his place, and the early part of 1976 were the periods of record unemployment in Barbados, and the claims on the fund were so great that, notwithstanding the increase in the contributions, and the loan of \$750 000, the fund still faced immediate bankruptcy. We had reached the stage where the Ministry and the Board were in a very serious dilemma and something had to be done.

By the time we assumed office and this was brought to our attention, a committee was appointed; and the committee reported. The reason why you have to deal with these matters in this way is that it must be recognised that there are a multiplicity of interests which have to be taken into account when one is amending the Severance Payments Act, or when one is introducing a principle of taxation on severance.

If employers are allowed a deduction of the amount of severance that they pay as a business expense, the question will arise as to whether or not the ultimate beneficiary of that deduction will also be eligible for tax. It is a fundamental principle of income taxation that where you have a deduction by way of a business expense, the reason for allowing it as a business expense is because the recipient is chargeable to tax on the receipts in his hand. That is why you allow medical expenses as deductions. The only thing is that there are usually far more medical expense deductions than are returned in income by the recipients, in the form of the people who put in their returns.

This question of allowing the deduction as an expense, and the issue of taxation on it, should be looked at in the light of the general principles relating to income tax, and the general principles relating to a deduction and a corresponding charge.

5.55 p.m.

I cannot, for the life of me, faced with these facts, appreciate the arguments on the other side, which claim

that is wrong in principle to tax payments of this kind, and that we are not acting in any reasonable manner. Our point has been confirmed by the fact that the honourable Member for Christ Church West Central (Mr. M. A. King) has been able, quite clearly, to point out that throughout the world where there are similar provisions in the laws relating to taxation, the general preponderance of opinion today is that it is just and equitable for severance to be taxed.

I also want to draw another matter to the attention of honourable Members. Let us not forget that, to the extent that any business, large or small, is not allowed to receive a refund from the Severance Payment Fund, that that is an expense of the business, which must be passed on to the consumers of the product, or to the services that that company provides. That is one of the problems we have in Barbados.

From the point of view of the Ministry of Trade and Industry, many people constantly draw to our attention that the true impact of the cost of severance payments is not the amount that the businesses have to pay out when they have to pay it out, less the refund, but also that they have to make provision for the excess that they do not get back. That is a very important point. They tell you that in fact when you are calculating your cost of labour in Barbados, you have to calculate the normal 52 weeks, if they are working on a 52-week basis and you also have to calculate that, it is an additional month per year after two years which you have to add on to the cost. And that is a contingent liability for 33 years if your firm is in existence for that particular period of time.

Many people are trying to fund it. We have had examples shown to us of companies which have made provision and have had to put aside, early, an additional sum above the National Insurance contribution. I hope that now that we have some measure of taxation, consideration would be given to allowing that additional amount which has to be put aside to cover that proportion of the amount which you would have to pay as severance, and which you did not receive from the National Insurance, to be deducted from your income tax.

When we bear those matters in mind, we must also bear in mind that because of this complete break with the tradition in Barbados, the Government, in an attempt to provide a measure of equity, has done an examination of the likely impact of this legislation.

I have heard no reply at all from the other side to the points made by the honourable Member for St. Michael West Central (Hon. V. L. Johnson). He has pointed out quite clearly that an examination will show that over 80 per cent of the recipients of severance pay

would not achieve the level of payment which is greater than the minimum eligibility for the tax. So do not give the public the impression that the Government is taxing the severance payment of the general mass of people who are likely to be redundant. That would be a false impression.

It may be your business to give that impression to the public, but it is our business to point out that, once again, we have been able to demonstrate that the burden of your arguments relate to the magnification of a problem, when, in truth and in fact, you are only distorting in order to gain some measure of political mileage. You can only do that if you have people on this side who are not able to respond.

It is clear that there are also other provisions in the law which would further mitigate any problems. Honourable Members have mentioned them, so I do not want to go over that. The likely impact of this on individuals, therefore, will be nothing as great as what the honourable Members on the other side have been trying to portray in here today.

The last point I want to make is that none of us in here can run away from the problem that, as far as the cost of things in Barbados is concerned, we are not in a position today, if we are to be competitive with other countries in the world, to ignore the general trend in other parts of the world. We cannot say, "do not mind what is going on in the rest of the world, we in Barbados are different." We would be able to do that if we were not dependent on our ability to export to live and to earn foreign exchange.

Whatever the impact in Barbados on our ability to compete abroad, whether we like it or not, we have to have a rigorous examination of our position. Whatever our private views are, whatever our sentiments are, reality dictates and demands that, like the steel industry, the coal industry, the motor car industry and other industries in the developed world, we have to take competition into account. That is one of the reasons we have to do more in this direction.

We have to look at all of these matters, I feel that the Government is facing up to reality when we look at these matters, and when we try to introduce matters which are in consonance with trends in other parts of the world. But, at the same time, because of our special circumstances, we have put in the legislation built-in provisions to mitigate the full impact.

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

On the motion of Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, seconded by Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE, Mr. DEPUTY

SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. J. G. ODLE in the Chair.

COMMITTEE

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The House is in Committee.
6.05 p.m.

Clause 1 was called and passed.

Clause 2 was called.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I beg to move that Clause 2 stand part.

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

Mr. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, I listened carefully to the honourable Members on the other side, and it seems to me, from all that has been said by the honourable Members on the front bench, that it is not the intention of the Government to impose the taxation on severance payments below \$25 000.

If that is the case, then Clause 2 (b) will certainly not have that effect, because Clause 2 amends Section 8 of the Income Tax Act. Section 8 of the Income Tax Act states

"Without restricting the generality of Division C in calculating the assessable income of a person for an income year, the following amounts shall be included, namely (a)" and now (b).

This now becomes (b), so all the amounts payable as severance under this must be taken into account in arriving at the assessable income of a person who has received severance payments during any income year.

If that is not the intention of the Government, then I am suggesting that the honourable Prime Minister, who moved the second reading of this Bill, should have a look at this a second time. If, of course, it is the intention that the severance payments should be taxable, then it actually sets out the position. If it is the intention that it should not be taxable, I think that this should be reviewed.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I should really say nothing about this. I should let the Dems walk about the country — do not stop at Half Moon Fort, go where the rich people who will get severance and big sums live — and tell everybody that all severance is going to be taxed. You do it. I say no more than that.

If you think that that is what is going to be done, you do it. Tell everybody that all severance is going to be taxed; then, the honourable Member who has just sat down will prove himself as great a promoter of false-

hoods as the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central (Dr. R. C. Haynes).

Clause 2 of the Income Tax Act defines income. Clause 48(b) of the Income Tax Act will define how a particular form of income is going to be taxed. Clause 48(b) says that the payments referred to in Clause 2(b) of the Act will say, when we pass this, "part of the tax at a particular rate". I say no more.

I know that the specific has to exclude the general. The honourable Member is a lawyer, and knows that, too. When you sit down at caucuses, do not be carried away by the foolishness of the honourable Member for St. Michael West (Mr. B. M. Taitt) and the non-legal knowledge of the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central.

There is a specific rate of taxation assigned in the form of income that the proposed Clause 2(b) will contain. That is all there is to it. If it was anybody else but the honourable Member, I really would tell him well perhaps it is the case and let him tell the general public that.

If the Government says that you tax severance above \$25 000, commonsense must tell you that you do not include what is below \$25 000 in income. Otherwise, on what is above \$50 000 you would have to pay more than what you receive in tax, because you would have to pay half of the severance tax and 60 per cent in income tax. Therefore, if you get severance of above \$50 000, you would have to find money to pay the Government over and above the severance.

Do you really believe that that is what we are passing here today, or could anybody honestly believe that?

The question that Clause 2 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clauses 3 to 17 inclusive were called and passed.

On the motion of Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS seconded by Hon. L. S. CRAIG, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.
6.15 p.m.

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

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: This brings us to the end of Government Business for this evening.

I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended until Friday, March 2, 1984 at 10.00 o'clock in the morning.

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER suspended the sitting accordingly.
6.18 p.m.

ON RESUMPTION

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: This sitting is now resumed.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, before we commence the business that is on the Order Paper, I wish to draw attention to the fact that the Betting and Gaming Duties, Order, 1984, was inadvertently placed on the supplementary Notice Paper. At this point I would like to have it withdrawn.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable Member is seeking leave to withdraw the Betting and Gaming Duties, Order, 1984. If there are no objections, leave is therefore granted.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: A number of items listed, items 1, 5 and 8, on the supplementary Order Paper were circulated to Members last Tuesday, and items 6 to 7 were circulated yesterday.

The Bill to amend the Health Services Act was also passed in the Senate on Wednesday. Copies of the printed Bill have been circulated to members of the House and Senate.

I have other matters here of which to give notice, and I now seek leave of the House to proceed.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: If there are no objections, leave is therefore granted.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to give notice of the following:

A Bill to amend the Health Services Act, Cap. 44.

A Resolution to grant the sum of \$75 000 from the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1983-84, Part I - Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1983-84, No. 28 which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

A Resolution to amend Resolution No. 48/1983.

A Bill to authorise the Government to borrow from the Government of Canada a sum not exceeding CDN. \$6 000 000 and to provide for related matters.

FIRST READING OF BILLS

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, I beg to move that the Bill to amend the Health Services Act, Cap. 44 be now read a first time.

Hon. Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM: I beg to second that.

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

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, I propose to do the Bill to amend the Health Services Act in all of its stages today. It has been appropriately circulated. I beg to move that the Bill to amend the Health Services Act be the instant Order of the day.

HEALTH SERVICES (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1984

Order No. 9 was called - To move the Second Reading of a Bill to amend the Health Services (Amendment) Act, Cap. 44.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS (St. Thomas): Mr. Deputy Speaker, it falls to me to take charge of this Bill, since the Minister of Health is a member of the Other Place. This Bill is a very short and simple Bill in its purpose; it can be stated briefly or at length. I am not pretending, on this occasion, that I am going to deal with it briefly. I fully intend to speak on second reading of this Bill to address the controversies which have been generated, artificial, hypocritical, and otherwise, during the last six months in this country. I intend to address the attitudes of the University of the West Indies, the Barbados Association of Medical Practitioners and the Democratic Labour Party.

First, to state the obvious and ostensible purpose of the Bill, this relates to the teaching of anatomy in Barbados. The immediate function of the amendment is to allow regulations to be made that will provide for the regulation of anatomy teaching in so far as it relates to the dissection of cadavers or human bodies by pre-medical and medical students in their first two years of study in Barbados.

I want to clear the air on the entire question of cadavers at the start of my speech. There is nothing illegal in Barbados at the present time in the dissection of dead bodies for the purpose of teaching medicine. Contrary to whatever uninformed persons in the press,

the Ministry of Health, or in the Attorney General's Department may have suggested, advised, or thought, it was always legal to teach anatomy as it has been taught, not for hundreds but for thousands of years, by the dissection of human remains. You cannot train a man to be a surgeon unless he knows what he is going to find when he cuts and opens up a living body; and you cannot experiment on living bodies, certainly not in decent societies, and, therefore, surgery has always been taught by the dissection of dead bodies.

I am no medical historian, nor, I concede, is anybody in the House, but a few of us have been exposed to a little knowledge of the history of medicine and surgery. I believe that it was the brain where human beings first attempted the art of surgery, and perhaps we are going back thousands of years to Egypt and, certainly, to Greece. As I conceive it, there would have had to be knowledge that hard blows to the brain can cause bleeding in the brain, leading to symptoms of paralysis, and that the first trepanners opened the heads of dead bodies in order to determine the bone structure and the other structure that lay within. From those early beginnings, surgery has developed.

The interest of Europeans in the Renaissance time in the practice and art of surgery is well exemplified by the many Flemish and Spanish paintings which you see in the great museums of Europe on the theme of "an anatomy school." Indeed, artists were taught by the examination of bodies. Men learning to become artists used to go to the anatomy schools to see muscle structure and the interior parts of a human being so as to teach them how to paint the whole exterior.

Those familiar with the Flemish artist of the Sixteenth Century would surely be familiar with Rembrandt's paintings of the anatomy schools, and the paintings of others, who showed the surgeons of those days, dressed somewhat unusually by our standards, dissecting human bodies in order to teach medical students what to do.

The first Anatomy Act, so far as I know, which entered the common law, was passed in Britain after the scandals in Edinburgh of Messrs. Burke and Hare, who used to supply cadavers to the medical school at Edinburgh which has trained so many of our doctors, and it turned out that they were, in fact, obtaining the cadavers while they were still alive, although they were delivering them in a state of death. An Anatomy Act was passed to allow the authorities to trace the origin of dead bodies, to ensure that the valuable trade in dead bodies for anatomy purposes was not being fostered by the traders producing the articles of merchandise, to put it crudely, themselves.

10.15 a.m.

From that original Anatomy Act there is a strand in the common law world, which to all intents and purposes,

is the English-speaking world, of regulations dealing with dead bodies. As it became understood that certain diseases could be passed on by cadavers — in their phrase, that the corruption of the body might remain and affect those dealing with the bodies — the regulations went in the direction not only of ensuring the prominence of the cadavers, but of ensuring their cleanliness and freedom from infection.

Barbados has no such Act, because medical students of the University of the West Indies, who are given their finishing touches in Barbados, have already learned their anatomy in Jamaica. But it should perhaps be made clear to the general public that every doctor who practices in Barbados at some time or another has had to practise on a cadaver. I say it should be made clear, but I have the feeling that the common sense of the general public in Barbados is such as to transcend even the foolishness published in otherwise trustworthy newspapers, and to see through the smoke screen of political nonsense put out by the Democratic Labour Party, and that every man, woman and child in the street in Barbados understands that in order to teach medicine, to teach the art of healing the living, you have to start with the art of understanding what is within the body by dissecting the body and examining it.

The Ministry of Health and its officials has to carry some of the blame for the state of affairs, the state of confusion, the state of propaganda, which we have found over the last few months. There are saboteurs in that Ministry seeking to undermine the Minister and undermine the Government, not necessarily for political reasons, but for reasons connected with opinions which they hold, and with which the Government disagrees. These saboteurs have undoubtedly paid insufficient attention to their duty to carry out Government policy and have allowed themselves to be diverted by nonsense into publication, into the expression of opinion, I believe into the leaking of facts, and certainly into the leaking of non-facts, to the Press.

I do not believe they have had much contact with the Opposition. The Opposition has produced its ignorance and its propaganda entirely from within its own ranks.

There was never any legal objection to the cadavers being dissected in Barbados. The health regulations, it is true, do not advert specifically to the question of cadavers intended for anatomy; they advert implicitly to cadavers intended to be buried as corpses in Barbados. This, perhaps, is the explanation of the difficulties which were encountered in the importation of the cadavers into Barbados in the first instance.

The conditions that one would expect when a corpse is sought to be used for the purpose of dissection

is that it should present no danger to public health, that the dissection should be carried on under proper supervision, and that, at the end of the dissection, the remains be given proper disposal, either Christian or other burial, or cremation.

The Government is satisfied that the St. George's Medical School, which was importing the cadavers, has obtained them from a proper source in the United States, that they have been treated in accordance with perhaps the most stringent health regulations in the world before being shipped to Barbados, that they are free from disease, that they are in a state of preservation, virtual mummification, which assures against their future decomposition.

The Government is also assured that the supervision of the anatomy classes is adequate. At one stage we believed it was carried on in a room that was rather too small, but that has now been corrected. The Government is also assured of the proper disposal of the bodies.

We are accordingly satisfied, after the proper inspection has been made, that the anatomy classes are being carried out in accordance with the best teaching procedures, and that the cadavers themselves are not only adequate, but are in the best condition that cadavers could be for the purpose for which they are needed.

We wish, however, to reassure the public and protect any medical school in Barbados, be it St. George's Medical School of Grenada, be it St. George's Medical School of Barbados, be it the University of the West Indies, by passing health regulations which will set out line by line what is expected. This amendment to the Act will give the power to the Minister to offer such protection.

I would not be making this speech at all, I venture to suggest, were it not that the St. George's Medical School and the St. George's University of Grenada has made application to the Government to set up a medical school in Barbados, a temporary facility in the first place, and then a permanent facility. I therefore want to deal with the history of the St. George's Medical School and its relationship to Barbados. (I, myself, am speaking from files, and from a few contacts with American diplomatic personnel who have been concerned with this matter).

The St. George's Medical School was set up some years ago, I believe in 1976 or 1977, in Grenada for the purpose of training principally Americans, principally to work in the United States. I will deal with the rationale and the justification for the school, in so far as it concerns us, in a moment or two, but I want to deal particularly with that institution.

I do not personally know anybody connected with the St. George's Medical School. I have never, so far as

I know, met Mr. or Dr. Bourne Senior or Junior. I have never met any of the officials.

10.25 a.m.

My contact with the St. George's Medical School has been entirely through diplomatic agents of the United States Government, ranging from the rank of Ambassador downwards. I make this point not because I want to put any particular distance between myself and the officials of the school, but because I want to deal, first of all, with the issue that, somehow, offshore Medical schools are shady and do not enjoy the support of the American Government, indeed perhaps attract hostility, and, somehow, are businesses which have to be conducted underground, underwater, or as the case may be.

From the word "go", when the St. George's Medical School in Grenada began to have difficulties, not with the Government on any ideological grounds, but because its main campus was directly in the path of the new runway at Point Salines, American diplomats, apparently at the request of the authorities of the school, have been feeling out ground for a relocation of the school.

The school obviously will have to be relocated, since the runway is, right now, up to its wall and is intended to go through the main campus. If you go down to Point Salines, you will see the students jogging on the runway up to the school, and walking on all the roads around the runway, right up to where the terminal building and the school is.

When we were first approached about the matter, we said that we did not wish to appear, even then, to be taking away a facility from Grenada. But we also made enquiries from the American diplomatic agents as to the standing of the school with the American Government, and I can give the House the assurance that American diplomatic agents have always made it clear that they understand the need for offshore medical schools to provide teaching facilities to those American students who cannot get into medical schools in the United States.

There was an article in *Time Magazine*, five or six years ago, which outlined the problem. I think it coincided with the opening of the medical schools in the Caribbean. It spoke of the need for Americans to go all over the world to be trained to be doctors because of the restrictive attitude of the American Medical Association towards training. It spoke of medical schools in Israel, Romania, Edinburgh and Guadalajara, in Mexico, and it spoke of the Caribbean Schools. They gave a list of, I think, some sixteen or seventeen schools in an indepth article. They analysed the performance of the students, and indicated that the students who had been trained in the overseas schools, came back to be just as good doctors as those who were trained in the United States. That was the summary of the article. It was,

I think it is fair to say, critical of the attitude of the American Medical Association.

This shortage of medical training facilities in the United States is not new. At the time of the *Time* article, the statistics then were — I do not know what there are now — that there were more doctors per capita in the United States in 1900 than there were in 1975, and that this was regarded by the AMA as an achievement in maintaining medical income, that the same amount of money had to be concentrated on a smaller number of doctors.

I have a great friend, who is a general practitioner in a prosperous Connecticut town, New London. He is, in fact, a little more than a doctor. His wife was a Professor at the University of Connecticut in a scientific field, he is connected with many teaching institutions, and is indeed a prominent member, I believe in Connecticut, of the American Medical Association. He was in Barbados recently, he had dinner with me, and I asked him what he thought about the medical schools.

He said that he well recognized the need for offshore medical schools, and he let drop a phrase which, I think, is as good an illustration, if any, of how difficult it is to become a doctor in the United States. He said that after he left Yale, he could not get into a medical school, so he went to MIT and did a Masters degree and it was only then that he could get into a medical school.

It is well accepted that the Massachusetts Institute of Technology has the highest academic standards for entrance not only in the United States, but perhaps in the world, and Yale, Harvard and Princeton have the next highest. And he was able to obtain admission to Yale and MIT, but could not get into a medical school.

Under these conditions, demand in the United States has elicited supply, and the training of Americans in medical disciplines overseas has accordingly risen.

There have been other factors in recent years which have exacerbated this demand. We have had the benefit of an article in the *Advocate News* this morning about the costs of Social Security and medical care. The article, about medical training, has pointed out that the cost of medical care in developed countries has risen, I think, from 2 per cent to 10 per cent of the GDP over a comparatively short time span such as 20 years.

These files, which at long last we have been able to get out of the hands of the registry of the Ministry of Health files marked "Closed", although they have my minutes and the minutes of the Ministry of the honourable Deputy Prime Minister in them, and which were not made available to the Minister when he was first considering

this matter, are full of reports that point out that new trends in medical specialization are threatening the entire structure of general practice in the United States. Doctors want to be specialists, they train in specialties, and the general practitioner service has therefore been deprived of the recruitment opportunities which it deserves.

There is also evidence that, increasingly, doctors are recruited in hospital administration, they are recruited into management positions in the hospitals. They find this more profitable than general practice, and they therefore abandon general practice, which is not, as yet, I am sure, in any particular parlous way in the United States, but it is not as attractive to American doctors as it was in the past.

The doctors trained in the United States then have first choice of continuing training, specialist training, being given perhaps in the same medical schools, hospitals, colleges, in which they got their primary training. So it is the overseas-trained doctors who appear to fill the gaps in general practice, so the reports on the file suggest.
10.35 a.m.

We have gone to a great deal of trouble to satisfy ourselves as to the *bona fides* of the concept of offshore medical schools *vis-a-vis* the American Government. We have spoken not only to the diplomatic agents of the United States, but to political figures. We have gained the impression, from speaking to political figures particularly from Eastern States, that it is only the lobby of the AMA which makes difficulties for the expansion of medical training in the United States, but that political figures well realise and recognise that some inflow of foreign doctors continues to be necessary.

These doctors, who come from the East, go to America with the qualifications of their own countries to be interns in the great hospitals of New York, Boston, Philadelphia, Chicago, the hospitals in the city areas where general practice is even less attractive than in the small towns and the affluent suburbs of the United States. Many of them never pass the American examination for foreign-qualified doctors, but stay for many years as interns practising within the hospital environment for a salary. Many Americans, however, come from the overseas medical schools with overseas qualifications, they take the examination and they pass it, do their internship and pass into the general stream.

The first point in the chain of logic with which I wish to expose the hypocrisy of the Democratic Labour Party is this. An American can go to the St. George's Medical School in Grenada, he then goes back to New York, he passes the five initial examinations necessary for foreign qualified doctors and enters upon internship in New York, he spends two years and he gets a licence from the New York State Medical Board to practise.

In Barbados, it is virtually perfunctory for one licensed under the New York State Medical Board to be admitted to local practice. Dr. Erskine Simmons can tell you that because he has, so far as I know, no greater qualifications; no other qualifications. I am not in any way detracting from his qualifications. I have made a speech in here which said how absurd it was for Barbadians to have the rule that no doctor from any Commonwealth country to practise in Barbados, for in the United States only United States doctors can practise. I made that speech in connection with a regulation to allow doctors trained in California to register here. I have nothing against the New York qualifications.

If this doctor, whose university and qualification is similar to St. George's, can find himself practising in Barbados, where does the argument of the Barbados Association of Medical Practitioners, the argument of the University of the West Indies and the implicit argument, because they have not said so outright, of the Democratic Labour Party stand? There is a Barbadian boy who was living on a yacht in Grenada while it was cool, who, I understand, is one of the students who is coming to Barbados, who intends to go to New York when he has completed his studies here, get a New York qualification and come back to Barbados to practise.

There is nothing that those people over there can say that will ever persuade me that that boy is not to be allowed to practise here, but the effect of what we read in the Press from the honourable Member for St. Michael West (Mr. B. M. Taitt) is that a Barbadian who has to go that long route to get back here to practise as a doctor, is not to be allowed to practise. I say to the honourable Member for St. Michael West: Let the doctors promote and implement their own restrictive practices. Do not lend yourself to them; they do not like you. They are using you as a foolish tool. If the doctors wish to restrict the number of doctors who are going to practise in this country, if they wish to stop the young men who have gone to the medical school in Grenada, who after eight, nine or ten years — they would not be here in a hurry — after much hard labour, obtain an American qualification, let them restrict, but do not, as a politician, lend yourself to them. That is the logic. If somebody can go to the medical school in Grenada, go to the United States, get a qualification and come back, why should we stop him from doing it in Barbados?

I have touched on the history of the medical school in Grenada. I will just bring it up-to-date. After what the Leader of the Opposition call the "gun slinging", and what the other members of his party shared in calling "the rescue operation", the activities of the medical school in Grenada were disrupted. The campus was on Grand Anse beach, the scene of the battle field — armoured cars, A-130 gun ships, marines on the beach, marines in the sea drowning, people being killed with

shells and the like, obviously, medicine could not be taught.

They asked if they could teach classes in Barbados. I was the Minister of Health, not even acting at the time, but whether I was at the time or not, I take full responsibility for it. I am neither a liar nor a coward. I do not tell lies about what happened in Cabinet, nor do I run away from a fight about something on which I feel strongly.

Asides.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have heard something that really delights my heart. I honestly — I am not going to say challenge, I would enjoy myself so much — I really want the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central (Dr. R. C. Haynes) to suggest any improper inducement was held out to me. I know the others will be glad to hear for themselves, but I want him to say that any inducement was held out, as he said like a damned, nasty coward from his seat in the House, the little, low-down guttersnipe.

Get on a political platform.....

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: On a point of order, Sir, ...

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: With all due respect, those words are very much unparliamentary. I can understand the honourable Member's feelings.....

Asides.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Will the honourable Leader of the House please keep quiet.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: If someone is a stinking, nasty-mouthed, disgusting coward, what words can I find to call him?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Will the honourable Member please restrain himself? I would like this debate to be conducted in an orderly manner, and I am going to say that if Members on either side encourage statements to be thrown across the floor, believe you me. I am going to allow people to reply to those statements.

I warn all honourable Members of the Chamber that if they do not behave themselves in an orderly manner, they might not like my behaviour today.

Please continue.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I would like to withdraw the words, but, Sir, I must ask for some protection. We have some heckling in here.

10.45 a.m.

The honourable Member for St. Michael South Central made a theatrical entrance into the House, and ostentatiously went into the back row to confer with the ostensible shadow spokesman on Health, who will really be getting into deep waters if he tries to reply after I have spoken. Sorry, I am not denying his ability; I do not mean that. I mean if he speaks first on behalf of the Opposition, he is going to be pushed by his colleagues to say things that he knows are not true and cannot be justified. That is all I mean by "deep waters"; I am not laughing at him. But after the honourable Member for St. Michael South conferred, he then came into the front row.

When I said that I do not know any of the proprietors of the medical school, indicating that I was saying this not to distance myself from them but to explain the support of the American Government for the matter, he was quite clearly heard to say: "You lie." I passed it by. Now, from his seat, he made the remark about the payment of US \$300 000.

Those remarks fall into the currency of the Press and of the gallery. He will never, under any circumstances, repeat that on a platform. Do not worry with the challenges. That is the kind of nastiness that you do in order to circulate a rumour when you have a nasty heart and a nasty spirit, when you are as rotten and stinking inside as the words that come out of your mouth. He would never repeat that on a platform. His object is for people in the gallery to hear.

It is no use challenging him. If you challenge the Leader of the Opposition, the Leader of the Opposition will get on a platform and say something, and he has been clever enough, always, to be able to repeat something without actually repeating the defamation. Always!

But the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central is so nasty in what he says that there is no way he can talk around it. He just takes the coward's way out, of sitting in a seat and making a remark for people nearby to hear, not understanding the contempt that most of the people nearby will feel in their hearts towards him when he does this.

Inevitably, the debate is going to decline if we have these mock theatricals, because, closely allied to the honourable Member's nastiness, is his intense sense of the dramatic. They say that lawyers are actors monkeying. The honourable Member for St. Michael South Central is an actor monkey, because he acts from the moment he gets up in the morning until the moment he goes to sleep at night, and, certainly, he acts in here.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Let us get back now to the matter before the House.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Although I withdraw the words; "nasty, cowardly, slimy, rotten, stinking"

and so on, unless, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the debate is conducted with as many blows as can be given, but on a level of fundamental decency of approach, obviously the House will have disorder today.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Would you wait a minute, please. Let us look at Standing Order 33(1) and (6) 33(1) says quite clearly:

"A Member whilst present in the House during a debate — must at all times conduct himself with dignity and decorum;"

and 33(6) says:

"must maintain silence except when called to speak by the Chair."

I intend to apply both subsections of this Standing Order today so that this debate would be conducted in a manner which is befitting this Honourable Chamber.

Please continue.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Yes, Sir.

The medical school was allowed to establish a temporary facility in Barbados. I have the assurance of persons in authority at BAMP level, and, indeed, at university level, that in fact there is no objection to the teaching of medicine at the pre-clinical stage within the parameters so far set out.

I think that although it may not be uncontroversial *vis-a-vis* the Opposition, it is uncontroversial *vis-a-vis* the profession, and *vis-a-vis* the university itself, that the establishment of classes to teach anatomy, to teach pre-clinical work to medical students, is not offensive to the pre-eminence of the UWI as a teaching institution, nor to the sentiments of the Barbados Association of Medical Practitioners, as practitioners within the system.

BAMP has done so many remarkable things that, no doubt, any statement you make about them will illicit a contradiction. If you say they are good doctors, good, decent and sincere people, they will call on you for an apology. You should have said they are excellent doctors, saints and people whose sincerity and good faith is beyond question by any politician. And even if you say that, no doubt they will demand to be addressed as angels of mercy.

But that is my understanding after discussion. The essence of the objection is any further development of the school.

I am going to say right away that this Government has never opposed the establishment of offshore medical schools in Barbados. A decision was taken at Cabinet, it has already been set out to the public, on August 4, 1977, and the opening words are:

"The Cabinet concluded that in principle there should be no objection to applications made under the International Business Company's legislation for the establishment of a private medical university or any other technical institution in Barbados to train students for export to the United States....." and it went on;

"The Cabinet further concluded that a committee should be set up to examine in detail the terms and conditions under which a private medical school or other similar technical institution could be established and operated in Barbados."

That is this Government.

There were people in the Ministry of Health, perhaps going to the very top at that time, who did not agree. Nonetheless, Cabinet decision is collective decision.

There has been some comment about the position of the Democratic Labour Party in this matter. I am going to deal with that.

I believe that some members of the Press got hold of some of the material contained in the formerly secluded files. Some of it has been published in a long study in the *Sunday Sun*. I believe that officials of the Ministry of Health quite freely spoke, I believe to Mr. Harding of the *Nation* — I do not know to who else — and I do know that the Leader of the Opposition recited some of the matters on the occasion of a debate in that Chamber.

The *Nation* newspaper, in one of the most remarkably hypocritical editorials I have ever seen in any newspaper, having published in the *Sun* extracts from Government documents to which they had been given access, then criticized the Government for giving access to those documents. That is what we have to contend with in this country, I hear *sotto voce* from the Deputy Prime Minister. That editorial said that we did not follow the DLP in buying North Point — there are a number of infelicities — so why should we claim to follow them with the medical school?

The writer of that editorial betrayed not only his hypocrisy, but his ignorance. Because the whole point of the matter is that we are not following the Democratic Labour Party in this, or claiming the aura of the Democratic Labour Party in setting up a medical school — we are seeking to expose its inconsistency in now opposing it.

10.55 a.m.

We are nothing to do with whether they want it or not. If we want it, we will have it, whether they opposed it or not. They oppose it now, we want it and we will have it.

The point is this. Dr. Caddle, in consultation with the Leader of the Opposition, who was then the Prime Minister, conducted negotiations with a medical school over a long period of time. He went to the Bank of America with officials of that medical school to discuss its financing. They asked him for an assurance that the Government would support the school. He told them that he would have to consult with the then Prime Minister. I do not know whether he consulted him or not. I do not know.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, Sir. The honourable Member said earlier "Dr. Caddle, in consultations with me," and mentioned officials of the proposed medical school and the bank. I had no such consultations with Dr. Caddle.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: That is not a point of order.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: He then said that he did not know whether I had consultations or not.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: In due course you will be able to make your contribution to this debate. As I have said already, I will apply the rules strictly. You will then be able to give your side of the story on anything that has been said on this side.

Do continue.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I know that there were obviously consultations, because the Cabinet's Minutes revealed something. I am being distracted but I will just give you the logic of the situation.

We are speaking of two different periods. There had to be consultations, because in April, 1976, or the beginning of May, the then Prime Minister produced in Cabinet the proposal of the medical school of which Dr. Caddle had spoken earlier. In my opinion, that could not have happened without those proposals being handed to the then Prime Minister, either by Dr. Caddle or the school.

That is 1976, but I am talking about 1975, in June, when Dr. Caddle was being given the go ahead. Having told the proposers that he would have to consult with the then Prime Minister after a few days on July 2, 1975, the proposer got a letter, which I will make a document of the House, and which I will read:

12K7 Vol. 1

2nd July, 1975.

Mr. Frederick T. Pishotta,
Project Director,
International Medical Foundation,
Lock Box 2479,
Chicago, Illinois 60690.
United States of America.

Dear Sir,

I am directed by the Minister to refer to his recent discussions with you and Mr. G. P. Amos, on proposals for the establishment of a private financed College of Medical Arts in Barbados, with particular reference to the preliminary report on the feasibility of establishing such an institute, which was delivered to the Minister on 27th June, 1975.

2. I am to state that the Government agrees in principle with the proposals under reference and will offer all possible co-operation to your organisation in pursuance of further investigations into the feasibility of this project.

3. We look forward to hearing further from you on this matter at the earliest opportunity.

Yours faithfully,

A. S. HOWELL
Permanent Secretary

I had better just give a little of the immediate history of that matter. If you want the connection with Dr. Caddle, consider this. Mr. Pishotta wrote to Dr. Caddle on May 21, 1975. Mr. Daniel wrote in reply — he said that he was directed by the acting Minister, Mrs. Eastmond, to reply — on 29th May, 1975. Dr. Caddle wrote personally to Mr. Pishotta on June 2, 1975. Mr. Pishotta wrote back personally to Dr. Caddle on June 10, 1975 — he thanked him for arranging the meetings with the directors of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. (This is the party which says that you must not use the QEH. This is the party which says you must not use the facilities there, and he carried the medical people to the QEH!) A meeting was held, at which the Minister expressed his keen interest in the idea and arranged meetings with the Minister of Education, with Dr. Ramsay, and took them to the QEH, to the St. Joseph Hospital, St. Michael District Hospital, three health centres, and some centre in St. John. (Whose constituency is St. John?) They then submitted a preliminary report indicating that they had to go back to the United States on a particular date, and they wrote a letter just before they went back saying, "time is important, however." So IMF — not the Inter-

national Monetary Fund, the International Medical Foundation — is prepared to begin mobilising its resources towards the implementation of this plan upon the receipt of a letter from the Government of Barbados setting its agreement in principle to this endeavour. That is the letter I just read.

I am informed by persons, who were there, that Dr. Caddle indicated that he had to speak to the then Prime Minister. As I said, I have not received specific information that he spoke, although I believe he did. I believe that the denial of the Leader of the Opposition is based on lack of recollection. I do not believe that he remembers. I think so because, in 1976, you were presenting it in Cabinet along with Dr. Caddle, and you had the proposals. I think you have forgotten, that is all.

Just as you forgot that you supported Grenada, in the first instance, when you were confronted with a newspaper that did not want to hear that, I think now that you are faced with a debate in which you are confronted with a party that does not want to hear that, you have to forget. I am sorry to say that, I do not wish to be insulting, but I think that, by the age of the honourable Member, passage of time plays tricks with memory.

That Government, having agreed in principle, the negotiations went on: Mr. K. R. Hunte offered Maxwell Great House as the site, the opening date was fixed for November 30, 1976, the 10th anniversary of our independence, and in April it was introduced into Cabinet by the then Prime Minister.
11.05 a.m.

But before I go on, I have got the evidence here. I had forgotten it. The honourable Member asked me what convinced me that he had held the talks. I do beg your pardon, Sir, but I wonder if the honourable Member would like to see this copy of the Cabinet Minutes before I go on. He signed them as correct. He has just denied in the House of Assembly that he held any discussion with Dr. Caddle, and here are the Minutes that he signed as correct:

"The Prime Minister informed the Cabinet of exploratory discussions which a group of medical men from the U.S.A., led by a Dr. Merliss, had recently held with him and Dr. the Hon. R. B. Caddle about establishing a medical training school in Barbados. The proposal envisaged the use of the St. Michael District Hospital as well as the other district hospitals at a later date."

This is the man who has just said in here he never had any talk with Caddle about the matter.

On 6th May, 1976:

"The Prime Minister informed the Cabinet that he had received a draft letter of agreement from the

United States group who wished to establish the medical training school, and that he would refer the draft agreement to the Minister of Health and Welfare."

This little exchange shows the danger of giving too much faith to sincerity and honesty sometimes. Do you see how mistaken I was in thinking the honourable Member honestly forgot, or that it was possible he had not spoken to Dr. Caddle?

I am nothing to do with the Democratic Labour Party and whether it was in favour of a medical school or not *vis-a-vis* our decision. We have had our little quarter of an hour of dramatics; I quite unhesitatingly plead guilty to them. The point is this, it is the attitude of wanting to beat a dog with any stick that is available that has informed the appalling, hypocritical ignorance, wickedness and malevolence, which has emerged from the Democratic Labour Party in the last few weeks about the medical school. They have allowed the big, fat tail they have to wag the body of the animal. Instead of checking the facts, instead of being properly suspicious of the recollections of the Leader of the Opposition, something about which my father first warned me 33 years ago when the Leader of the Opposition was explaining to me how flying saucers arose, and in the Holligan murder case why they could not find the bullet — perhaps the honourable Member cannot recall that — but the first time we ever met.....

Asides.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: It is irrelevant to the debate, I am sure. I cannot believe the honourable Member said he never had any discussion with my father.

The honourable Member for St. John and I stood up next to a cabbage palm that then existed at Tyrol Cot, and he explained to me — he and his colleague next to him are now reading something about flying saucers — that he believed it was a projection, and explained something about angular velocity that was mathematically accurate, that when you move something at a slow speed on earth and it was projected sufficiently far in the heavens, it would seem to be moving at supersonic speed, or the speed of light.

(Mr. B. M. TAITT: Which is exactly what you are doing now).

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Let us step aside from these irrelevancies. It is because I am so appalled at the level to which public debate about the medical school has descended, that I dwell upon these matters.

The Democratic Labour Party, like the Barbados Labour Party later, examined the reasons for having a

medical school. They came to the conclusion that there were circumstances in which a medical school might be reasonably established in Barbados. They did the proper and correct thing, so far as I am concerned and so far as the files reveal! They negotiated, they sought advice, they read reports, they examined the situation with the medical profession in the United States, they sought the advice of the Barbados Association of Medical Practitioners, they sought the advice of the University of the West Indies. They have nothing to be ashamed of, except the lies they are now telling. They did, so far as I can see, nothing disreputable.

I do not believe that in going to the Bank of America with the directors of the medical institution — although it is a bit unusual — that Dr. Caddle was doing anything disreputable or corrupt. I state without sarcasm, I state as a fact, that I do not believe that there was any element of that as far as I am told and as far as an examination of the papers reveal.

Examining the files does not suggest impropriety. It is only now that the Democratic Labour Party is lying about its participation that we must re-examine the whole matter. Why lie about something if they did not have something to hide? I am looking at liars. I am looking at the people who said they do not remember it ever coming up to Cabinet, and those who say, positively, that it never came up to Cabinet when they were there.

I want to hear who is going to say — I am not going to reveal who was at Cabinet that day — that they were not at Cabinet on the last Thursday in April, 1976, and the first Thursday in May, 1976. I want to see who is going to say he did not sign the Cabinet Minutes or he did not preside over the Cabinet. It is the inconsistency of the Democratic Labour Party which is being addressed by the Government so far in this debate.

Now, we go on, to the reasons for having the medical school, and we go on to the arguments against it. Nobody can say that the arguments against having the medical school have not been set out adequately and completely over the last five or six years. The then Minister of Health was always opposed to it, the Prime Minister and the Deputy Prime Minister were always in favour of it as a business enterprise. I think I can say the majority of Cabinet, perhaps all of us, other than the Minister of Health, shared that view. We listened to the arguments pro and the arguments con.
11.15 a.m.

The arguments pro are the enormous economic benefits that any educational institution, with a large number of students, can bring to Barbados. Six hundred students will spend the same in a year as, perhaps, 25 000 tourists. It is a matter of straightforward arithmetic.

Twenty-five thousand tourists staying in Barbados for an average of eight days each can show how much they spend. Six hundred students, professors, and people associated with them, living in Barbados for 280 days obviously are going to spend a great deal more per capita.

The Government's policy has been to foster the development of offshore services. We offer services to banks, insurance companies, shipping companies, data processing operations — I see that one of them is in controversy now — and the other services to educational institutions.

I, myself, think that Barbados has lost a great deal by not now being able to attract students from overseas to the Lodge School and others. I think that has both an economic benefit and a social benefit. I think that the establishment of secondary schools, language schools, business schools, medical schools and offshore law schools, if such can be conceived, would be of economic benefit to Barbados. They need to be controlled, that is all.

If we could have 1 000 Venezuelans being taught Business English in business schools, if we could have 1 000 Trinidadians being taught at secondary school level in a boarding school, such as Trinidad now has and we do not have to the same extent, it would be of economic benefit to Barbados, and the host of Barbadians would be widened by exposure to persons from other parts of the earth.

There are only 250 000 of us living in this island. It has immensely benefitted Barbados for us to be able to meet the 300 000 tourists who come from North America and Europe, to meet the resident English, I believe 4 000 of them, indeed even to meet the resident Vincentians and St. Lucians, because we learn other peoples' point of view, we learn tolerance and we have understanding of the world outside of Barbados. If you cannot go to another man's country, perhaps the best thing is for the other man to come to yours.

This has informed the policy of the Government at a social as well as economic level. We, therefore, start out with no objection to the concept of an educational institution setting up in Barbados to teach anything that is not against the laws of Barbados, or the laws of any other country.

I am going to make a statement, Mr. Deputy Speaker. It is a very tentative statement, but I think we have to face reality and face possibilities.

The University of the West Indies is a marvelous institution, which I support up to the hilt. Nevertheless, the University of the West Indies is faced with strain. The Government, outside any question of economics of

offshore schools, has to give consideration to the long-term future of tertiary education, including professional qualification, in this country.

What will happen to this country if the University of the West Indies breaks up, as has been threatened in 1975/76/77, and as may be threatened again in the future? What will happen when we do not have free access to Mona, or free access to the new medical school in Trinidad? I do not believe we have access anyhow to the new medical school that is being set up in Trinidad.

The Government has to give thought to how doctors will be trained in this country, perhaps about 20 years from now, maybe 10. We never know. In face of the possible fissiparous tendencies within the university, is the Government of Barbados seriously to turn down the possibility of the establishment of some level of medical training within the island, not at Government's expense, as a possible back-stop in a future situation? That is why the Cabinet yesterday agreed to set up a committee to examine the whole future of medical education in this country.

I am not saying that it is anything to which I look forward. I do not, not at all, but it is a factor to be taken into consideration. As it is at the moment, the facilities for training Barbadian doctors are very much more limited than the number of students who would wish to train.

We have been trained in offshore medical institutions for years, Dr. Simmons, Dr. Haynes, Dr. Cato and Dr. Caddle. The honourable Member for St. Michael South Central went to an offshore institution in Edinburgh. Dr. Caddle went to an offshore institution in Madras. Dr. Simmons went to offshore institutions in New York. Dr. Cato went to an offshore institution in Edinburgh. We have trained our doctors at offshore institutions, so let us understand what we are talking about.

I went to an offshore law school, and so did you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, one of the biggest in the world, whose principal purpose in those days was economic. It was not operated for maintaining the legal standards in the colonies. It was operated to maintain the existence of the Inns of Court as an institution, on the cheap, for facilitating barristers in London. If it were not for the fees of the overseas students, the Inns of Court would have had to raise more money, and they would not have been able to rent chambers to barristers for £100 a month and flats for £500 a year.

It is only that we want to sell ourselves short, that we do not wish to believe that we can make use of an institution and control it. That is all. All of us who were trained in offshore institutions, offshore to Barbados, are now using "offshore" as a dirty word.

Asides.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Grays' Inn is no more than an offshore law school of the colonies, because the overwhelming percentage of all law students in London were foreign students; perhaps only 10 per cent were English. There may be more English students today, but when we were training, there were only a few.

But we have got to this stage now where you create a new dirty word, "offshore", and everything connected with "offshore" is suspicious.

These are the arguments in favour, the economic argument and, in the end, the desirability of having a potential, if our present arrangements fail, for medical training.

Now, the arguments against. When I set out the arguments against, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I may from time to time answer them.

First of all, the standards. We fully accept that the standards of any medical school have to be of the highest. We would prefer to go the way, as the files reveal since we have got into power, of some kind of co-operation, with the University of the West Indies and the Barbados Association of Medical Practitioners, in ensuring that the standards of any Offshore Medical School in Barbados are of the highest. It is not us who are holding back in dealing with standards; it is the University of the West Indies and the Barbados Association of Medical Practitioners. It is not us.

11.25 a.m.

We would be glad if the powers contained in the Medical Registration Act of Barbados could be administered with the assistance of the University of the West Indies, perhaps to set a local examination which the students of any offshore medical school could be examined in. I would be glad to have the collaboration of Dr. Walrond and Dr. Haynes. I would be glad to have the collaboration of persons, who are engaged in the teaching and the instruction of medical students, in ensuring that the Government can maintain the standards of any institution teaching medicine, whose persons, however marginally, may ultimately be entitled to practice in Barbados.

But have we had that collaboration? No, Sir! All we have had is a series of public statements attacking the Government, when the Government has not said a word. The first word the Government has said about this matter was the statement made in the Other Place by the Minister of Health. We have been silent under a long blitz.

The Government has held innumerable meetings with the UWI, at CARICOM Ministers of Health level. We

reminded the University of the West Indies that, as long ago as 1971, in collaboration with a study by the Inter-American Development Bank, the University of the West Indies supported the idea of setting up a medical school in the Eastern Caribbean. That is on record, and has been already published in Barbados — I do not have to go over it. We have reminded them of that, and we have met with nothing but the hostility of those responsible.

I am not saying that Dr. Walrond, however well-known his support for the Democratic Labour Party is, is motivated by political opportunism in this matter. I believe that he is mistaken, but sincere. He has struck me as a person who is very bright and intelligent, but very apt to make mistakes — his judgment gets clouded. He has struck me as a person whose opinions on non-medical subjects and subjects outside of his own speciality, are sometimes based on unsound premises, and indeed perhaps prejudices, although I cannot say political prejudices. He is a politician true enough, but I do not believe that in this matter he is motivated by politics.

Laughter.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Honourable Members opposite are laughing at the idea that Dr. Walrond might not be motivated by politics. Well they are in a position to know better than me. You are right to laugh at him.

The standards of medical schools are obviously our greatest consideration, and the object of the Government would be to ensure that if a medical school were set up in Barbados, no student could successfully obtain a licence in Barbados until he satisfies the existing standards set out by the General Medical Council under the Medical Registration Act. In the short term, it would mean that internship qualifications would be set which would ensure that any student seeking to practise in Barbados would have the same exposure to the last years of medical training as any other doctor practising in the island.

It is very hard for me, to see what other argument could be maintained in this matter in the light of the Government's own statements. I do not want to go over them at length, but I would want to deal with a particular one, access to the medical facilities of Barbados.

For some reason, there seems to be very intense jealousy on this point. I do not mean jealousy in a narrow emotional sense; I mean jealousy in the sense of exclusivity. It seems that the University of the West Indies and the Barbados Association of Medical Practitioners, are particularly concerned that students from another institution should have no measure of the clinical facilities for teaching at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital.

The Minister of Health has also told me that it would be an absolutely impossible situation if you had

two separated disciplines trying to teach medical students at the same time in the QEH or any other hospital. I do not know about these things, I would have to ask the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central for his experience in this matter, but I would agree that it would seem very difficult to have two sets of professions teaching students within the same wards of a hospital.

The Government, unlike the Democratic Labour Party Government, has made it clear to the proprietors and persons concerned with the medical school that we do not intend to make the facilities available.

There is also a question of numbers. I am told that there are only 50 students from the U.W.I. being taught at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital; they go through in sets of 25. In relation to the number of students at the St. George's Medical School, I hear the figure of 600 — I cannot identify that as a specific proposal, but I read that in the papers — and I gather that would mean that there would be 150 at any one time needing clinical facilities, and this is many more than the numbers that should be accommodated within the size of the Q.E.H.

It is for these reasons that the Government, with our limited knowledge and experience, has decided that it does not appear feasible for the Q.E.H. to be held out as any hope of a teaching hospital to the St. George's Medical School. Indeed, I am told that the number of students they are training and teaching is comparable with the numbers being taught at any given moment at Harvard and McGill, and therefore the facilities they would need would be in excess of those at the Q.E.H.

I dwelt on this problem because it has been dwelt on by BAMP, but it is an empty problem. The previous Government was willing to expose the district hospitals and the medical facilities outside Bridgetown, as well as the Q.E.H., to possible use by an offshore medical school. In that, I somewhat tentatively say they were mistaken. I am not accusing them in this matter; I will merely say that I think that the numbers could not easily have been accommodated within our small health facilities. I am not critical, because I dare say that would have been made clear if a different event had taken place on September 2, 1976.

I am sure that all honourable Members by now have read what I think is a classic of ministerial prose, from the honourable Member for St. Michael South (Mr. L. E. Sandiford), who wrote to the medical school on August 20, 1976, to tell them he did not think he could meet them at that time — would they kindly apply for a meeting after September 2. I think that is well up to the standard of the honourable Member for St. Michael South.

We do not know in what form the previous Government would finally have approved of any schools. I can only say that, for now, we do not think the number of students can be accommodated, and we think that there would be enormous difficulties in having two separate universities trying to teach medicine in the same hospital.

I really do not know what other arguments can be marshalled with any seriousness against having a medical school. I will probably have to listen to honourable Members opposite.

I think I have dealt adequately with the situation of the U.W.I. We would like to seek their co-operation — it is they who have rejected ours. I have dealt with the attitude of the Democratic Labour Party. They, like us, were convinced of the utility of the medical school, but for cheap political advantage, or what they may think is cheap political advantage, they are now pretending to be against it.

11.35 a.m.

I want to turn to the situation of medical practitioners. I know that there are people sitting down in here anxiously waiting to hear me abuse BAMP. They want me to deal with BAMP as I dealt with the Democratic Labour Party. They want me to deal with Dr. Hoyos as I dealt with Dr. Walrond, although I have not said anything against Dr. Walrond. I am not going to do any of these things. BAMP is misguided and, like so many situations in which doctors find themselves, not entirely of this world when coming to deal with matters outside their immediate discipline.

I am going to reveal something. We have had a great outburst from BAMP about the Minister of Health giving instructions to civil servants not to speak with them or the general public. Why has BAMP not told the public that they solemnly sat down at a meeting and passed a Resolution, by a majority, telling the President he was not to speak with me. I say as a fact that such a Resolution was passed by the Council of the Barbados Association of Medical Practitioners.

(ASIDE: Saying what?)

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS:.....Telling the President he was not to enter into any negotiations with me, and not to have anything to say to me about the matter of the medical school and the national health whatever it was.

(Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I do not know anything about that.)

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: These are the same people who say that Senator Trotman was wrong in drawing civil servants' attention to the General Orders.

I am going to tell you something about BAMP. I have spoken to members of BAMP. Do you know what they have said to me? They say: "Richie is not the worst, Richie is not bad; Richie talks about the thing seriously. You do not have to worry about those who are against you, it is those who are for you in there." They say that the members of BAMP who get on with these things do not even know Dr. Caddle or Dr. Simmons, they know Richie — but it is not Richie who is pushing them.

Whether that is true or not, I do not know. I have never known the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central to refrain from heaping oil on fire in any circumstances. I have never known him to hold back from piling Pelion upon Ossa, from gilding the lily and further increasing the corruption of the day. I do not believe the honourable Member could be in anything in which he is interested, in which his immediate instincts are not to stir up trouble if no trouble exists, as he has done with the Democratic Labour Party over this issue, or stir up more trouble where trouble already exists, as I am told he did not do with BAMP. But be that as it may, BAMP is really very misguided on this matter.

There have been those in BAMP who wanted to co-operate with the medical school originally. But, like the lemmings who gather upon the cliffs of Norway at the appropriate season, harmless, sweet little animals, the doctors went in mass pursuit of the unreachable, and have shown the same capacity for mass self-destruction as a herd of those pleasant, good animals on the Norwegian cliffs.

The doctors object to anything being said about the negotiations. Since they have unilaterally closed the negotiations, by saying that they are not going back to have any discussions with the Minister of Health until he apologises, I think they have opened the door to what has been going on being published.

The doctors, I do not know misguided by whom, have actually had — I do not want to use words like insolence or impertinence — the gall, they understand that, to tell a Minister that he must not instruct civil servants to obey the General Orders of Government.

I do not mind the Leader of the Opposition lending all his spurious authority to the call. It is as well-known to the Leader of the Opposition, as it is to the civil servants concerned, that not only the General Orders, but also the Official Secrets Act of this country, forbid the disclosure of discussions of Government to third parties.

There was a civil servant who made unauthorized disclosures to the American Embassy, who, as a result, is no longer working in the Civil Service, although I gather she has been taken on by the American Embassy.

There is a document which civil servants sign when they become civil servants, which refers to the Official Secrets Act, and which they know they must not break. When, at Cabinet, I made a joke speculating on what the returns might be if I now wrote my memoirs of the Grenada matter, the Deputy Prime Minister said to me: "How are you going to spend your money when you get locked up under the Official Secrets Act?" It even affects me. I cannot reveal, without the permission of Cabinet, the inner workings of Government and the inner secrets of recent history like the Grenada matter — not even past history. I would have to have the permission of Cabinet. I have to have the permission of Cabinet to produce this document in here.

So how is a civil servant, who is covered by the Official Secrets Act, and bound by General Orders not to reveal information unless on the instructions of a Minister, going to be able to talk freely to the Barbados Association of Medical Practitioners, or the Press, without breaking the rules which bind them? How, even, is a third party to defend himself successfully, if he receives, for example, a document obtained in breach of the Official Secrets Act?

I would seriously ask the Barbados Association of Medical Practitioners to think again, give consideration to your position. The Government is not unsympathetic to you. The view which you have got, which you expressed at your Council meetings, that the Government is anti-doctor, is a paranoid view. You are adopting not only the arguments of the Leader of the Opposition, but his sickness, when you go on with that.

I do not believe, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the Government will ever come to agreement with the doctors over the National Health Service. They objected to the fact that the Government has revealed that the gross emoluments available to a doctor for looking after 450 old people would be between \$47 000 and \$48 000 a year. I am now going to reveal that the negotiating position of the doctors for looking after a full panel of people of all ages, and with which the Government has agreed, is that they will have gross incomes of between \$150 000 and \$160 000 a year. And I am going to say, in connection with that, that their argument is that the income is all right, but they must not look after 3300 people, as an English doctor would have to look after for less money than that, but they must only look after 2200, and we must get more doctors to get that income.

You are dealing with people who, when you negotiate with them a special payment to go into that \$160 000, as part of it, for ensuring that there is always somebody available on night call from a given group of doctors, passed a unanimous Resolution that, in addition to being paid, by the year, a substantial sum of

money for being available on night call, they must get \$50 for every patient they see after a certain hour. 11.45 p.m.

Obviously, the Government is not foolish. There are doctors in this island who will only see people after 6 o'clock in the evening. If you give them \$160 000 a year and \$50 for every patient they see after 6 o'clock, there are doctors who will arrange to see their patients after 6 o'clock. This is only a matter of common sense. Doctors are only human beings, they like money just like the rest of us. The honourable Member for St. Michael South Central has always made it clear that doctors like money just like the rest of us, perhaps more than the rest of us. Under these circumstances, it is extremely unlikely that the Government would be able to come to an agreement with the medical profession on the emoluments and conditions for the National Health Service.

I am going to go back and give some history on the negotiations. The first offer that was made to the doctors was to ensure that every doctor got an income averaged out from what they returned to the Inland Revenue. The doctors said that would be impossible; one even emigrated — he went to Bequia. We said, "All right, tell us by how much under-estimate your incomes." They gave a figure. We sent people around to doctors' offices, unknowingly to the doctors — one went to Dr. Caddle's office, "Bethesda" — and we worked out how much we thought they were under-estimating, the incomes by. We agreed with them on how much they were under-estimating, we added that to what they were estimating, and we said that we would give them that. The doctors said, "No! We are not paying tax on what we are under-estimating. You will have to give us enough now to pay the tax on what we are under-estimating since we are going to have to pay a tax on it, once you know about it." So we gave the doctors what they admitted they were making and paying tax on, what they admitted they were making and not paying tax on, and the tax to pay on what they were not paying tax on. The doctors said that was not enough!

We entered into discussions about providing adequate surgeries for the doctors, because the National Health Service is much more than paying the doctors; it is making sure that they have proper premises, proper records systems and that they employ proper staff. We said that the Government would provide space in a polyclinic for any doctor, or group of doctors, who wish to carry on their private practice in the polyclinics, and that we would lend the doctors money to build on surgeries or improve their existing surgery. (One doctor put his name down for \$300 000 for a surgery. I think that, at the time, that would have been a four bedroom surgery with the swimming pool.)

The doctors who already had adequate surgeries said, "What about us. We do not want to go into a polyclinic and we do not want to borrow money to build a surgery unit, because we already have adequate surgeries." We agreed that we will pay those doctors rent for their own surgeries. So when, as I have no doubt, Dr. Caddle enters the National Health Service — he has been one of its supporters, one who understands its social importance, and understands the object of the Government in providing it; and I have no doubt that he will be a leading proponent of it and that his patients would get good service — we will be paying Dr. Caddle rent for "Bethesda" Clinic, which he, himself, owns — I believe that the rent has already been negotiated. He will get rent to work in his own building — at a time when we were abolishing housing allowances for the rest of the civil servants.

But I am not quarrelling about this. As far as I am concerned, if some of the pseudo-specialists, I do not mean the pediatricians at the Delaware Clinic would throw in the sponge and admit that they are general practitioners, we might pay them rent for the offices they occupy at Delaware Clinic as well.

We are not being exclusive in this matter. What I am trying to show you is that we have leaned over backwards to come to agreement. No country in the history of national health services has ever offered such generous terms to doctors on a national health service basis as has been offered in Barbados.

The doctors say that they are not going to look after 3 300 patients; that the number has to be reduced to 2 000 or 2 200. In this country of ours, with a relatively young population, and therefore a healthier population than that of Great Britain, with much less chronic disease, far fewer respiratory ailments, which particularly attract the attention of general practitioners, because they are usually not fatal but patients do need a lot of medication.

In Great Britain doctors can look after well over 3 000 patients, but in Barbados they must be paid more than English doctors for looking after 2 000.

We are dealing with unreasonable people. I think that perhaps the best thing that could have happened is the foolish letter that they have written saying that they are not speaking to the Minister anymore until he apologizes. The Minister's note on the file, in red ink, says, "I had better not, because the apology might be worse than the original", and I agree with him. Lenin said at the Smolny Institute on a classic day in 1917: "Let us therefore proceed comrades, to build the Socialist Revolution". I say; Let us therefore proceed to build a National Health Service in this country!

I dust my hands of the negotiations. If, out of the kindness of his heart, the Minister decides before the battle lines are drawn — there will be a battle, and I conveyed this to the President of BAMP; we are prepared for the struggle — to facilitate them and the Barbados genius for compromise can assert itself, then so be it. But we are not retreating from a panel of a reasonable size, we are not increasing the emoluments — gross pay of \$160 000 a year is quite enough, even if they have to pay a nurse out of it — and we will go ahead with the National Health Service on the basis of a capitation tax. Who joins, joins; who does not join, let us see what happens to them. Who does not join becomes a specialist.

So much for BAMP, and, indeed, so much in the main for the medical school.

I will sum up. The Government has absolutely no difficulty with the continuing presence of the St. George's Medical School on the present basis. There is no element of negotiation involved in the medical school continuing to teach pre-clinical studies in Barbados. They may go on as long as they like; we will facilitate them, in general, by welcoming them and by regulating their activities in the interest of proper teaching. That is not a matter of negotiation; it is a settled fact and can continue as a settled fact.

We are negotiating over the question of the permanent establishment of a medical school. I do not intend to expose the Government's negotiating position. This is the reason why the Government has had nothing to say during these last four weeks of hysteria in the Press and on Opposition platforms. When you are negotiating with somebody, you do not talk to the Press about it; you do not expose yourself.

11.55 a.m.

I hear a *sotto voce* remark which I consider appropriate and proper to the debate. It is merely wrong and mistaken. He says! "Tell the Minister of Health". I challenge any honourable Member to discover a statement made by the Minister of Health relative to the permanent establishment of the medical school prior to the statement in the Senate. The Minister may have spoken about the cadavers, he may have spoken about phase one of the National Health Service. We have not discussed the medical school, because we are going through the proper procedures, just as the Democratic Labour Party went through the proper procedures of negotiation, analysis and discussion.

We will be informed in those negotiations by some factors external to the medical school and its application. The first is that we have no wish of depriving our fellow CARICOM members, our friends and comrades in Grenada, of the benefit of a medical school if it is at all possible or feasible for the school to continue in Grenada. We will not encourage the St. George's Medical

School to leave Grenada. We did not encourage it to leave when Bishop was in power, and we are not encouraging that now. We have made it clear to the American Ambassador and to other Americans — I cannot say they encouraged it either, but it was discussed — that we are not seeking to take the medical school away from Grenada. We recognise that it was Grenada's greatest foreign exchange earner under Bishop and it could continue to be, so we are not seeking to deprive Grenada of its medical school. I very much hope that whatever arrangements are worked out will allow Grenada and St. Vincent to share the same benefits that they have enjoyed.

The other point which arises out of the statement made by Cabinet yesterday relates to tax benefits. I said at the beginning of my speech that I do not know these people. As far as I know, I have never met any of them, but I regret it, because if I had ever spoken to anybody from the St. George's Medical School, I would have told him: 'Do not waste your typewriter and your paper in asking for Income Tax privileges and the other tax privileges that you have asked for.' I really regret that they have ever wasted the public's time by having to read them in proposals, or wasted the Government's time in having to reject them. It is the one negotiating point that we are quite happy to expose at the beginning.

(Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Ezra Alleyne drafted the proposals).

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Do you think it is the first foolish thing Ezra Alleyne has ever done? Do you think it is the first foolish thing that a lawyer was ever asked to do? Do you think it is the first foolish proposal that a lawyer's client has ever insisted on?

The honourable Member apparently knows more than me, because I do not even know that. Perhaps, just for the Record, I should say that it probably is only within the last week that it has come to my attention that a former member of the House on this side was even their lawyer. Not only have I not spoken to the people of the medical school, but I have not spoken to Mr. Ezra Alleyne.

The officials of the school might have done better to have spoken to me. It might have been in their interest to have spoken to me, because the whole public relations in this matter has been thrown into turmoil, first by a set of proposals that contain quite unworkable parameters; secondly, by the leaking of those proposals by the officials of the Ministry of Health to BAMP and the Press; and thirdly, by the hysteria of the Press in the silly season in picking up a lot of these points.

Why did the Press not pick these points up in 1975? The *Nation* had a big headline with the first negotiations. Why was there not all of this hysteria? How

come BAMP did not rush into print in 1975? How come BAMP is in everything now? Has it got to do with politics? Because I do not believe that in 1975 the Opposition was backward in picking up serious political points. I do not think that our voices were mute. But how come the Press makes a tremendous thing of the medical school in 1984, but in 1975 it passed unnoticed? I can only put it down to factors outside the Press, and I think that BAMP bears the greatest responsibility for it.

If anybody had consulted me, had written a letter directly setting out their wish to put proposals, they would only have had to say to me "tax free" for me to say that that does not work here. If a medical teacher at the university has to pay income tax, so does a medical teacher at the St. George's school of medicine. You can be sure of that.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this amendment has, so far taken two hours to debate. I think that we can reasonably say for now that this is enough. I have dealt with the Barbados Association of Medical Practitioners, and I do, for the third time, appeal to them to let common sense enter their deliberations. They are doctors — above all, they should know the symptoms of mass hysteria. I ask them to retreat from that.

I have dealt with the Democratic Labour Party. You cannot ask fools to retreat from their folly. I will just have to deal with them in the terms which I have been indicated in my opening remarks.

I have touched on the University of the West Indies. I appeal to the University of the West Indies to come in with us and help make this proposal not only workable, for I am sure we can reach a workable solution with the medical school, but acceptable. Help us. If you feel we need local examinations, help us. If you feel that we need to institute a curriculum, or curricula, which the school will have to follow to satisfy the UWI, tell us so and help us to do it.

The Cave Hill campus of the University of the West Indies has never needed the Government of Barbados so much as it needs us now.

Aside.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: That is no threat. I am saying that we need the UWI and the UWI needs us. Let us co-operate in this matter.

This Bill is a very simple one. Perhaps never before has there been so long an introduction to a second reading on so short a Bill, which consists only of an amendment to the regulations power. But arising out of this Bill are many issues of principle: the issue of honesty in public life, telling the truth in public life,

consistency in public life; the issue of how far a pressure group can go in seeking to manipulate public opinion and seeking to pursue selfish ends without a real regard for the public interest. It is a debate which contains, ultimately, the issue of how serious we are as Barbadians in assessing the public interest, in educating the public as politicians, and in receiving education in the public from the political leadership.
12.05 p.m.

When a political party, for whatever cheap advantage it perceives, seeks to mislead the public on major issues, make monumental pronouncements on matters on which it can so easily be contradicted, the entire political process has been threatened.

The statement by the President of the Democratic Labour Party about the St. George's Medical School, is damaging, not only to himself and to his party — for let there be no doubt that the general public out there is quite happy to see this school, as you will find out — but it is damaging to the whole political process, because it destroys the credibility of politicians. I want the honourable Member for St. Michael West to have credibility with the public, because the day that the public comes to reject a political party, or reject its spokesmen, for dishonesty or untruthfulness, for self-service and for self-seeking, not just that political party suffers, but all politics and all politicians suffer.

The hysterics, the dramatics, the ravings and the rampings, the brandishing of pieces of paper and the shoutings — I know, I will do, you must do, this is death, this is worse than death, this is blood, this is money — all of that erodes the whole political process in this country. It cannot, and it has been proved nonsense, drag down the Barbados Labour Party. What it does and will do is to drag down Barbados.

The eyes of the whole Caribbean and the world are on us, and we are running around talking about cadavers and the medical school, contradicting ourselves and raving like wild animals. Over what? Over something that everybody accepts can be an institution and a system of economic and social development that can come to Barbados under certain given conditions.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I can only now beg to move that this Bill be read a second time.

Hon. L. R. TULL: I beg to second this Bill and reserve my right to speak.

Mr. L. A. WEEKES (St. Michael North West): Mr. Deputy Speaker, we have had a very long speech by the right honourable Member for St. Thomas (Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. Adams). At the outset he did say, as I understood him, that he would range far and wide.

For us on this side, the Bill before us is very important, not for political reasons, or for that matter not because of any outside assistance from anyone, but certainly for the benefit of the people in Barbados; and the historical background which the right honourable Prime Minister gave is enough to convince us why we should have strong reservations about supporting this amendment, about the far-reaching consequences attached to this amendment and about those whom the amendment will certainly serve.

In his introduction, the Prime Minister said that in one country, because of the eminent danger of disease and lack of proper protection in providing cadavers for the.....

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: If the honourable Member would give way.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: On what does the honourable Member rise?

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I rise on a very important point.

I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended until 1.10 p.m. today for lunch.

Mr. B. M. TAITT (St. Michael West): I would like to speak on this motion for the suspension of the House.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: That would be a dilatory motion.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: But until you hear where I am going.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Let me hear what you have to say.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: The honourable Member would have spoken and normally we would have broken either at 12 noon or 12.30 p.m. or at the end of his speech. I find it strange that the Leader of the House would wait until the honourable Member had actually began his speech, said the first two paragraphs, and then moved the suspension.

I am suggesting that in the future, the Leader of the House, in moving such motions of suspension for lunch, would take into account that the business of the House would be much smoother if we could have these motions coming at the termination of one's speech wherever possible.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: In replying, I just want to let the honourable Member know this. It is from this very

position that the Barbados Workers Union boss, Mr. Frank Walcott, said "It is not a Sunday School game." It is as simple as that.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I think we are suffering from defects of the Standing Orders, in that when there is a suspension and the House commences at an hour other than that stated in the Standing Orders, you are always in difficulty as to what time we are prepared to break. This is something which the Standing Orders Committee should look at in the future, and then we would not run into these difficulties.

The question that the sitting be suspended until 1.10 p.m. today was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER suspended the sitting accordingly.
12.15 p.m.

ON RESUMPTION

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: This sitting is resumed.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, there were two Bills on the Order Paper which should have been read a first time. I gave notice of them, but through an oversight early in the morning's proceedings, the Bill to authorise the Government to borrow a sum of \$6 million was not read a first time. With the leave of the House, I should be grateful if Your Honour would allow me to have this read a first time now.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

On the motion of Hon. L. S. CRAIG, seconded by Hon. L. R. TULL, a Bill to authorise the Government to borrow from the Government of Canada a sum not exceeding CDN. \$6 000 000 and to provide for related matters was read a first time.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS RESUMED

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: When the suspension was taken, the honourable Member for St. Michael North West was speaking. He may now continue if he so desires.

Mr. L. A. WEEKES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, when the suspension was taken, I had mentioned two areas where I considered that we on this side would find it difficult to support the Bill before us. The third point I wanted to add is that, in the absence of a completely new Bill to deal with the anatomy aspect or the dissection of these bodies in the hospital, I consider that the Bill as it stands would be limited in many ways in carrying out the functions that would be necessary to make the operation successful.

If any problems have arisen over the past two days, it is clearly the Government's inability to inform as best

they could all those who had a specific interest in this matter. I do not believe that they can talk themselves out of it, because the damage has been done by the way in which the whole incident took place. It seems to me that we will never be able to mend the damage unless we give the country the assurance that there will be the proper legislation to deal with the dissection of cadavers.

Sir, one has to be very careful in providing an Act in this country to cover these areas. I would like to say that in times like these, where morality and professional ethics seem to be a thing of the past, we cannot leave things to chance; we must have the necessary safeguards built in. That is why an Anatomy Act is so necessary, because it would cover very vital areas.

There is always a question of making sure that certain procedures are carried forward. For one thing, we must have certification of this particular body. I need not draw your attention to the fact that there was an instance in Barbados where we had a mix up with the undertaker having the wrong body placed in the wrong place. I know to err is human, but to err in these matters can be very disastrous and discomforting, and that is why it is absolutely necessary to have in place the kind of legislation that would avoid that.

It is also necessary to see that those bodies are lawfully and ethically ready for use. It is true that many of us can practise on old and disused mechanical devices, but when it comes to dealing with the prevention of disease and curing people, we have to be very careful that the bodies which we use to practise on are the ones that we can get the most beneficial effects from.

It will also be necessary, in that process, to know not only the age, but to see that the body is free from any disease which would be disastrous to the country. I mention this because it borders on public health matters.

We in Barbados not long ago witnessed an almost break-down in our public health department; fortunately, it was only for a short time. But when you have an Act of this nature in place, you must have adequate personnel to deal with it, and you must have people who are properly trained to ensure the implementation of the Act. This would also require a trained inspector who would be able to make sure that all the relevant standards are maintained. To back up all of this then, we must have, as I said, our public health department functioning effectively, and one cannot have any confidence in that department as it stands, in the light of the recent events.

I believe the House is in receipt of the Chief Medical Officer's report from 1982, in which there is a very interesting statement on page 1, which reads as follows:

"As a result of the shortage of manpower, one public health district was without the services of a public health inspector for three months, and on many occasions the districts were without their public health inspector for a month."

My reason for stating that is that, if you are going into a situation like the one we are going into, it is clear that the Ministry is not adequately staffed, they are not prepared for the venture. And I can assume that since they have been having the problem of retaining the inspection services, as happened in the last three weeks, it can be a very dangerous thing when not only 15 bodies are around, but when they are more, because I presume that as the institution requires more, we will need much more supervision. This, too, can have a far-reaching effect if adequate supervision is not provided to make sure that these things are not present.

We talked about the economic benefits of the school, but certainly if your public health system breaks down, tourism itself will also suffer, because people do not like to go to unhealthy countries. What assurance will the Government give us then that all protective measures will be taken to make sure that the uses of these bodies for dissection will be adequately covered?

It is clear that we would prefer a much more comprehensive approach. We just cannot accept only an amendment to the regulations of the Health Act. We think that you need to go much further.

In this whole question of the St. George's Medical School as it relates to this Act, it appears to me that we were putting the cart before the horse. It is almost impossible to believe that you are going to allow an institution to come into your country and not be aware that certain provisions must be in place. It is possible that you never intended that it should be here, and I believe this is the real truth of the matter.

I notice that the Minister of Education is not in her place at this time, and I am not casting any doubt about that particular Member, but I believe that the whole issue centres around education. The only health matters, as I see it, is how the health of the country would be affected, and what benefits health-wise the country would gain.

I have listened to the honourable introducer and I have not gathered any information, or any strong feeling, that this institution will produce a better health service for the country. This is very important, because the honourable Member introduced the idea of the National Health Service. The people in Barbados, as I know them, are very conscious about their health, they are very particular about whom they choose to serve them, and I notice that that point was particularly absent from the

honourable Member's introduction of this measure. So Barbados can hope to gain very little from the introduction of this institution, further substantiating the point that we see no need at this time for this kind of institution.

1.25 p.m.

These institutions at points in time may have made some contribution, but we in Barbados have always had pride in our institutions to which we go. I almost thought that the honourable introducer had got to the point where he might have said that he would instruct some of our Barbados Scholars to take the opportunity to go to such a school, in view of the case he was making. I am almost certain that many of our scholars, even at the University of the West Indies, sometimes prefer another institution, but we have very little knowledge of institutions such as the one which we are now looking at.

We have never had the experience of seeing any of these graduates perform anywhere. This must, in some way, concern most of us in this country. And there is no point in trying to reduce the strong arguments made by knowledgeable people in this matter. I say so because none other than Sir Philip Sherlock, who gave an independent view, came out very strongly as to why we ought to be very careful in supporting these institutions.

We have always expected very high standards of our people. One of the hallmarks of Barbados is that, in any country you go to, even though we are a small population, you can put your hand on people who have reached very high academic standards. We will have to carefully consider any approach by any institution which is likely to cast any doubt on our reputation, so we have to see whether we are going in the right direction in accepting this school here.

Already at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, even though some of the doctors there are well qualified and have met with the requirements for the posts, we still fear that some of our people are a little uneasy with them, not because they might not have been properly trained, but because they may not be accustomed to the ways in which our people like to be treated in relation to their health. This is another of the real problems about which we in Barbados must be very concerned about.

I see the issue as having two sides. I see it from the health angle; what benefits we are going to gain health-wise, and from the educational standpoint.

I, myself, find it difficult to understand why we are trying to encourage this institution into Barbados. I have never heard of any outstanding achievements by the institution. I have not heard any good reason to believe that we are not adequately staffed with doctors. I do not have any reason to believe that the University

of the West Indies is not capable of producing the number of doctors required for our area.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Do not say that.

Mr. L. A. WEEKES: I believe that all it needs, if there is a shortage, is that we need to put more effort and emphasis on improving our training and divert some of the financial assistance we may get into that area. My own observation is that we should be trying to encourage that institution to meet our own Caribbean needs, rather than bring in other institutions, probably to dilute and make our situation a bit more complex.

It is evident from what has been said by the honourable introducer, that that was more an attack on those who did not accept the proposal with open arms, but wanted to make sure that every possible effort is made so that the decision taken would not lead us down the hill, than anything else. The Democratic Labour Party's view is very simple and straightforward. We are not seeking to get any political mileage from this particular Resolution; there are many other areas we can get political mileage from. But as a matter of national pride, whenever anything raises its head to the detriment of our own country, we try, as we should, to make sure that every possible effort is made to achieve the best for our own.

Now we may have listened to a school's applications and what they wanted done. But the one thing that has not come out is that with all these negotiations, or discussions, the Democratic Labour Party did not make a decision to admit any school. We did not do it, and up to this day, I am still waiting for that firm declaration that we did. Hence, we are not inconsistent, we did not encourage it.

We can afford to stay here and make our own criticisms because we say, like you, if you mean it, Barbados first. We think Barbados first. And we have to make sure that Barbadians at all times get the best of any deal.

There are a few questions which I believe must come out of all of this. For instance, if you set up a school with six hundred people who are to be properly trained, in inadequate circumstances, how are you going to accept and encourage any one person to believe that these people would be the type of persons to carry his medical problems to?

The one thing that makes this particular Bill before us important is that the school have shown a determination to teach anatomy. That, obviously, would lead on to the fact that they cannot altogether rely on the dead, but they must also be involved with the living. With the QEH having about six hundred beds, how is that number of

people going to practise? The QEH is the only comprehensive institution we have. The polyclinics only deal, to a large extent, with preventative medicine, so the whole crux of the matter is; that the school will have to find some way to instruct their students.

The Government is saying that they have given the assurance that they will not afford them the opportunity to use any of our clinics. Well what is the purpose of allowing them to come here?

1.35 p.m.

And we will be guilty of another act. If we do not allow them to practise here, but in the meantime let them masquerade as doctors, it means that people in other countries will suffer. They may even start to believe that the people of Barbados are not the kind of people they thought them to be. So we need to make sure that the reputation of Barbados remains high and I would like to know what reputation is going to come to us in Barbados out of this exercise.

When I look across to the other side, I can see on the front bench Barbadians of whom we are proud, and who we send abroad to keep our image high. If we continue to believe that only economic gain is the only thing we should strive for in life, then we become a sad nation.

Health has no equivalent to cost — cost only comes about as to what you can afford — and when you are trying to achieve the highest standards in health, there is almost nothing you should not do to make sure that those standards are high. I do accept that the few dollars which we may get from the students here may put some dollars into the economy of the country, but I continue to ask myself: is it that the dollars are much more worthy to us than either our reputation abroad or our good educational standards? There are many people in the United States who try to send their children from the United States to Barbados because of the reputation we have. No amount of money can give us that high reputation which we have for education standards.

I do not believe that it will be all that easy to collect this heap of money which, I understand, we will get. Recently, we have been observing that money has been scarce among a number of people, even including tourists, and I would presume that, from the amount of money that will have to be spent by these individual students, they will not have so much floating around to put into the economy of the country.

There is another point. Whenever institutions such as these are set up, they produce another effect. We already have a housing problem, and this will create further problems. You must remember that we are talking about 600 people, — and if the Convent cannot accommodate

them, it is clear that they will have to go out and compete with some of our own Barbadians for housing space. So how do we balance the necessity of this school against the total benefits we will get?

Sir, I can only re-state our views on this matter. I have no intention of going down all the avenues the honourable introducer went down, although I suppose he had good reasons for doing that. But since my duty is to deal with the health aspect of this matter, I thought that I should put my own views, and the party's views, on the health aspects of this matter in its right perspective. It does not matter if it is the St. George's School or any other school; once it does not in any way add to our already high health standards, I have every intention of making sure that we do not support any school which will not fulfill those aims.

I think that the doctors, themselves, should be listened to. Very often we have a situation when people assume power, not necessarily political power, or authority, there is a feeling that others cannot be critical of them. I do not believe that the doctors are less nationalistic than any of the Members over there; I think their concerns are genuine. They have been working in this country for a very long time, they have been able to see the needs of the country, and they have, in many ways, contributed to the development of health care in this country. I do not see them as wanting to destroy anything. I see them as people who want to raise health to the highest level, so that we could be an example and, as we always boast, the leaders in the Caribbean.

I think the doctors stand very strong and tall in this issue to come out and say openly what they think is the matter, what should be looked at, and what should be done. I have not read, or been informed, that they have submitted or suggested anything to be ridicule of the Government. What they have said is that if the taxpayers are provided with something for themselves, then we ought not to allow other people to seek, so to speak, to edge on our facilities. I support that. I feel that these institutions belong to us, we have provided them by our sweat over the years, and we will object to any person who would want to erode any of these facilities and the services which they provide.

So my contribution to the debate will not be too far reaching in terms of the National Health Service or in terms of who opposes this legislation. My contribution is primarily as a citizen of this country, to see that the best is given to us; and if I have any doubt about that, I feel that I should say so. I know my colleagues have the same feelings on the matter — they have very little confidence in these schools because of some of their past experience and history.

When I first started to work, some people said that some of the doctors came from some peculiar places, and advised others not to go to them. And those were the days when people were not too clear about what doctors did. So now we know, we can expect more of that reaction.

Do not fool yourself, there are some superstitious people in Barbados. "Duppy" is a funny word in Barbados, and the school is bound to create a little disturbance among people, because even as a child you are threatened with "the duppies." What is even worse now, in these days when people are missing — and you hear about "heart men" and "hearse men" — I would not be surprised if one of these mornings you find somebody going to the St. Joseph Hospital to look for those missing. We need to remove that fear from the people.

The honourable Minister is vouching for the integrity of people. You know, as well as I, that in this world today you can get fakes of anything — fake passports and certificates — and if we do not get identity of these people right, anything can happen, because we are new to it. That is the point, we do not have the experience in this area, and once we are new to it, as has happened in industrial development, where people exploited us, and even in the drug industry, where people set about to do things to Third World countries that they would not do in their own country, we may be opened to fakery and exploitation.
1.45 p.m.

What I am trying to say is that an Anatomy Act would clearly remove a lot of these doubts. The people in Barbados would feel very happy, and as a result of that you would not get the continuing feeling of disharmony among the medical people and the Government, and it is for that reason that I make my contribution particularly on the health aspect of this Bill.

I have said that we are not going to support the Bill, not because we are not in favour of having some form of control over these cadavers, but because of the further implications of the cadavers and the school, which must be linked together, for there is no other institution to which I know these bodies would go, so we put the two of them together. We are not supporting the Bill on the basis of the further implications of the school, in which we have not enough confidence at this moment, not due to the school itself but because of the reputation generally of many of those schools.

I thank you, Sir.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES (St. Michael South Central): Mr. Deputy Speaker, this debate, from an educational and health point of view, is perhaps one of the more important debates that have taken place in this Parliament, and it is with deep regret that adequate notice was not given

to all Members. This represents the sort of slipshod way in which the Government has been doing its business in a very vital and important area of national life.

One important thing has happened. At last the person who took the decision to establish the medical school in Barbados has been smoked out of his hole. I am saying, and I am charging, that it was the Prime Minister of this country who, when he was temporary Minister of Health, instructed that every step should be taken in order to facilitate the establishment of the St. George's Medical School in Barbados, despite all the implications involved. The facts are — and it is very important to understand this — that we are not dealing here with an accredited American school, which has been established in Barbados for the purpose of training graduates for the United States. We are dealing with a situation that is completely different from our past experience.

When the honourable Member for St. Thomas (Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. Adams) seeks to compare an offshore medical school with those of us who have had medical training in foreign countries, it is total nonsense. We were all trained at established universities, we received degrees established by those universities, accredited by the Medical Council or the professional body in those countries, and then, on return to this country, our own professional body had to give accreditation to that particular degree which we obtained overseas.

What is involved in these offshore medical schools is the fact that there are American businessmen, and a lot of American crooks, and I make no apologies for it, who operate them. They cannot establish in the United States because they have been expelled from the United States on legal grounds. They sought to establish themselves in the State of Ohio. That matter was contested right through the courts of Ohio, and they were expelled from the United States.

What are the reasons? They were not expelled because in the United States private individuals cannot establish a medical school. It is perfectly lawful in the United States for any group of individuals to establish a medical school. What is unlawful is for them to produce a quality of training in the United States which is below that required of the given State. That was the ground on which they were pushed out of the States.

Hon. L. R. TULL: They who?

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: The same IMF you are talking about is one; the EETC is another one.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable Member will have to make that document a document of the House. The honourable Member knows the rules particularly well.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I did not read from it, Sir.

You have a bunch of crooked Americans who are prepared to undermine the American system of medicine. You have crooked Americans who cannot establish schools in the United States because they cannot conform to the standards required in the United States, so they come to bankrupt countries around the world, set up these off-shore medical schools with all sorts of weird promises.

Ten years ago, in 1973, when Governments around the world were presented with what was a series of promises, a document promising what they would do for the country, many Governments, even the Gairy Government, would not have had any experience of the operation of these schools. Ten years later we know exactly what has happened.

First of all, they make no capital investment whatsoever in the countries in which they have gone, because that is not the name of the game. It has been an entire rip-off of the children of wealthy parents, predominantly, who are desirous, and understandably so, of having a medical education, but who have failed to gain entrance to any university in the United States, Canada, Latin America or anywhere else in the world where, traditionally, American students, who have failed to gain entrance to American medical schools, have gained entrance to the particular country's medical school.

When I was at Edinburgh University, I would say there were at least 25 Americans in medical school at Edinburg University, at least 1 000 around Scotland, about 2 000 around the United Kingdom alone, and about 5 000 around Europe, when you involve Leiden and the other older universities. So the students of these medical schools are students who have failed to gain entrance into the United States system or any accredited university.

What do they do to these students? They bring them to these small islands. Most of these islands, like Grenada and St. Vincent, clearly have no medical facilities for the training of doctors. They then proceed to stuff them to pass what is called an ECFMG exam. This is an examination that foreign medical graduates are required to pass to gain entrance into the United States.
1.55 p.m.

When I was an under-graduate or a graduate, way back in the 1960's, the ECFMG examination dealt only, and exclusively, with whether you could speak English or not. As the years went on, the examination got a little more difficult, but the point is that that examination is no indication of the clinical competence of anyone trained in those schools. That is Number One.

The schools have no facilities for medical training. What they do is bribe hospitals and consultants around

the world, for example, in the United Kingdom, outside of the teaching system of the United Kingdom, to take their students. They bribe doctors in the United States to give them some form of clinical exposure. But this is not done in an organized manner, and that is a serious problem, because the gaps that occur in clinical training in those years have to be responsible for some of the most disastrous horrors done by the graduates of those schools to patients in the United States.

In the State of Ohio alone, Mr. Deputy Speaker, there are 44 malpractice suits against graduates from these schools; and four of them are so bad that a case of assault and battery is being brought in addition to malpractice. We think that we are training people who, when they go back to America, will be dealing with Americans and not with us, but let me tell you that one of those cases involved a Caribbean person who could not speak English. The man got into an automobile accident, and all that was wrong with him was that he had a stiff neck, but the graduate of the offshore medical school intervened in the man's neck and cut his spinal cord. The man now is a quadriplegic; all of his limbs are paralysed because the surgeon from the offshore medical school did not appreciate that the spinal cord was behind and not in front.

In relation to standards it is not a question of Richie Haynes or the Barbados Association of Medical Practitioners saying that they are not good enough. These schools have been assessed by the Canadian Medical Authority, by the American medical authorities, and by the British medical authorities — and no less a distinguished person than Professor Rhodes has actually visited those schools. All have found them to be totally inadequate in every way.

I will make this a document of the House. This is *World Medicine*, December 10, 1983. A Congressional Committee of the United States actually went to all those schools, and these are the kinds of conclusions that they came to. Listen to this very carefully:

"A recent report from the United States General Accounting Office has concluded that none of these schools offers a medical education comparable to that in the United States. It found deficiencies in admission requirements, facilities, equipment and clinical training. Even the cadavers were too old at some schools, the observers noted. On Grenada, cadavers were flown in at nights because of local superstitions."

Why did the Congressional Committee go down there? I will tell you why. This is a serious matter.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I hope the honourable Member will keep his promise and make that a document of the House.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I will make it a document of the House, but I am not quite finished with it yet.

The interesting thing is this. That Congressional Committee went down there because part of the deal in silencing the school over the Grenada invasion was that the school should change its stance in relation to the danger to the medical students in Grenada. That is a fact. Up to the day before the invasion, the school was saying that there was no harm, nor potential harm, to the medical students. Mr. Mordecai was called in from California and told, "Look, you had better shut up or we will deal with you by not allowing your graduates to come back into the United States." He changed his tune.

I did not say so. There was a letter published in a California newspaper which was republished in the weekend edition of the *Manchester Guardian* where Peter Bourne, their Washington lobbyist, pointed out step by step what the St. George's School was doing during the period of the Grenada invasion.

This Government is now negotiating with people who were negotiating with that brute Austin in Grenada. They were negotiating to establish Austin as the leader of Grenada. There is evidence, which I can produce in this Honourable House, that they actually submitted a report to Congress in Washington to establish that Austin was no monster and that Austin was going to bring the country back to democratic rule.

We had our own soldiers in Grenada — and the very people who we are encouraging here were the people undermining the foreign policy of Barbados in a very critical moment of the history of this country. I have absolutely no doubt about this. The *Guardian* of November 20, 1983, page 10.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Just a minute. The honourable Member knows full well that he cannot read newspaper reports in this Honourable Chamber. Newspaper reports are the opinions of the writer of the particular article.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Sir, I am not too sure about the *Weekend Guardian*.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The *Guardian* is a newspaper.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I am not so sure about that. It is a magazine. The *Weekend Guardian* is not the same thing as the *Guardian*.

It is immoral for us to be encouraging an activity that cannot take place legally in the United States, the Virgin Islands, or Puerto Rico, when we know that we have no control whatsoever over standards in those

schools because you can say they can practice elsewhere than in Barbados. It is not morally right. It is not morally justifiable. It is completely and totally wrong on moral grounds.

The same people who operate the St. George's Medical School have been telling the people of the Caribbean that they will give scholarships to Grenadians, Vincentians and so on. I can say as a matter of fact that they do give scholarships. What they do, is accept people with first class degrees from Mona, say, in Biology, and the basic sciences. But these people will never pass the exams. Do you know why? Because not being American citizens, they cannot guarantee them entry into the United States because their examination would not satisfy the requirements of foreign medical graduates who are not United States' citizens, who not only have to sit the ECFMG, but also have to sit the VQE. If you can tell me of a single Caribbean graduate who has graduated from that school and has been able to continue to practice medicine in the Caribbean or elsewhere, I would be very surprised. I do not know of one.

Asides.

2.05 p.m.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: He was not a Caribbean graduate; he was an American graduate that nearly killed a Caribbean man. That is what they do. They make sure that they set the exam, and correct it, in such a way that they are never faced with that problem.

There is another more serious problem. If we are going to establish such a school in Barbados, the Government has to give a charter to that university, and it has to accept its degree as a licence to practise medicine in Barbados — and do not tell me otherwise. When I graduated from Edinburgh University, I was given a degree by the university, and I was given a licence to practice medicine in the United Kingdom. I can only practice medicine in Barbados because the Medical Council of Barbados allows graduates from a distinguished school like Edinburgh to practice here, almost without questioning. Some Government has to give them the accreditation unless they have a degree that is equivalent to a licence to practice. Unless they have a Government accreditation, they cannot practice anywhere else. So we have to do that.

If you give somebody a degree which is equivalent to a licence to practise, how can you stop them from practising medicine in your country. You cannot stop them from practising. You have already said that a degree to practise is equivalent to a licence to practise medicine, and you can only do that in terms of your own jurisdiction. You can take the ECFMG exam thereafter, because under the American Federal Rules in relation to medicine, once you are licensed to practise in a foreign

country, irrespective of the quality of your training you can take the ECFMG examination. That is a basic fact.

You can say you will exercise your work permit rules or what you like to stop them from practising here, but if you do that, I would say it is immoral. It is immoral to tell young people that they can come, train in your country, get a degree, can have a licence, and then tell them that they cannot practise in your own country. That is the first thing.

The second thing is this: if one of them should get married to a Barbadian, how are you going to stop him from practising?

Asides

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Sit what examination? There is no further examination. This is one of the tragedies. I believe that honourable Members on the other side do not fully appreciate the implications of what they are doing. So long as you charter a medical school, so long as you give them a licence to practise, then you can only issue that licence in relation to your own jurisdiction. Therefore, once you issue that licence they are entitled to practise, unless you are going to say the Government is going to issue a licence. But then, the General Medical Council is not going to accept the licence issued by the Government itself, and then you will get total chaos and a total breakdown in the administration of medicine in this country. If the Medical Council was faced with a situation where the Government has approved a degree as a licence to practise, and then the Medical Council has to say, "No, you cannot practise in this country!" What kind of situation will you be dealing with? That is the kind of problem you are going to create down the road.

There is another major problem too, that you will not find the St. George's Medical School, or any medical school, at this point in time making any significant investment in Barbados or anywhere else. Do you know why? Steps are being taken to tighten up the ECFMG exam; steps are being taken to stop these offshore schools from stealing the examination papers, as they did over three years. Steps are being taken, and this is very important, to apply the VQE, that is the higher examination to American as well as non-American graduates, and you are going to find yourself contributing to a situation where you have a whole heap of people within your jurisdiction within the Caribbean who cannot practise medicine anywhere else but in this region. These are serious problems, and I am warning you now to address yourself to this problem, because it is not a matter within your control.

When the American Medical Association begins to stretch its muscle — and at the moment no academic

institution in the United States would accept one of these students, unless they do so in the early pre-clinical stages if a vacancy should arise, when they would get a proper clinical training in the United States — not one of the American institutions would accept them, so they drift to the village hospitals, the smaller hospitals.

The state of California has only about eight weeks ago made a very important decision to send back 200 of them to Mexico, where they came from, when they discovered that some of the credits that they were supposed to have were absolutely bogus. That is an absolute fact. So Mexico, which issued the licence, which approved the graduates, now have 200 additional quacks in their own territory — and they can do nothing about it. These are serious ethical, moral and professional problems.

You can save the situation now by doing two things; (1) ensuring that this campus that you have here for the moment is temporary, and (2) that it is regarded as an extension of Grenada so that the degree will have to be issued by the Grenada Government and not by the Barbados Government. Make it an extension and do not make it a Barbados Medical school; otherwise, you are going to run into the same kind of problems I am talking about. I am just trying to give you a way to get out of the mess. Make it clear that you are not going to get into any business of giving these people a charter as any medical school.

Finally, make sure that the question of cadavers in this country, of duppies coming to this country, is properly handled. I think it is totally disgraceful that people who give their bodies to science in the United States should have their bodies lying down, tied-up in black plastic bags, at the airport for three days, and then, when they were sent back out, to have them put in metal coffins to comply with the existing Disposal of Human Remains Act and sneaked into the cellars of St. Joseph Hospital. That is wrong; it offends the religious principles of every single person.

One reason for an Anatomy Act is that it deals with not only the health problem, but addresses itself to serious religious problems. It deals with the acquisition of bodies, how they are handled and how they are disposed of.

Asides.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I was a gold medallist in anatomy. I was a demonstrator in anatomy.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER ordered that a certain word be struck from the record.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: You have to have serious regulations in relation to the acquisition of bodies for the use

of dissection. The history of this thing is too serious to mess around with it by way of regulations. When these bodies have been acquired and certain health standards have been made, it is important to establish an inspector of anatomy, who will not only be able to inspect those bodies here, but be given the authority to go to the United States and make sure of the origin of these dead bodies, and we all know what happens in the United States in relation to the acquisition of bodies and what happens elsewhere. These bodies should then be handed under warrant to an undertaker, and under further warrant to a licensed anatomist in Barbados, who would then supervise the entire operation that takes place there and, above all, make sure that the remains of each and every cadaver is kept together and that that cadaver should be properly disposed of by being handed to a priest of the religion of the person. The priest must be required under warrant to report to the proper authorities that that was done.

2.15 p.m.

The integrity of the human person, as far as I am concerned, goes from the womb to the tomb, and I could never subscribe to any situation where you can treat a human being worse than a dog in Barbados. You cannot import a dead dog into Barbados for dissection or for any other purpose. You could not get even a living dog in Barbados for dissection. But you can behave in an atrocious manner and bring human bodies in this country; then you can issue a directive that they cannot come in here, and then you allow them to come in here, despite the directive!

You ought to be ashamed! Wherein lies your authority as a Government? Wherein lies your morality? It is that deep gulf on matters of principle that distinguishes between the Democratic Labour Party and the Barbados Labour Party on this matter.

Asides.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: There can be none. This is a trade in human beings.

With all due respect, the only positive comment I have ever heard about those medical schools from all authorities is that the students are highly motivated.

(Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: And pass exams.)

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: It is criminal for people to exploit that in the way it is being exploited. It is wicked. That makes it worse. We cannot be party to a situation where we can give the stamp of approval to a graduate in medicine in Barbados and allow that person to go to the United States and kill people. It could be your grandmother, it could be your grandfather, it might be you. It could be a deprived American today; tomorrow, it

could be another individual. These are the principled grounds on which we are bound to oppose this.

The Democratic Labour Party will not be giving any charter to any offshore medical school at any time to operate in Barbados.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: That brings you to the end of the time allocated to you under the Standing Orders of this Honourable Chamber.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Not even a chance?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: That has brought you to the end of your time. The honourable Member should be watching the clock.

Mr. B. M. TAITT, Hon. H. B. St. JOHN and Hon. L. R. TULL stood.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: There are now four Members on their feet. Will all four Members please take their seats.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I beg that the honourable Member be given an additional five minutes to wind up, Sir.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable Member would have had to have asked for a suspension of the Standing Orders in order to do that. The Standing Orders are still in force.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I only want two more minutes to put some lashes in them.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable Member's time has expired.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I am begging for a couple of minutes; only two minutes more.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am not prepared to do that. I am following the Standing Orders.

(Mr. P. M. GREAVES: I hope that applies all around the board. Let us time him. It is now eighteen minutes after two.)

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN (Christ Church East Central): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am sure that all of us who heard the last honourable Member speak are convinced that, really and truly, the honourable Member is not opposed to the establishment of a medical school in Barbados. I am intervening in this debate.....

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Sir, on a point of elucidation: I am absolutely opposed to the establishment of any offshore medical school in this country, as presently constituted.

If, McGill University wanted to.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: That is now a speech.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: No, no, it is a point of elucidation.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable Member has now started on McGill University, which I have not heard during the last thirty minutes he was speaking.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Just give me a little chance, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I have been listening to the honourable Member and reading what purports to have been published by him, and I am positive that if you study what he says and writes carefully, the honourable Member is not opposed to the establishment of a medical school in Barbados.

The second point which I would like to deal with is that a lot of legal heresies have been uttered on the floor of this House by the honourable Member. The authority for determining what qualification a doctor must have in any country is the Legislature of that country. No medical association has such authority, no university has such authority, no body of medical practitioners has such authority — the powers have to be derived from statute. And just as the Barbados Government can prescribe what qualifications you must have to become a lawyer, a dentist, or a surveyor, so, too, it can prescribe the qualifications for you to become a doctor.

In the determination of the qualifications, one obviously, consults with the professional body. But the Government reserves the right — and they are correct in so doing — in determining the qualifications, irrespective of the views of the particular body of people that they would prescribe. So the fact that you get a degree in medicine from a particular university will not allow you to practise, it is quite possible, and within the competence of the Government of Barbados, to prescribe that, in addition to getting a degree from a particular university, you must pass a professional exam. This has been done in relation to law.

As a matter of fact, a person who gets a degree from McGill University cannot go and practise in Nova Scotia, or in New York. Who do they think they are fooling? The Uninitiated? A person who has a degree from Edinburgh cannot go and practise in Nova Scotia, in California or in Florida. Each state of the United States, as well as each province in Canada, has a right to prescribe.

The Government of Barbados well knows that we can prescribe additional qualifications above the degree conferred by the university. That is why we have said that we are not going to be bulldozed into any particular position, but that we will set up a high-powered committee to look at this matter and to prescribe the conditions under which permanency will be stamped upon what is now temporary. Who can object to that? I would like to know who can object to that stand, because in so doing, we have allowed an opportunity for all and sundry to state their viewpoint.

I was very interested today to hear the honourable Member say that, as far as he is concerned, if he were able, he would say that the degree to be conferred should be a degree from Grenada.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: On a point of order, Sir: I did not say "as far as I was concerned". I said to help the Government to rescue the situation, I would advise them to do that, and that they should get about it as soon as possible. They are two different things.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Sir, the truth of the matter is this. The honourable Member, like some lawyers and some other professionals, are so ineptly conservative that they cannot conceive of any progress being made in training other than in the manner in which they were trained. That is the problem. I am satisfied, that there is a reservoir of expertise in Barbados of a sufficient calibre to advise the Government to set out examinations, to design a curriculum, to supervise it and to do the teaching here in Barbados, and that we can have standards for qualification in the clinical area which, if satisfied by the students, will earn the respect of medical opinion all over the world.

2.25 p.m.

One of the great things about Barbados is that we have a lot of experience in the educational industry. We have always had to deal with such matters. We had Codrington College, the boarding schools, the schools of English and the schools of Commerce, and we also had people who made a living out of providing secondary education in Barbados. We have enough doctors here who would willingly offer their services as teachers and examiners. Not free though Sir, not free! As the Prime Minister has said, if there is one characteristic which runs through all of the doctors in Barbados, with very little exception, is that they have a greed for money. They like money a lot.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: On a point of order, Sir: The honourable Member has said that a characteristic of all doctors in Barbados is that, with very few exceptions, they like money. I want to point out that all the Barbadian doctors, who are not directly employed by the UWI, give their services free in a teaching capacity, and

have done so for the past 17 years in Barbados. I certainly have given mine totally free, except for the \$250 honorarium a year.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I say on the floor of this House that the honourable Member is one of the first doctors who understood the commercial exploitation of medicine. He sized up the potential of medicine for commercial exploitation earlier than any doctor I know in Barbados. Do not let us fool ourselves. You only have to go around Belleville in Barbados to see the number of clinics, established on a fully commercialized basis, down to the owning of the property.

I do not blame them. After all, if the profession which they chose lends itself to that within the ethical standards of the profession, why are we to blame them? What I blame them for is the hypocrisy when they deny or seek to pretend, that it is not so. They are no different from the proprietors of these medical schools, they are all interested in the commercial exploitation of medicine. Just as we have to bring in the National Health Service to see that the public is protected from this commercial exploitation, so, too, we will bring in regulations to ensure that the medical students are not exploited by this. So do not let us fool ourselves. We are dealing with a bunch of hypocrites.

Now let me deal with them about they offering their services free. They attach themselves to the university because being attached to a university brings prestige. They also have access to the hospital equipment, hospital drugs and to all of the junior exploited house surgeons, who will do a lot of their routine work for them, and they still charge the people whom the juniors see the full medical fees and do not even give the juniors Christmas presents.

Asides.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Quiet please.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I came up in a house with doctors. I well know about this. I have the greatest respect for doctors as professions. They learned early that just as you have areas like Harley Street in London, where colonials went to London to buy the best of medical treatment, received it, and paid handsomely for it, you can have some in Barbados. The Harley Street of the eastern Caribbean is in Belleville. It has extended itself so greatly that it now includes the area opposite the old hospital near to the Roman Catholic Church.

This is what we are dealing with. Do not let us confuse ourselves with this idea the doctors are trying to put forward, that they are the only ones with reservoirs of knowledge and ethical standards, and that they are motivated only by the highest moral principles. I will

keep quiet about a few things, because I have some friends who I hear talking; and if I were to let out some of the things I know, I would lose their friendship, so I am done with that.

The Government's committee will examine the question of standards very, very carefully. We know that the University of the West Indies — and I sat on the Grants Committee, so I know — they are very worried that some of their lecturers will be tempted by the offers from the proprietors of this school, and will leave lecturing for the University and go and lecture for this school. But they are not going to do that, not until facilities are set up for the clinical training of students comparable to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. The reward for teaching in the Queen Elizabeth Hospital for the non-professional staff, the full-time staff, is not the pittance the university offers them, it is the access to the hospital, the opportunity to project yourself as being a lecturer in medicine on your letterheads, the opportunity to say, "Meet me at the hospital", and when you meet them at the hospital to see a lot of students around, and you walk around like a demi-god talking to the students. The people have to pay for that.

I want to give the public the assurance that the Government is fully aware of the implications of the school, we have done a special study on this subject. As long ago as 1977, the Ministry of Trade, Industry, and Tourism, in its projections for the service economy in Barbados, put forward the concept that Barbados should be like Switzerland. It is an ideal place for the selling of services in relation to health. One of those services consists of being used as a base for the training of doctors, for the provision of post-operative treatment, for rehabilitation, for pre-clinical studies, for geriatrics or post-graduate work. Whatever it is, Barbados has the infrastructure, physical and human — everything that we can exploit. It is part and parcel of us making use of the investment that has taken place in Barbados over the years in education and in physical infrastructure.
2.35 p.m.

I am sorry that the university is so conservative that they do not see part of their function as not being to bend its traditional approach to lend a hand to Government to see how we can exploit the reservoir of talent that is in existence there. When I was on the Grants Committee, many people said that one of the failings of the university was that it did not see itself, outside of its teaching time, as a facility to bring people to the Caribbean to study subjects, and to live on the campuses within the Caribbean instead of closing them down. In short, they have failed even to recognise that the old traditional colleges in Europe and in the United Kingdom, in particular, in order to survive, have had to change their attitude. They have had to exploit any commercial potential there is in a greater utilisation of their manpower and buildings.

I would have loved to have seen, as Dr. Ramsay proposed during the Democratic Labour Party's time, that we look at the offshore medical schools in the eastern Caribbean as part and parcel of our efforts to ensure that, within the eastern Caribbean, we have adequate medical training facilities for the doctors. The University of the West Indies cannot provide the number of student places that Barbados needs for the people who wish to become doctors, those who wish to become engineers and those who wish to become lawyers.

But I go further. I am very worried about recent decisions that have been taken with respect to the decentralisation of the campuses. I know that because of stringent financial circumstances in territories where the existing pre-clinical and post clinical studies are concentrated, priority is going to be given to students from those territories.

Jamaica has to pay an additional amount of money to the University because of the fact that the hospital is situated in Jamaica and the Jamaican public benefits from the hospital. The Trinidad Mount Hope medical complex is going to cost about TT \$1 billion. I would be very unrealistic if I thought that, however generous Trinidad has been, and they have been generous, when it comes to the allocation of places in the Mount Hope, that the students in the eastern Caribbean are going to get priority. I would be living in a fool's paradise if I were to advance such a proposition.

What in fact do we have in Barbados? We have the Queen Elizabeth Hospital facilities being used as an integral part of a whole, but it is not the whole. You cannot qualify as a doctor after you have done the period of study at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, and these are some of the reasons why we were impressed, when we read through the files, with the arguments of people like Dr. Caddle and Dr. Ramsay when they were arguing that you must look at these applications from the foreign medical schools as part and parcel of your own domestic policy to satisfy the requirements of your medical manpower. So I think there is great scope for co-operation.

The Government of Barbados has nothing against doctors. We know they cannot help themselves when it comes to money. We know there may be some reason for them to have that attitude. We know it takes them long to study; when they take 10, 12 and 14 years to specialise, we know they want to get back their money quickly, so we do not begrudge them the little coppers. That is why we are offering them the generous amount we are offering.

The full motivation and reasoning of the Government is known. I am confident that every Barbadian will go home feeling fully satisfied that the Government has taken the interest of Barbados into

account, and that the Government, in its usual wisdom, will look after the interest of Barbadians in this instance.

I have great pleasure in supporting this Bill.

Mr. B. M. TAITT (St. Michael West): Mr. Deputy Speaker, this debate has been going on since 10 o'clock, and during the first two hours, we were subjected to a very interesting exercise by the Prime Minister. He apparently sought to use the technique of obfuscation to carry the issue away from its basic course, and to give the people of Barbados the impression that the Government, in pursuit of its role as the Government, is doing nothing more than looking down the road 20 years and trying to make sure that the basis of medical education in Barbados would be sound and secure for the next 20 years, and going into the 21st century.

Anyone who was unfamiliar with the basic issue, which has confronted Barbados ever since the Prime Minister made the decision, anyone who had not been following this issue during the last two weeks, could have come to the conclusion that the Prime Minister was beleaguered by a bunch of people who were merely opportunists, and who were seeking the opportunity to make themselves heard and to get political play out of it. The fact is that we became embarrassed as a people when, in the Other Place, the Minister responsible for Health, the Minister who is charged with the responsibility for ensuring that the people of Barbados live and operate in the healthiest possible environment, took it upon himself to take on the role as chief publicist for the St. George's Medical School.

Anyone who has read the 13-page statement which the Minister responsible for Health read in the Other Place, a statement which the Government, when it found itself with its back to the wall, did call upon its chief architect of propaganda to formulate, to allow the situation to appear differently from the reality, can see that in the very first four pages it repeats almost verbatim the brochure that is put out by the St. George's Medical School. That in itself is an embarrassment to the community; it is an embarrassment when the Minister of Health can be the propagandist for a school which the Government is supposed to be negotiating with.

2.45 p.m.

We heard the Prime Minister giving this Honourable Chamber the impression that the reason why the Government kept silent was because they did not wish to betray their hand. But that is not why they kept silent. They kept silent because they watched, in horror, as the Minister responsible for Health first dug a hole, then poured some quicksand into it, and then jumped straight into the middle. As he made statement after statement; first, concerning the cadavers; secondly, concerning the National Health Scheme and, thirdly, concerning the role

which he sought for himself vis-a-vis, the doctors in Barbados, it became obvious that the Minister of Health is part of an endangered species of political aspirants.

Then, suddenly, the Government decided that it must behave like how Richard Nixon behaved when his back was to the wall. They decided that they would stone-wall him, they would join together as a band and they would defend their position, and today we heard the issue being subtly shifted away from its main focus to a point where the Prime Minister ended up, after two hours, giving us the impression that he is looking at a new approach. This culminated in the speech of the last honourable Member telling us that no one could quarrel with the fact that the Cabinet has decided to set up a high-powered committee.

Ask him, in the manner of the rebutter that he is, who can quarrel with the setting up of a committee? Let me hasten to say to him that no one wishes to take up any quarrel with the setting up of a committee, because we will not be misled. We wish to quarrel, first of all, with the manner in which the Government, and more particularly the Prime Minister, as Minister of Health, sought to mislead this entire country. They told this country, through an announcement, that this school was coming to Barbados on a temporary basis. You will recall, Sir, that during my intervention in the Grenada debate, I challenged the Government not to continue down the road of letting Barbadians feel that, because of the hostilities in Grenada, the school had had to shift suddenly to Barbados on a temporary basis. Now, the cat is out of the bag, and they are discussing it in different terms.

But the Prime Minister is on record in the Ministry of Health not saying that he wishes the matter discussed, not saying, as he sought to say today, that they took the course the Democratic Labour Party took when this matter arose during the Democratic Labour Party's time — to seek advice and to examine this and to examine that. He said to the Permanent Secretary, in his own hand, that the offer made by the St. George's Medical School to establish a university school in Barbados should be accepted. He said further, in his own hand, that he was aware of all of the objections which had been made, but that he was not interested in any other issues except the instant political fall out.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is small wonder that the Minister of Health took 13 pages to come, finally, to two entries which he claims that he found on the files. I challenge the Government, if they are exposing the files, to let an independent observer, not everybody in Barbados, but an independent observer, examine all of the files. Let the people of Barbados see the decision that was made by the Barbados Labour Party Government, how it was made, and then come to the con-

clusion as to why it was made. That is how you should let the files be explored.

The honourable Member, who just sat down, talked about the commercial exploitation. I am going to tell you why I am opposed, unalterably to the establishment of an offshore medical school in Barbados. It interferes with our pride as a people.

I spent a substantial part of my public life working for Barbados outside of Barbados, trying to give a large number of people across the world the impression that although we were a small community, we were an important community. I spent a substantial part of my life saying to the people in the United States, in Brussels, in London, and in far places, that we, the people of Barbados, were a proud people, worthy to be considered as a nation, that we were our own decision-makers, and that we, in the words of our first statement to the United Nations, "were friends of all and satellites of none."

I came across a large number of fly-by-night operators during the course of that activity. As you are aware, the United States in particular does not lack for people of shady character, people of no morals at all, who perceive developing countries as a lot of banana republics, populated by thorough idiots who are incapable of making decisions. And they believe that when there are those who can make those decisions, they are motivated by greed and concepts of graft which would allow them to make any kind of decision without any reference to the people of the population, but only concern themselves with how much they can get out of the decision.

The offshore medical schools have been portrayed in almost all countries of repute as falling into the categories of shady activities. They, together with a number of so-called offshore banks — not all, but a large number of them — have been identified as schemes and methods of (a) getting rich quickly, and (b), finding ways to beat the legitimacy of their own systems in their own backyards.

At the meeting which was held in the Ministry of Health, the persons who represented this university, a Mr. Francis Redhead and two other persons — and I can speak in relation to that from knowledge — are persons who have been on the fringe of varied and sundry deeds for a substantial part of their existence in the New York metropolitan area. My time is too short to go into great detail about the Redheads of this world, but there are Caribbean operators who see an affiliation with these various shady dealers as a way of earning a substantial part of their existence. I will go no further on that.
2.55 p.m.

When you get a Minister giving the impression in his opening statement that a university has been estab-

lished — he talks about the creation..... let me quote, because it is a document of this Parliament:

"The school....."

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: From what is the honourable Member reading?

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I am quoting from a statement made by the honourable Minister responsible for Health in the Other Place at the last meeting in that place.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable Member knows full well that you cannot introduce matters from the Other Place into this place that way.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I am not finished and released to the public by that said honourable gentleman. I have a copy of it which I received from the Clerk at the Table.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable Member will have to make it a document. As far as I am concerned, it is a new document in this Chamber, therefore it will have to be made a document of this Chamber.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I humbly do so.

As I was saying, in the very opening comment the honourable Minister from the Other Place said that permission was granted. He started off by saying the school was dislocated during the intervention in Grenada in October last year, then he said permission was granted within the framework of the policy of the Barbados Labour Party, and he said that policy was outlined in 1977-08-04, and then he goes on to say the St. George's University School of Medicine has since applied to be permanently sited in Barbados. Do you hear that? It has since applied to be permanently sited in Barbados.

I wish to state that the Prime Minister of Barbados had directed the Permanent Secretary in the Ministry of Health, on a date before this Statement was made — these are my notes, they are in my hand — that the application from the school should be accepted, and that the Permanent Secretary should work out with the St. George's Medical School the most effective way of establishing a campus in Barbados.

I charge the Government with deceit. I say that this statement by the Minister of Health is an attempted whitewash, and I wish to point out that when he says the St. George's University School of Medicine was created in 1976 by an Act of the House of Representatives of Grenada, following a two-year highlighted the beneficial nature of such an in Grenada and its neighbours in the Caribbean are the identical words which can be found in a

publication of the St. George's Medical School. Those and all the words following for the next four pages are from the brochure of the St. George's Medical School, in which they set out to demonstrate, sometimes truthfully and sometimes untruthfully, that their school, which was created in 1977, has done wonders.

It took the University of the West Indies ten years to establish their medical school; there was ten years of research and discussion going on long before the University College of the West Indies opened. They had feasibility study upon feasibility study. But this school was created by an Act of the Grenada Parliament, under that distinguished West Indian, perennial nuisance Sir Eric Gairy, a man who makes no bones about his capacity to look after himself along the lines advanced by my friend, the honourable member for Christ Church East Central (Hon. H. B. St. John), commercial exploitation, a man who has made no bones about the fact that he looks after No. 1 first and then anything else.

This school was created by Sir Eric Gairy in the halcyon days of graft and corruption in Grenada, and this, and other schools like it, form part of a pattern of exploitation throughout the eastern Caribbean by these operators. I felt before, and I feel now, that Barbados must never ever appear to fall into the category of those "namby-pamby" states that are manipulated by all kinds of commercial exploiters from all places, using all patters. I have come to believe that honourable Members on that side, while they prosecute their responsibility as the Government of this country, have believed that too. That is why it must come as a shock, and with a sense of pain, when one finds that the Government, in the face of tremendous evidence, in the face of tremendous resistance, is stonewalling and shifting, and now they say they have set up a Committee.

I am grateful that they have moved from the position that the Prime Minister, as Minister of Health, took that the school should be accepted, to one where they are setting up a committee to look at medical education in Barbados. I think that the University of the West Indies will be happy that you are going to examine medical education in Barbados, because to the extent that you do so, and that you do so genuinely, it is bound to emerge that such a school as the St. George's Medical School, which was accepted by the Prime Minister in October of 1983, when he directed the Permanent Secretary to start making arrangements, is totally inimical to the interests of Barbados and Barbadians for all time to come.

..... of the Democratic Labour Party, I ought to have made the statement that they would have to go. I repeat it on the floor of this House. A Democratic

Labour Party Administration will not permit any fly-by-night operators to operate in Barbados, and to the extent that they have been established in Barbados, they will have to go.

Asides.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: The St. George's Medical School falls into that category as far as I am concerned, and what I said then, I say now, and I stand by it.

I will say more. That statement went a long way towards assisting the Government in their retreat, because the others must know, and it is the duty of people in public life to let all of these people who would come and offer these blandishments that they cannot come to Barbados and merely, because Barbados is a small country of 166 square miles, assume that we are a banana republic. We are not an offshore country.

Asides.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: The honourable Member says "Sydney Alleyne." If you search the files, you will see that the Cabinet was also informed that Sydney Burnett Alleyne had declared a government-in-exile and had appointed a member of your party as the Prime Minister in exile. Is that the kind of frivolous foolishness which you would then have us say we discussed that matter at Cabinet? No attempt at grandstanding on the part of the Prime Minister, or his Ministers, will negate the fact that the establishment of such a school, in the circumstances, is unacceptable to the people of Barbados.
3.05 p.m.

I go further. The Minister responsible for Health seeks to justify the establishment of the St. George's Medical School on economic grounds. I find it embarrassing that, after all the discussion, he would come up with some of the things he has come up with.

He says that the operating expenses of the school would be approximately US\$5 million, and that it would be injected into the economy of the country through the acquisition of goods and services. I invite every able-bodied person in Barbados to examine that, as an economic proposition, if students will each spend approximately US\$2 000 in the country, with an initial class of, say, 200 in the first semester, approximately US\$400 000 will be injected into the economy.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, would you perhaps not expect that, concomitant with that statement, would be an accompanying statement quantifying the number of services which these two hundred persons would use in Barbados? I submit, at a purely theoretical level, that the services which are provided for each individual in Barbados, who lives in Barbados, exceed US\$2 000 per year. I sub-

mit that the spending of US\$2 000 a year by an American who is living here, as opposed to an American who is visiting here, is not an indication of economic gain. That is more likely to be an indication that they are going to cost us more to maintain them, because the use of our social services would cost much more than US\$2 000.

The Minister suggested that the tourist industry would have about another 2 000 people visiting, because the parents will visit their children in Barbados. That is laughable, if it were not so tragic.

The chances are that the people who come to Barbados to study will go home for their vacation, not that the parents would come to visit them. They are not in kindergarten, these would be medical students. They would more than likely wish to go home; because they would not be able to find summer jobs in Barbados, and they would go home to find summer jobs, if nothing else. So that is a waste of time.

They say that if the St. Joseph Hospital were developed, a hospital fee of US\$2 000 per student per year, with approximately 100 students doing clerkships, a fee of US\$200 000 could be realized. That, again, is clutching at straws.

Students have been in Grenada for some considerable time and they have been in St. Vincent for some considerable time. Let the honourable Members over there get up and tell us what are the substantial benefits that they can identify in quantities that Grenada, or indeed St. Vincent, can boast from these students.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker; since he has asked, Maurice Bishop told me that 60 per cent of the foreign exchange came from the medical school.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I do not believe him, because he has said before that he never talked to Maurice Bishop. Maurice Bishop is now dead, and here he is getting up using poor Maurice Bishop as a source. That is typical of him.

Why do you not tell me that Austin told you something?

(Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: He is your friend, not mine. Austin is your friend.)

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I bet you would not tell me what Austin told you, and what you told Scoon. One of these days, it will all come out in the wash, but I do not want to deal with Grenada now.

The statement goes on: "fee-paying Barbadian nationals would have their tuition fees subsidized by the

school." I think the Prime Minister should give his Minister of Health naught out of ten for that. He really should call him and speak to him. In fact, he should speak to his Minister of Information, because he wrote the statement. I think he really should tell the Minister of Information he should not have put that to fall out of the mouth of the Minister of Health. It really is not nice. Collective responsibility is one thing, but making a fool of your colleague is another. I really think that that is an embarrassment to the community.

This morning the Prime Minister made some comments about the UWI and the school, and how the last Democratic Labour Party Government had the same intentions as them. It is interesting that he said that the Democratic Labour Party had nothing to be ashamed of.

There are, I believe more than one hundred statutory bodies in this country, including the School Boards — certainly, there were during my time — and, it is not known in but a copy of the minutes of every meeting of every board, is sent to the Cabinet; and so long as a copy of the Minutes goes to the Cabinet, there is a note in the Cabinet Minutes that such and such a thing was noted.

Sir, you, yourself, have been a member of a Cabinet and you know that, from time to time, the Prime Minister, or another Minister, may report that he had a meeting with some people who made a proposal of a, b, c or d. It is then a question of whether you give the impression, subsequently, that a discussion was held and decisions arrived at. That is the impression which they seek to give to the people of Barbados, that the Cabinet discussed this matter in great detail, in the way for example, they have discussed it, and reached a conclusion similar to the ones they have reached.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have come to the conclusion that you have reached the end of your time.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the time has come so quickly that even, I, myself, am surprised. I am grateful to you for your indulgence.

I will end by saying that we cannot support this amendment, not because of the inherent nature of the amendment, but because of the motivation of the amendment and what it will accomplish. We cannot support it and will vote against it.

Hon. L. R. TULL (St. George South): Mr. Deputy Speaker, as long ago as 1971, an Inter-American Development Bank Study was commissioned to deal with medical education in the Caribbean. That report, which is in the hands of all the Governments of CARICOM, and in the hands of the University of the West Indies, pointed out that we needed double the number of medical places to

cater to the needs of the Caribbean. Ever since that time, the university has been grappling with the problem of financing for additional places for medical students at the University, and have not, so far, come up with any solution. The constraint, obviously, is money.

Before the decision was taken about the restructuring of the university, the case was put more strongly by Trinidad and Tobago, in the first place, which put out its famous White Paper on Higher Education, and this was supported to a very great extent by Jamaica. The sum total of the restructuring exercise was that each territory would be responsible for the internal running of the campus on its territory, and that any capital development on any territory undertaken by that territory, would be used solely at the discretion of the territory that pays the money.

The Government of Trinidad and Tobago is now building a medical complex at Mount Hope. Initially, it was estimated to cost about \$500 000 million, but with inflation, and with a delay in start of the complex, the figure is now over \$1 billion. The school will cater for 65 medical students, and Trinidad and Tobago have made it plain that all 65 places must be reserved for citizens of Trinidad and Tobago.

3.15 p.m.

Equally, the Government of Jamaica is putting money into the University Medical School and Hospital in Jamaica, and it is ensuring that the money that it invests in the University of the West Indies Medical School, and in the hospital in particular, will be for the Jamaican students. As long ago as 1971, it was proposed in the university that a medical school should be set up in Barbados, but nothing has come out of that — again, because of money.

At the moment, when the University of the West Indies screens its applicants for the School of Medicine, it usually get about 700 in one year; that is 700 applicants the university considers as reaching an acceptable level for entry into the University of the West Indies School of Medicine. Only one student out of seven manages to get places. I believe that they admit less than 120 students a year, but they have over 700 people whom they consider as suitable, on academic and other criteria, for entry into the School of Medicine. With these three things happening, Jamaica is looking after its own at the school in Jamaica, Trinidad and Tobago is constructing a medical school for over \$1 billion for its students, and if the Government of Barbados had any sense, it would be looking to see how it will be able to provide for its own citizens who want to enter medical school now and in the future.

What is the situation Sir? We have people who get Barbados Government Exhibitions, these are among the

top 1 per cent of our students in this country, who apply to the medical school of the University of the West Indies and cannot get places. We have people who get Barbados Scholarships and apply to the Medical School of the University of the West Indies and are told that there are no places. So I would have thought that this was an admirable opportunity for the Barbados Association of Medical Practitioners, if they are serious, and the Opposition, to work with the Government and everyone else concerned to see how we could rationalize medical education in Barbados for the future. But that is not what is happening. It strikes me that the Democratic Labour Party, in its efforts to make political issue not of everything, can even politicize motherhood.

I have searched this issue hard, long, objectively and dispassionately, to see what are the arguments put up by the Opposition, and by the handful of doctors who are opposed to the establishment of the school, to see what are their cogent arguments for opposing it. I have not found any. Even during this debate, I believe that very early the steam ran out of the case for the Opposition, because no one in the Opposition has put a case with the vehemence with which they were putting it both at public platform level and in the Press over the past two or three months. I really would like to know what, precisely, are these cogent arguments they are putting up against the establishment of the school, and I have not heard them on this score.

I believe that when the Government took the decision to establish a high-powered committee to look into the future of medical education in this country, and tie it into the establishment of this school in Barbados, they were on the right wicket. By doing that, the Government can bring to bear its own resources and its own political will to bear on the direction of the St. George's Medical School.

I understand that one of the main arguments put by the people on the other side of the argument is that the St. George's Medical School should not be allowed to use the facilities of public medical institutions in Barbados. I understand that the Minister of Health, on a number of occasions, has said that they will not be using these facilities. I think it is a little bit wicked for others to set up this argument repeatedly, and knock it down themselves, even though it is not a position of the Government, or the school, as I hear. I think it is a position repeatedly set up by the people who are against it only to knock it down, because the Government has repeatedly said that the St. George's Medical School will not be using the government clinical medical facilities.

We have had consideration by the University of the West Indies, and by the Ministers of Health in CARICOM, of the need for post-graduate study in community medicine, medicine for general practitioners. They have said that the

cost of the community post-graduate work for general practitioners is too costly at the moment to be undertaken within the context of the University of the West Indies. It is therefore an admirable area in which the Barbados Association of Medical Practitioners could try and work with Government in trying to see how we could Caribbeanize and Barbadianize the St. George's Medical School operation, bend it into the direction which we want it, and, indeed, if needs be, at a later stage to take over and manage it in the way we want to manage it. This is looking down the road and, obviously, this is the sort of thing in which the committee will look.

I am a little bit disappointed at some of the posturing being taken by individuals in a matter of such supreme importance, and I want to refer to just one person — Dr. Walrond. In 1980, the Government of Barbados identified Dr. Walrond as a man whose background and experience, not political background, as a doctor, surgeon and teacher of medicine suited him to advise on the establishment of medical schools. Indeed, he was recommended by the Government of Barbados to work with the Government of Trinidad and Tobago on a task force for establishing a medical school in Trinidad and Tobago. During that time, I was in the Ministry of Education, and Professor Walrond would make regular reports to me.

Professor Walrond was the one who pointed out to me at the time that Barbados was being put in a very difficult position in relation to medical education because of the single-mindedness of the Government of Trinidad and Tobago to look after only their own students in Trinidad and Tobago. He also expressed doubts about the future viability of the University of the West Indies and the Medical School with the new restructuring, and he advised me that the Government of Barbados should seek to find ways to ensure that medical education will continue for citizens of Barbados.

Now I have heard the Opposition, and other critics, say that the students who go to the St. George's Medical School from the United States are rejects and people who are of sub-standard level. That is a lot of nonsense. The same position that obtains in the Caribbean with respect of places, obtains in the United States. Therefore, there are a number of highly able and well-educated young men and women in the United States, who the schools of medicine in the United States say have met their entrance criteria, but cannot get into the medical schools simply because there are not enough places, and some of those are the ones who are studying at the St. George's Medical School.

To hear the Opposition talk, you would believe that these are people who could hardly get through high school, but these are students of the highest academic ability, who are denied places in medical schools in

the United States simply because they do not have enough places in that country. These are all things that one has to consider in what has become an emotional debate, heavily interlaced with a lot of political tendentiousness.

I heard the honourable Shadow Minister of Health give a very simple and straightforward exposition. Nothing in his submission amounted to a criticism of the establishment of the medical school in Barbados. I thought that all he and the speakers on the other side, including the one who makes the most extravagant and excessive statements, with the exception of the last speaker, the honourable Member for St. Michael West (Mr. B. M. Taitt) were doing was expressing certain cautions. There was not a clear and explicit statement that they were against the establishment of the school. What they were saying is that there must be certain safeguards. The Government of Barbados is more anxious than the Opposition to ensure that those safeguards are established in the law of Barbados and law practice, so that all the dire needs anticipated and feared by the honourable Member for St. Michael North West (Mr. L. A. Weekes) would not materialise.

We hear all the talk about cadavers. A word that I had not heard since I stopped studying Latin many years ago until a couple of months ago, now perhaps is the best known word in Barbados.

We have brought legislation here today, but not because it was illegal to bring corpses into Barbados for any reason before today. If you look at the law, if you understand the basis of our jurisprudence in this country, you will know that anything the law does not ban, it allows. So if the law does not say it is illegal to bring dead bodies into Barbados and cut them up, then the law allows it. That is the situation. We have, however, felt, and I have so advised the Ministry of Health, that they should perhaps be more detailed in the regulation, because under the Health Services Act, Cap. 44, I believe it is Section 10, just about everything is spelt out.

I am only going to read one particular regulation, regulation 10(1)(u). This one says that the Minister of Health may, subject to negative resolution, make regulations for the proper carrying into effect of this Act, and in particular may make regulations.....

"regulating the interment of the dead, the entry of dead bodies into Barbados, and all matters incidental thereto, and providing for the inspection of undertaking establishments, morgues, crematoria and other places used in connection with the preparation, transportation and disposal of dead bodies;"

I read that specifically to point out that it can easily be argued that this regulation already is sufficiently

detailed to achieve what this particular piece of legislation is doing now. But we are doing something which we would like to allay the fears of the people of Barbados who, as the honourable Member for St. Michael North West said, are superstitious and, therefore, will have strange notions about what happens to dead bodies.

We feel that the type of amendment that we have brought to the Act today will perhaps go somewhere in allaying those fears. The fears did not arise out of nothing, the fears arose out of a calculated attempt by the members of the Opposition to get through to the public that something contrary to the law was happening and that it was being sanctioned by the Government; that the bringing of dead bodies into Barbados for cutting up was wrong and against the law. I am saying that there is nothing in the law that says so.

We have also the question of the agreement or the proposals. Again, those who are against the establishment of the school picked up and ran with a proposal which has never even been considered by the Attorney General's Chambers. It has never been submitted by anybody in Government, or any agency for the Government to study. In other words, nobody has ever submitted to the Attorney General's Office for study, so it was a mere proposal, prepared privately by somebody and floating around. But the Opposition picks it up, and *the Nation*, a disreputable newspaper. *The Nation* takes a proposal, which has not been put to us for study and agreement on, and sets it out to the public as if it is something the Government of Barbados has agreed to. I learned that the proposal was in the hands of the *Nation* before it was in the hands of the Government.

Asides.

Hon. L. R. TULL: The honourable Member for St. Michael West said that the *Nation* got it from the Government's files. That is something we have to deal with. I do not think the Opposition should encourage civil servants to take things out of files and hand to anybody, but they are very good at that. I well remember having a letter that was sent to me as a Minister, and had a minute written in my hand on the same letter, turn up at the headquarters of the Democratic Labour Party. I remember that very well — they encouraged it!

Asides.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I can only speak of what I know. I know it ended up at the Democratic Labour Party's headquarters. It was a letter off my file, so they encouraged that.

Getting back to the substance of the matter, we in the Barbados Labour Party have no difficulty at all in having an offshore medical school set up in Barbados.

What is important for us, and that is why we have decided not to be rushed into any decisions but to study this matter, is that we do some negotiating and get some people to advise us, because we want when it is established that we would be able to have maximum influence on many of the areas where the Opposition seemed to have fears.

There is the question of standards, whether the school would do any damage to the quality of health services delivered to this country. We will look into these problems very closely, and we will make our decision consistent with our own thinking. Our decision will have nothing to do with the energies of the Democratic Labour Party and its cohorts in the medical profession, who seek to find an issue for the political platforms.

I have heard the honourable Deputy Prime Minister make allusion to the fact that the doctors use the hospital facilities, something that has caused me considerable concern for a long period. Some of these people, who have lucrative medical practices outside the hospital, get on to the University of the West Indies' staff, and the Vice Dean of the medical staff in Barbados is Professor Walrond, do practically no work in the university — and I mean practically, Sir — but by being attached to the staff of the University of the West Indies in a token way they are given the use of the full facilities of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, including hospital beds. That is something that has always troubled me, and something I have asked questions about over and over again without a satisfactory answer.

When you hear the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central (Dr. R. C. Haynes) — I wanted to conclude my speech without making any reference to him, but that has been bothering me a long time — saying that they give free assistance to the University of the West Indies, that is a fraudulent statement. What they do is they get their private patients into the hospital, which they could not ordinarily have done, use the facilities of the hospital for their private patients, and, at the end of it, the patients go to their office when they leave the hospital and pay the big fat fees in their doctors' offices and not into the Hospital. That is a fact.
3.35 p.m.

I do not propose at this stage to widen the debate, as it has been widened into the whole question of the National Health Service. I believe we will have time at a later stage to deal with that. But I would make an appeal, because I really think that too much energy, and sometimes malicious energy, has been used in putting the worst construction on what has been done and decided in respect of this medical school.

I was at a party last Saturday night, and I overheard three doctors talking, including the honourable Member

for St. Michael South Central. In the middle of the people's party they had a cadaver session, the bunch of necrophiliacs — that is what they are — and they were talking about cadavers, the school and such topics.

I overheard them — I believe that they were talking for me to hear; they were trying to give me a message, they know me — and I understood them to be saying that one and a half million dollars was passed to somebody to set up a school here. That had me wondering, because I do not know about those kinds of figures. But they were saying it at the party loud enough for people, who were having a good time, to hear — so that they would walk about and say so.

Even under the cloak of privileges in here, we have not even heard one of them get up and make such a charge, not one of them. That is the kind of thing that does our whole society a grave injustice. And over what?

I have before me some of the files dealing with this matter from way back, including some things that I wrote on files in the Ministry of Education when I was there a few years ago.

The Democratic Labour Party Government, despite the protestations of the honourable Member for St. Michael West, did engage in serious negotiations with people for the setting up of a medical school in Barbados. They held meetings not only with five doctors from the United States of America, including one whose name they called today, but they met with the people's lawyers who came down from the United States. They also met with one or two prominent Barbadians, who were pushing the idea of the medical school, and they even identified the property of one of the leading members of the Democratic Labour Party which they were going to buy to establish the school there.

There were several meetings between the Ministry of Health, the Ministry of Education and, I think, the Ministry of Finance. I am not too sure about the Ministry of Finance, although the then Prime Minister was involved, but certainly there were meetings with the Ministry of Health and the Ministry of Education. When Dr. Caddle was Minister of Health, when the honourable Member for St. Michael South was Minister of Education at one time and Minister of Health in the other and when Mr. Frederick Smith was Minister of Education, all during that period there were active and constant negotiations going on over the establishment of a school. That they did not come to a conclusion, because they were already seeking property and getting funding, was only because the elections of 1976 came in and spoiled their effort.

I have no doubt, Sir, that if those elections had gone the other way, there would have been the establishment of the same medical school in Barbados in the

year 1977. But you hear them talking, you hear all this hypocrisy, led by someone who has a certain axe to grind in this matter.

I want everybody to know that not all the doctors in Barbados are against the establishment of the medical school in Barbados. On the contrary, the majority of the doctors in Barbados are not against it, and many senior doctors in Barbados are very much for it. I have talked to a number of them who do not seem to have the courage to come out and say publicly what they feel — they seem to be afraid of their own peers. I tell them there is no point telephoning me at night, or meeting me somewhere socially and bending my ear over some of the foolishness some of their colleagues are saying when they do not have the courage to say so publicly.

I want it to be understood that the doctor's position is not a monolithic medical position against the establishment of a medical school. It is the position of a minority of doctors, Democratic Labour Party-oriented doctors, led by two of the most active politicians in Barbados, one Haynes and one Walrond.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: That brings you to the end of your half hour.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD (St. Michael South): I have always been guided in my observations on public affairs in this country by what I consider to be the best interest of the people of this country. I also retain the right to think independently on all issues which come before this Chamber for consideration. I therefore wish to make it clear from the start that there are certain basic things in relation to this country against which I have no objection. I do not object to motherhood, I do not object to fatherhood and I do not object to education. In fact, most of my productive life has been dedicated towards the educational upliftment and advancement of this country.

I believe if there is one area of activity in which this country has over the years shown commendable leadership and registered advances, it has been in the area of education, and I see absolutely nothing wrong with medical education being set up, or facilities for medical education being developed, in this country as a general principle. It depends, however, on what are the specific proposals for medical education that may be proposed from time to time.

Let me make it clear and outright that, in principle, I have no objection to the development, or extension, or expansion of medical education in this country, or engineering education, or of any of the technologies, as the case may be. What I would say specifically in relation to this matter, however, is that while I was Minister of Education in this country, and while I was Minister of

Health in this country, I never became aware of any proposals coming from American sources for the establishment of offshore medical schools which I could find acceptable.

I do not deny that proposals came before the Democratic Labour Party Government. I was aware of some of them, I do not know whether I was aware of all of them. I will certainly say that certain things may have happened of which I was not aware, because Government is sometimes like an iceberg — there is only a certain part of it visible but most of it may be under the surface — and members of a Government, or members of a political party, may not be aware of all that is going on. I speak of those matters of which I am aware, and in which I may have had some kind of input to make. 3.45 p.m.

As far as proposals for the establishment of a medical school in Barbados by American sponsors are concerned, I certainly recall, I believe, one Pishotta and a Dr. Merliss making one proposal while I was Minister of Education. I was very skeptical. My name, as Minister of Education, was used as being appointed to serve on a Committee, and my name was used in that particular regard in vain, because I was never consulted on that, and I never gave my agreement on that particular matter. So I made no commitment to the establishment of any medical school while I as Minister of Education.

I will say this much as well. As Minister of Health, I certainly recall at some time in 1976, around the month of April, a letter from a prominent Barbadian was received in the Ministry of Health advancing the cause, or making a proposal or submission, for the establishment of a medical school in Barbados — it was dated April 8, 1976, I am jogging my memory — and indicating that certain properties might be desirable as a place for use in that particular proposal. As Minister of Health, I was aware that officials of the Ministry met some time later in April with some of the proposers, or founders and co-sponsors, or however they describe themselves, of this particular school. I think these things are well known. They were Dr. Merliss, a Dr. Cooper, a Dr. Simpson and then a Mr. Burke, I believe, who was the developer.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am jogging my memory, and it is a fact. How could I deny that? So the Minister responsible for Health and my senior officials were meeting with the proponents of that particular proposal.

I know that what was being proposed was an institution which would be of no cost to Barbados. They said it was non-profit, they said it would have been supported by the fees of the students, and that, as I had indicated already, Maxwell Great House might have been used for that particular purpose. Indeed, that might have been proposed.

I do not wish us to malign the Barbados Association of Medical Practitioners, because even at that very early stage the Barbados Association of Medical Practitioners was indicating that the facilities of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital would not be adequate for all of the students from that school to do their clinical work. That is as far as I was aware from the Ministry of Health.

Then, some weeks later, the then Prime Minister sent down some documentation. Apparently some other discussions or communications had been going on with him, and he sent these down to the Ministry of Health for consideration. These included some major new proposals, in addition to what had been put forward, by this prominent Barbadian, which called for a further examination, and on which no decision could be taken without an indepth analysis of the whole matter.

Do you know what they wanted, Mr. Deputy Speaker? They wanted the St. Michael District Hospital to be upgraded into a first-class medical institution with all of the facilities of a modern hospital, including an acute room, an X-Ray Department, laboratory facilities and all of the other ancillary facilities for the service and treatment of patients. That would have meant a considerable injection of finance into that particular institution.

Nay more, Mr. Deputy Speaker. They were also asking for the establishment of a private hospital as part of the medical school. And they were not saying that they were going to build the private hospital; they were saying that that new hospital would have to be dealt with through the joint efforts of the sponsors of the school and the Government of Barbados!

Now how, Mr. Deputy Speaker, do you expect that I, as Minister of Education, or the Democratic Labour Party, which has always proceeded on the basis of a thorough and complete examination of all the proposals put before it, could take a decision at that particular time? Meetings were held and we examined the proposal.

I wish to say this also. The experiences with some of the earlier proposals and sponsors of some of these medical schools were not all happy. Some of them might very well have been thugs. Some of them had no real interest in medical education as such, but in the profits that may result from education, and I was always very skeptical of such kinds of development.

To the best of my knowledge, I am aware of three occasions in 1976 on which this matter came before the Cabinet. Two of them were purely for purposes of information; one of them being the Prime Minister indicating that he had received some documents which he would refer to the Ministry of Health and the other was one in

which he was saying that exploratory discussions — I do not remember exactly — I think the words were quoted in this particular document here; I am very grateful that I can refer to it — Oh yes, on 22nd April:

"The Prime Minister informed the Cabinet of exploratory discussions"

(This is the Prime Minister under the Democratic Labour Party regime:)

".....which a group of medical men from the U.S.A., led by a Dr. Merliss, had recently held with him and Dr. the Hon. R. B. Caddle about establishing a medical training school in Barbados."

3.55 p.m.

Note the words "exploratory discussions". As any competent Prime Minister, as indeed he was, receiving a proposal, he said that he had began "exploratory discussions," or that "exploratory discussions" were being held.

The other occasion was when a paper was submitted, in which the facts.....

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of explanation, Sir. Perhaps, the honourable Member was in the House. He would be unaware of the fact, of course, that the former Prime Minister has denied that he ever had any discussions with Dr. Caddle about a medical school, and that he ever met the promoters, so I am very glad that the old recollection of the Cabinet decision accords with ours.

Can the honourable Member deal with the fact that in 1975 the Ministry of Health had written to those people telling them that they approved the setting up of the medical school in principle?

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am referring to a statement that was issued, I believe by the present Minister of Health, in which he is referring to a Cabinet note, which says, quite clearly, that exploratory discussions had been held. I am not in any position to deny that, that is an extract from the Cabinet note.

In respect of discussions between the Minister of Health in 1975 and the sponsors or co-sponsors, I cannot speak on that. I was Minister of Education at that particular time, and I am not aware of the discussions to which the Prime Minister may be referring in specific terms.

What I am saying is that the position of the Ministry of Health, during the period when I was Minister of Health, in the early part and middle of 1976, was to the effect that the Ministry of Health so directed, the political directorate of the Ministry of Health at that time, was unable to come to any decision on these particular

proposals. It would have called for an indepth and careful study by all of the interested parties. That was my particular position at that time.

There is one thing I learnt from my long experience in public affairs, — it is little known that I had some months in the public service of this country — and that is what b.u. and p.a. means. When you have any matter to deal with and you have to think about it, you do not rush and put down any decision, you do not rush in where angels fear to tread. You say, "Alright, you defer this matter for a little while and you can bring it up, if you so desire, at some future date." This is exactly what I did in 1976. I knew I had another battle on my hands, so I was not dealing with that matter at that time.

I wish to make this point in all seriousness. There is nothing that I have heard so far — and I regret that due to other commitments I was unable to hear the earlier speeches in this particular debate — which indicates that the Democratic Labour Party's Cabinet had taken any decision for the establishment of a medical school or a medical university in Barbados. I am unaware of it.

(Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Let me see the letter. You agreed "in principle.")

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Did you hear what I said? I said I was a member of the Cabinet, and I am unaware, as a member of the then Cabinet, of any decisions taken by the Cabinet, in principle, in substance, or in any other form.

I am prepared to revise that position when documentation is presented showing that the Cabinet of Barbados took such a decision. But I am saying that at this moment, I am unaware, as a member of that Cabinet, of any decision being taken by the Cabinet in 1976, or before, agreeing in principle or in substance for the establishment of a medical school or a medical university. But that is by the way.

These amendments are the St. George's Medical School Amendments, we are all aware of this, and the point is that the establishment of a medical school is no small matter. The Government has found itself in this particular position perhaps because it is not as open in this matter as it might have been. The concept of "open Government" seems to be on the retreat in recent times. And as far as the Government is concerned, it should not have to be going back and saying "Look, the Democratic Labour Party did this and therefore we are on good ground." I thought what you would be saying.....

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of explanation: The honourable Member really has suffered a little bit from not coming earlier to the debate. I do not care what the Democratic Labour Party said or did, and

that is what I said in my speech. The Democratic Labour Party should not now come and say how hostile it is and how wicked it is to have a medical school, when in the past it had agreed in principle to one. That is the burden of our speech — inconsistency, not precedent!

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I wish to make the point that, as Minister of Education, I was committed, and the Democratic Labour Party was committed, as far as I am aware, to the expansion of medical education in Barbados through the University of the West Indies. As far as I am concerned, there could be other developments, provided the terms and conditions are right, but what I have seen so far does not convince me that the proposals for offshore medical education are in the interest of Barbados.

I would like to call upon the Government really to set out all of these antecedents to make public the documents on which these decisions were supposed to have been made by the Democratic Labour Party. And quote them in full. I believe they should be quoted in full, not in terms of extracts; I believe the full documentation should be set out so that the people can be aware of what it is.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not wish to speak any longer. I merely wished to get those matters on the Record and to say that we are not convinced, as a party, that the proposals that have been so far put forward, and which we are aware of, are in the best interest of this country. 4.05 p.m.

Mr. L. L. SISNETT (St. Michael North East): Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I cannot believe that.....

SUSPENSION

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: On a point of order, Sir: It is now 4.05 p.m., and I beg to move that the House be suspended for 15 minutes.

Hon. L. R. TULL: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER suspended the sitting accordingly. 4.10 p.m.

ON RESUMPTION

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: This sitting is now resumed. When the suspension was taken, the honourable Member for St. Michael North East was about to speak. He may now speak, if he so desires.

Mr. L. L. SISNETT (St. Michael North East): Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I wish to support this Bill which we

have spent the entire day discussing. Hardly would I want to believe that a country like Barbados, which boasts of such a high literacy rate, would at this time still be discussing the pros and cons of the establishment of a medical school in Barbados.

The other side has made some accusations, and I summed them all up as a storm in a tea cup. While listening to the cricket from Guyana during the week, I heard one of the commentators making reference to Daylight Saving Time. It caused me to think for a while that here in Barbados that little phrase "Daylight Saving Time" was a very serious political issue and it caused the Government to make certain retractions in the interest of the stability of the country. But that, too, was a storm in the tea cup.

Importing cadavers into Barbados for a medical school is all part of the education process, and since we are boasting of an enlightened society, I do not see how the Opposition could in any way want to bring pressure on the Government to force them to perhaps discontinue consideration of the proposal of that medical school.

The law is rather silent on the importation of cadavers, and I am at a loss when I hear calls from professional bodies like the Bar Association and BAMP, and some individuals, calling on the Government to refuse the establishment of a medical school in Barbados. It seems to me that they are asking the Government to impose some form of dictatorship in the country. I submit that if there is nothing on the Statute Books which would prevent the importation of dead bodies into Barbados, I cannot see how a Government, which boasts of being a democratic Government, could impose a ban on the establishment of a medical college in Barbados.

The proposal is not novel, because as far back as 1975 the then Government of the day commissioned a preliminary report on the establishment of a privately financed medical facility in Barbados. In 1975, there were no adverse comments then from any of the established organisations, no adverse comment from any newspaper of the day, no front page stories — nothing! There was an air of total silence. What amuses me today is that what was very silent in 1975 has become a focal point of contention in Barbados.

The Government of the day in 1975 went into full detail on the economic feasibility of that privately-financed medical facility. The International Medical Foundation in a document submitted on 20th June, 1975, under the section dealing with the economic feasibility, states:

"An entering class of approximately 200 American students will be paying their tuition to the Central Funding Investment Corporation. The Caribbean College of Medical Arts will provide all the

operating revenue required to support a full 4½ year programme in the Barbados school of medicine. This amount of funding will also provide for the free education for 20 to 30 Barbadian students per year."

So it would seem to me that the then Government was fully aware, and did recognise, the need for a medical school in Barbados.

These schools do exist in other developed and Third World countries. They exist in Mexico, in Egypt, and in London, we know of one in St. Vincent and we also know that there was one in Grenada. If we are boasting of such a high literacy rate in this country, what could be so adverse about the setting up of such a school in Barbados? Who will suffer from such an organisation here in Barbados?

One can see the economic benefits, because if they are going to be over 200 students in class at any one time, the tuition must be paid by some external source, and that is foreign exchange, and we know that it will generate some kind of ancillary employment. We have also heard the Prime Minister saying that the 600 students would provide as much foreign exchange as 2,500 tourists.
4.30 p.m.

I can hardly think, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that today, when many other countries are occupied with housing their people, education and alleviating poverty, when Canada today is discussing the prospect of another Prime Minister, and when there is also the question of high inflation, world wide recession, high unemployment, shortage of food, serious economic problems everywhere, this Assembly could find time to discuss the setting up of an educational institution from which Barbadians themselves will benefit.

There is existing in Barbados what I call the medical mentality. Doctors become very unco-operative in trying new approaches to the established dogmas which they have traditionally gone through. Doctors, with few exceptions, are usually card bearing members of the medical establishment, and they are interested only in continuing that membership — they do not want others, whom they consider undesirables, to infiltrate that membership.

Doctors are also members of local, regional and medical societies, such as the American Medical Association, the British Medical Practitioners' Association and here in Barbados, BAMP, as it is called. All of these associations have goals which are usually of self-interest. The members who stay in line are supported, and those who go astray are censored.

I believe there are many Barbadians, who may want to have access to the tuition and training, who might not

necessarily have the qualifications at the outset, but who, in the end, might turn out to be very capable and proficient practitioners. I feel that the Government is right in so desiring to consider through a committee the establishment of the St. George's Medical School, and I certainly want to give my support to the concept, as it relates to the law of Barbados, in so far as they comply with all the requirements. I would like to see more schools established here in Barbados.

When the former Administration established HARP, the High Altitude Research Project, that was an offshore facility for scientific training for engineers and so on. There were no protests in those years. The facility flourished for a number of years in Christ Church and the only thing it brought was damage to a few properties there.

I believe that only good can come from having this medical school in Barbados, and I would really want to give it my wholehearted support. I hope the Opposition will come around to seeing the sense in supporting the measure giving Barbadians, who may wish, the opportunity to practise in it.

The question that the Bill be read a second time was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:

Ayes: Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS; Hon. H. B. St. JOHN; Hon. L. S. CRAIG; Hon. L. R. TULL; Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE; Hon. Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM; Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW; Mr. R. E. BRATHWAITE; Mr. A. TRUSS; Mr. L. L. SISNETT and Mr. J. G. ODLE — 11.

Noes: Messrs. B. M. TAITT and L. A. WEEKES — 2.

On the motion of Hon. L. S. CRAIG, seconded by Hon. L. R. TULL, Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. J. G. ODLE in the Chair.

COMMITTEE

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The House is in Committee.

Clause 1 was called and passed.

Clause 2 was called.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to move that Clause 2 stand part.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS (St. Thomas): In seconding that Clause 2 stand part, Sir, I want, first, to congratulate the Leader of the Opposition on his pre-

science four or five years ago in removing the honourable Member for St. Michael West (Mr. B. M. Taitt) as Shadow Minister of Finance. If the honourable Member's grasp of finance is as such as is exemplified in his calculation as to the benefit of 600 students in terms of tourists, I think that we are well rid of him.

The honourable Member cannot think that a medical student here for three terms could spend less than, I would say, \$8 000 in Barbados. He could not think that. As a matter of fact, it is documented. They are paying, I think it is, \$600 a month rent and they have to spend a certain amount every week to buy food.

I do not know if the honourable Member has any children abroad studying. I have consulted with other honourable Members on this side, and in no case do any of us get any change out of \$18 000 a year. I spend more, over \$20 000 a year, in supporting a student child abroad.

This is important, this is not an irrelevancy. Let us assume that the medical students who come down here are not rich, will not drink a liquor when the evening comes, will not have a video cassette or rent a TV film, will not rent a car and drive to Bathsheba, all they will do is sit down, eat chicken and bread and never eat corn flakes or any other expensive imported foods — so take half of \$20 000, and take away a bit more, and come, say, to a figure of \$8 000 a year for a student to rent a house and buy food and live. Six hundred multiplied by 8 000 is 48 million. The average spending of a tourist in Barbados is around Bds. \$1 400. Forty-eight million divided by 1 400 is 32 500 and some odd, so I was even wrong when I said that 600 students are the equivalent of 20 000 tourists — they are the equivalent of 30 000 tourists. If you make 600 x 8 000 other than 48 million, tell me.

4.40 p.m.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Sir, one of the wonderful things about this system we have in Parliament is that you get to speak in English. The honourable Member wanted to congratulate the Leader of the Opposition for removing the Shadow Minister of Finance, because, he said, that I could not calculate. He then went on to make a speech.

The honourable Member should get up and apologise to me, first of all, when I am finished, and, secondly, I will show you why you will agree with me that your Minister of Health should be fired.

What I was reading when he came in through the door was the foolishness which your Minister of Health said to the members of the Senate. If you look at page 8 of the statement of your Minister, you will see that it is he who said: "students will each spend approximately US \$2 000 a year in the country." I was castigating him

when you came through the door. He is the one who said \$2 000 a year, not me, so you should fire him.

You would say that he has nothing to do with finance, so you can keep him as Minister of Health, but he is the person who said \$2 000, not me, so do not get up in here and try to prance on me. He is the joker,... well, not him; the person who wrote the speech for him is the person who said that.

You should be ashamed of yourself for getting up and trying to castigate me before you found out what the facts are. You came through the door, you heard me saying \$2 000 and, as usual, you thought you had a point.

It is your Minister who had said so on page 8, not me. I agree with you. I think you should apologise, you are a big man.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I now understand. I cannot fully accept the blame, but I understand that he was quoting.

It is \$4.8 million, incidentally — even I am confusing myself — but I do accept what the honourable Member is saying. The students could never spend such a little amount as \$2 000. If that error was contained therein, well, the reproof is taken.

I really do not believe that a student could spend only US \$2 000 in this country in a year of study. That figure probably related to a term, or a much shorter period.

The question that Clause 2 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

On the motion of Hon. L. S. CRAIG, seconded by Hon. L. R. TULL, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. L. S. CRAIG, seconded by Hon. L. R. TULL the Bill was read a third time and passed.

Order No. 5 was called — To move that the House resolve itself into Committee of Supply to consider the grant of sums of money for the service of the island.

On motion of Hon. L. S. CRAIG, seconded by Hon. L. R. TULL, Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. J. G. ODLE in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The House is in Committee of Supply.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1983-84

No. 23 \$413 352

HEAD 10 — GOVERNOR GENERAL

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I beg to move that Head 10 stand part.

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

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

HEAD 13 — SERVICES COMMISSIONS

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to move that Head 13 stand part.

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

Mr. B. M. TAITT (St. Michael West): Mr. Chairman, I just want to ask something on Services Commissions. I, in recent times, heard the Minister responsible for Establishments indicating that he was unaware that 200 persons had been dismissed.

Asides.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I will take it under the next Head.

The question that Head 13 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 14 — ESTABLISHMENTS

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to move that Head 14 stand part.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS (St. Thomas): I beg to second that.

I do not know if honourable Members want a long debate on this matter. We waxed very warm in Cabinet, because we were very furious at the confusion which led to 200 workers in the Ministry of Health being without wages on a Friday.

This is the vote, which I am satisfied, beyond any peradventure, the Permanent Secretary (Finance) told officials of the Ministry of Health could be used to pay the wages. We had agreed that this vote needed supplementing anyhow, this is Item 2, Other Personal Emoluments, and any monies paid from it to the Ministry of Health could be recouped in the supplementary.

We were told that an officer of the Ministry of Health rang the Chief Establishments Officer, did not

make it clear that it was on my advice, and that of the Ministry of Finance, that the funds were being sought — and it was quite a small amount of money, only \$11 000 — and so there was no money released. And we were told that the officer concerned in the Ministry of Health said he felt tired and he went home, although the Permanent Secretary (Finance) had remained in his office, and indeed made himself available the next day, Saturday, because I was ringing him to ask him how all of this had developed.

As I said, we were very angry over the matter. There were contradictory instructions and there were contradictory understandings among, and between, the personnel officers in the Ministry of Health and the chief financial officers. And although the Schedule of Personal Emoluments said quite clearly that only either 24 or 28 general workers were to be employed on the Public Health Service vote, a much larger number were employed. Indeed, they were trying to lay off 78, so clearly more than two dozen more had been employed. All of this created a confusion that reflects no credit on the public officers concerned. It is, however, now the subject of an enquiry, and my feelings have been made known in no uncertain way.

I have also examined very carefully whether anything I might have said, either as Minister of Establishments, or Minister of Finance or as Prime Minister, could have led them to the layoffs. I am satisfied that, although my words may have frightened the Permanent Secretary, the directions relating to the hiring of excessive staff, and its rejection, were uttered only in respect of the Aedes Egypti inspectors. But they were not in fact affected at all, because they were not due to be paid that day, and none of them were laid off.

I know that politicians should not say that public officers have not done their duty, but it puts us in a bad way. What do you do when you find examples of fairly clear incompetence within a Ministry, and a lack of supervision and direction from the top that you are entitled to expect? We have no power to discipline civil servants. We have no real power to deal with them at all, except by way of transfer to a less sensitive position; and even transfer now has come to be regarded as a punishment, so the National Union of Public Workers negotiates for people not to be transferred. We are therefore in a very awkward position.

We are supplementing this vote because I believe that, in the end, some of it may in fact have been used to meet the salaries since the date of the contretemps, and I am now asked to move not the sum of \$167 437, but of \$420 543 made up of \$413 352 under Item 2, and, I suppose, it is \$55 015 under Item 3 and \$7 191 under Item 4.

I beg to move this amendment and that Head 14 stand part as amended. The additional sums are related to the Ministry of Health matters.

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

Mr. B. M. TAITT (St. Michael West): Mr. Chairman, I heard what the Prime Minister had to say, as I had read what was reported through the GIS as being his thoughts. The system of Government which we operate appears to me to make it extremely difficult, short of a venal act on the part of someone, that the Prime Minister, neither in his capacity as Minister of Finance nor in his capacity as Minister responsible for Establishments, would not know that as many as 200 persons were in danger not only of being sent home without notice on the same day, but at the same time not even to be paid for the work they had done, those who ought to be paid weekly. It just seems to me that it is untenable in the system of Government which we have that workers can find themselves in that kind of position.

I have spoken before about the ineptitude and the lack of morale in the Civil Service in Barbados today. I believe that the *ad hoc* manner in which a number of Ministers operate has led to a breakdown of the systems in some respects. I am told, for example, that all employment now has to go to the Prime Minister's Office, including all of the temporary posts, from whichever Ministry such posts are to be employed. If that is true, it seems all the more reason why those 200 persons ought not to have been treated in that manner.

It appears that the Prime Minister is saying that he did not know about it. He says he has been angry, and I will accept that he has been angry. I think what may have happened is that the Prime Minister gave a general direction about laying off some of the persons who are in these categories in order to deal with his current financial difficulties. He might have done that, and he might have, through his officials, indicated a certain stringency in the methods that would be employed if persons went beyond their votes, and confused people working in the Government Departments may have decided, "Well I am not doing anything unless I have directions, because where I use my discretion I may find myself in trouble."

There is another version going around. I am not going to give it currency at this time, I have heard it and it seems so unbelievable that I will not be the agent that gives it currency in this Honourable Chamber, but I am going to check. I do not wish to put it on the Table.

I however draw it to the Government's attention that this whole area of methodology that is used to lay off people is unacceptable in a community like ours, because you never hear of any people in the middle or

at the top being laid off — it is always the persons who fall at the bottom. The odd person gets sent on special leave, and I do not like the methodology for special leave either. I think that what we have

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable Member is straying.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: No, Sir, I am not straying, I am dealing with Establishments, and Establishments has to do with personnel, and what I am saying is that I think we have to reform the machinery that we have now. We have to modernise our system so that if a Minister feels genuinely that a person is incompetent, that that person can have a reasonable trial, within a reasonable time, and that a decision can be made concerning the discipline.

I do not like the idea of the few persons being sent on special leave. Each time that has happened, one has come to feel that that is a political decision, and that the person is suffering because of his political affiliation, whereas it may very well be that in each single case it had to do with nothing more than inefficiency.

I am not here making a case for how wicked the Government is. I do that at other times. I am saying that it is not good for Barbados as a country, it is not good for the efficiency of our public sector for there to be these constant lay-offs of numbers of people down the line.

A few weeks ago, for example, there was a stated lay-off of persons in the Soil Conservations Unit. Then there was a statement put out saying it was not true, it was an error, that the persons had to report back to work the following Monday, and then, a few weeks later, there was another statement saying that some of the persons were being laid off. Whether this is true or false, I am saying that it is unnecessary, and it is inept, for there to be all this anxiety created among people about their livelihood.

I am not going to try to turn this into a full-fledged debate on this issue, but I hope that I have served sufficient warning that it is an area that will form a platform issue unless something is done about it immediately. I am not afraid of political issues, but I do not like political issues where people are suffering while we are discussing the issues. I do not like political issues where the small people, those at the bottom, rightly or wrongly, can come to feel that the weight of the system is falling down on their shoulders. I think we have a responsibility, no matter which side we are on, to make the less fortunate, but nonetheless important, people who work in our system feel equally secure in their positions, because they, too, have mouths to feed at home, they too, have to go home to wives, and they too, have family lives and

all of the problems that we have, and they do not have as easy solutions as some of us can find by virtue of the positions we occupy in this society.

I will say no more at this point, Mr. Chairman, but I hope I have put the issue, as I see it, in some kind of perspective.
5.00 p.m.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I regret that in the last twenty minutes I seem to be doting as much as another honourable Member of the House some many years my senior. I think that I may have been mistaken in my attack on the honourable Member's arithmetic on the last item, and I now find that I am mistaken in moving the amendment which I have just offered. A piece of paper was put in my hand and I misunderstood it. We do not have to supplement this vote and I beg to withdraw the amendment.

I also offer the honourable Member a compliment, something which rarely comes from me to him. I think every word of the speech he just made is well judged. The advice he offers is also well judged and will be well taken.

I believe that he is exactly and precisely right in saying that so great a state of confusion and fear may have been engendered in certain senior civil servants that they took the steps they took in connection with the Ministry of Health.

I myself do not like the device of special leave. But the honourable Member is mistaken in thinking it is a politician's device. That is where the mistake lies. The politicians advise the Public Service Commission that Mr. X is incompetent. I do not recall that the words, "special leave" have ever come on my desk. It is not a matter for politicians.

The Government Printer, for example, was a case where there was open and clear incompetence and unfitness for office. The Public Service Commission is repeatedly unwilling to take the step of trying a man for incompetence. When a civil servant is incompetent beyond belief, and the political official, who ultimately has to answer for that incompetence, makes this clear to the Chief Personnel Officer, immediately the 'old boy network' comes into play. The object is to prevent somebody from going home without a pension, no matter how wicked or incompetent.

In the case of a female officer who made photocopies of confidential documents relating to the dispute between the American Embassy and the Government of Barbados and carried them home — that is a breach of the Official Secrets Act — that officer was allowed to resign. The Public Service Commission then said that they

had no power to stop her from going and working at the American Embassy!

In the case of the Government Printer, for seven years he allowed a vital piece of machinery to stay in the yard of Government Headquarters in a box in the rain, because he said it was too big to get through the door of the Government Printery. An admirable officer, who had been kept down for years in the Establishments Division — I was very proud to see him acting as a Permanent Secretary yesterday — was sent to act at the Government Printery, and in the first two or three days he acted, he broke open the box and discovered that the box was too big to get through the door — not the machinery. It was a big box guarding a delicate piece of machinery. And in a matter of a month, less than a month, he had the House of Assembly Debates, which had been two years in arrears, up-to-date.

You cannot want clearer evidence of incompetence than a whole file dealing with this equipment and the recommendation of the Government Printer that a new building should be built to accommodate the Government Printery so that the equipment could get in. And he nearly got through, too!

We did not send anybody on special leave in that case. It was done by people who do not want public officers to lose their jobs.

Before I left my office this morning, a file came on my desk relating to filling the place of three public officers who were no longer in the service. One had been dismissed and the other two had resigned. The one who was dismissed was a very low level officer. The other two, who had resigned, were slightly senior officers. One of them had been the subject of a security report by the police, who reported that he was a serious security danger in a particular area of Government. They reported that he was in contact with criminal elements in this country and was giving them information relating to the commission of crimes.

Aside

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: He was not a policeman. He was involved in a mutiny in a particular part of the Government Service — an actual mutiny with death and gun and everything! The Attorney-General will know who I mean.

Having been removed from where he was, because he was suspended, he was put on special leave and then went back to work. Everybody complained bitterly. He could not stay there. He was then sent to somewhere else, also involved in the administration of justice, and this time, I think it was the money that he handled. And I discovered this morning that he has resigned with a pension.

Somebody below him was dismissed from the Government Service because he was less slick and smart. It is always only the people down at the bottom, just as the honourable Member said, who suffer these severe penalties of actually being dismissed.

I really think that until a comparatively senior civil servant is prosecuted, not for stealing money, but for some other offence, or until the Privy Council allows the politicians to deal with the appeals of public servants — because I really think the Privy Council operates up in the skies when it comes to knowledge of what actually happens — that will continue.

When I first was a member of the Privy Council in Barbados, some papers were sent to me relating to the appeal of a man who had been employed in the Ministry of Education. He had been dishonest, and he had attempted to rape a clerical officer in the Ministry. She worked in the Ministry and he tried to rape her in the Ministry.

(Mr. B. M. TAITT: Was he prosecuted?)

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: He was not prosecuted. But there was a lot of evidence relating to it.

I happen to know the man concerned, and I well remember when he was charged for raping two Canadian girls at Sunset Crest. He also had a number of other cases relating to his total incapacity to keep his hands off women.

You must not make a man guilty by association, but where a young girl in the Ministry of Education tells an extraordinary story about how a man tries to rape her on the corridor, and you have to assess, as a Permanent Secretary, whether that girl is inventing the story or the man, in denying it, is a good and decent citizen, you must look at the fact that the man, before George Moe gave him a job, was one of the best known rapists in St. James.

I seriously feared that the Privy Council was going to say it was only her word against his. By good fortune, the acting Governor-General at the time happened to be the Chief Justice. But I seriously feared that that little girl was going to have to go through — this was in 1976; in other words, it was long ago — her career in the Service with a man grabbing her in a room in the Ministry of Education and trying to rape her, and then having to see the man walking about still working in the Government Service.

Aside.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The honourable Member is perhaps extrapolating from his own experiences

in this matter. It is not everybody who is put off by a slap.

The honourable Member, I think, has spoken very cogently and reasonably. He has warned us, and he has asked us not to let politics appear to be involved in these decisions.

5.10 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, no politics are in these decisions. I had a meeting with officials of the National Housing Corporation — and I do not think the honourable Member will say that the National Housing Corporation dismissed only small people in the number that was sent away — and I thought that it was best to bring it out in the open. I said, we were undertaking a re-organization of the staff and we would have to lay off some of them. I believe that at the National Housing Corporation, about half of the employees support the Government and about half oppose the Government. Of the employees who support the Government, one-third are vagabonds who have got jobs through political influence, free-loading, and not pulling their weight. Of the people who oppose the Government, about one-third are vagabonds, who are saboteurs trying to destroy Government's policy. I said, "Make sure that you get rid of the free-loaders as well as the saboteurs."

The honourable Member for St. Andrew (Hon. L. B. Brathwaite) was present and heard me utter those words. I do not think that particularly the honourable Member or the people at the Housing Corporation liked it — they are hard words — because of the reflection on the quality of the staff. Perhaps I am exaggerating in the numbers, but there was a whole room full of people, including people to whom the honourable Member has at least as much access as he has to the senior officials in the Ministry of Health. They can confirm my observations on the matter.

This Government has no interest in protecting free-loading just as it will have no compunction in getting rid of saboteurs. We are not going to protect somebody who does not pull his weight because he hates the Government, just on the grounds that he is a member of the Democratic Labour Party and you must lean over backwards so as not to be seen as victimizing them. There are people who support the Democratic Labour Party, who are working in the Corporations, and who have no commitment to Government's policy. There are people who, when the Government is trying to divide 60 parcels of land up in Haggatt Hall, to sell to poor people to put chattel houses on, to allow them to benefit from the USAID programme, keep the files in their desks for six and seven months at a time without asking that the land to be surveyed, laid out, or priced or anything else.

These are the problems that all Governments have to face. I regret that it is likely that it will be many years before the honourable Member for St. Michael West has to face them again and, therefore, his role at this time is to give us the good, sound, and cogent advice, couched in a reasonable and polite manner, which he just gave.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I just want to draw something to the honourable Member's attention. In the United States, and I believe in the United Kingdom and other senior countries, it is not possible for persons who were in sensitive areas of Government to go immediately after retirement, or severance, to work for a foreign administration. I think it is strange that we in this country can have persons functioning in a government department today, they retire tomorrow, and start working for a foreign government in a sensitive area. I do not understand it.

When the honourable Member talks about someone photo-copying something and carrying it over to a foreign government, that is not something you deal with only at a disciplinary level. You deal with it at that level as well, but that requires more than discipline, that is a serious matter.

You can have a little regard for a man, or woman who photographs material and gives it to the Opposition, because, as the honourable Member knows very well, that it is the only way that an Opposition can keep a Government on its toes, and the person may be motivated by the highest possible ideals. But a person who photographs material and gives it to a foreign Government has crossed the border. That is no longer looking after your country, that is selling out the country, and I do not care who it is and what political stripes they wear. The Government needs to get legislation to take care of that sort of thing.

We have more security forces these days than we ever had, and we have all kinds of intelligence trainees — all kinds of things. I see some of them functioning, but you will have to give them a little more training — they look too obvious.

Asides.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Do not let us get into Ricky Singh. Ricky Singh is something else.

The point I am making is that you are going to make provisions in the laws to deal with certain aspects of the problems which the honourable Member identified. Because some senior personnel in the Public Service — and most of them do not feel that way but there are some — who, from the time they get past 46 years, have lost interest in what is happening in their respective departments. From then on they concentrate on where

they are going to find a job at age 50, if you can come out.

I remember that when I first came into the service as a Minister, I had a discussion with someone, and he told me: "I did not reach the top, Mr. Minister, and I am now 46 and I am finished with this. I am only coasting out now." He told me that he was coasting out, and that he had four more years to coast, after which he would be trying to get out, at 50, and he was looking for a job.

I came to the conclusion that he could not work in the Ministry, because I was going to be very serious about the work I was undertaking. I asked them to move him from the Ministry, and I think he went to the one where persons like that go. I am told that whenever they move persons from any Ministry, they usually end up in that particular Ministry.

I think you should do something about the security aspects of functioning for Barbados.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I am glad that the honourable Member supports this. The Deputy Prime Minister and I called out *sotto voce* that we are under the impression that we did have the power to stop it. I did ask the Public Service Commission to stop the person concerned from drawing a pension and working at the American Embassy. But you have to consider that it is a very serious thing, reflecting on the amity between two countries, when you prosecute a public officer under the Official Secrets Act for supplying information to another country. It is universally regarded in the conduct of foreign relation as an act hostile to the receiving country.

It is supposed to be dealt with by a word. Obviously, the correct words were not spoken in the Ministry of External Affairs, as it was then, Foreign Affairs now. Instructions were given to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs to make representations to the American Embassy here, and we discovered that those instructions were not carried out for several months. I believe that it was only dealt with probably since the Grenada matter, when this must have taken place over a year ago. It was only when I discovered that we had not got any response from the Americans as to how they could employ somebody who had been asked to leave the Government Service because of spying for the United States — I cannot put it more politely than that — and I asked what the response was, that the Minister told me that he understood they had not made the representations yet.

I do agree with the honourable Member that we should have provisions for persons at certain levels simply not being allowed to work in certain occupations. I was strongly of the impression that employment with a foreign Government was one of the reserved occupations. I believe employment with a foreign corporation is, but not with a foreign government.

I was very vividly reminded, when this whole matter came up, of a man who was the Russian Minister of War in the First World War, and all through the war he was suspected of being a German spy, but they could never prove it. The gentleman left Russia after the revolution, wrote his memoirs in 1921, and dedicated them to the German Kaiser, whom he said he had admired all his adult life. This man had reached a little higher up in the public sphere than Burgess and Philby.

5.20 p.m.

What do we do? In this case we found out, but we found ourselves hamstrung, and until we have legislation to deal with it more firmly, which means amending the Pensions Act, we will not be able to do anything about it.

In the last analysis, the Government is really not willing to have a breach with the United States over this particular matter in an open way.

Hon. L. R. TULL (St. George South): Mr. Chairman, one of the errors that took place in the instant case was that this matter was referred after a while to the Minister of Foreign Affairs for action on one side.

According to the constitutional amendments of 1974, the Attorney General is responsible for prosecutions under the Official Secrets Act, and it was never referred to the Attorney General in that capacity. It was sent to the police and to the Director of Public Prosecutions, and up to this very moment the Attorney General has not had the matter referred to him. It was referred to him as Minister of Foreign Affairs to carry out another function, which I really thought was a waste of time.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The amendments to Head 14 have been withdrawn.

The question that Head 14 — Establishments — stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 16 — PRIME MINISTER'S OFFICE

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to move that Head 16 stand part.

Hon. Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM: I beg to second that.

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

HEAD 17 — DEFENCE AND SECURITY

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I beg to move that an item be included in Head 17.

Asides.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Can I not move in another head?

I beg to move that Head 17 be moved in in an amount of \$7 191. This is Head 17 – Defence and Security, Subhead (3) Immigration, Item 6 – Utilities.

I beg to move that this be moved in and that the Resolution be amended with this amendment.

Hon. L. R. TULL: I beg to second that.

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

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to move that Head 17 stand part.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I beg to second that.

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

HEAD 19 – MINISTRY OF FINANCE AND PLANNING

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I beg to move that Head 19 stand part.

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

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

HEAD 20 – REVENUE COLLECTION

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to move that Head 20 stand part.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I beg to second that.

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

HEAD 21 – STATISTICS

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I beg to move that Head 21 stand part.

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

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

HEAD 39 – MINISTRY OF LABOUR, SOCIAL SECURITY AND SPORT

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to move that Head 39 stand part.

Mr. L. L. SISNETT: I beg to second that.

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

RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE EXPLANATORY NOTE TO HEAD 72 – DEFENCE AND SECURITY

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS (St. Thomas): Mr. Chairman, I have to leave the House very shortly, but I would have liked the opportunity of a debate on this item. This is basically the Grenada item, the vote to pay for the operation in Grenada.

We did not buy the uniforms for the Army. An amount of \$300 000 was voted for that. We have used some of that vote, the balance is half million dollars, and we have used that vote for the regional security system. There was initially a mistake, it should always have included a note on the regional security system. This was always a vote which we had to use, and the upkeep of the regional security forces in Grenada has been met from this vote. I cannot give you all the details; obviously they vary from moment to moment, but there has been a number of other expenditures.

The regional security forces have had to rent the accommodation at the airport used by the Americans and by ourselves at both sides, some from Aero Services, some from the Department of Civil Aviation, and there have been one or two other expenses. I think an advance has been made to the appropriate officer so that these amounts could be paid. It seems the airport has not got the money yet; I suppose it is waiting for this amendment.

The general public of Barbados were very resistant, as somebody said, to inviting a man to have dinner and then sending him a bill for the food, and accordingly we are meeting this expenditure. It is not, in fact, particularly substantial when you really consider it.

I hear other Ministers saying that if you invite a man to come into your yard, and he mashes up the yard and knocks down the guard wall, he should pay.

The fact is that the Defence Force wishes to unlock these funds so that it can pay the Regional Security Force, which can then repay the Defence Force, because this money will be going around three ways before we are finished with it, for advances that the Defence Force made from its ordinary funds to meet the expenditure.

Without initiating a long debate, I want to know this: Who is the voice of the Democratic Labour Party? Is it the man who says that we were wrong not to negotiate with Hudson Austin? Or are they the men who got in

the House and said they were giving critical support to the operation?

5.30 p.m.

I have never seen a more inconsistent political party than this Opposition. When a Government can support a medical school and we can have such an admirable speech from the honourable Member for St. Michael South — telling the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth — while the other members of his party oppose it, you can understand what I am saying. The two best speeches made in here today in favour of the medical school were made by the Attorney General and the honourable Member for St. Michael South. Their speeches were in a class by themselves, both in favour of the motion, and neither Member voted against it.

But I want to hear some answers now. Is the Democratic Labour Party for going to Grenada or is it against going to Grenada? I am a member of the public as well as Prime Minister. Please tell me. What are you doing over this thing? You are talking with two voices. How many more you are going to talk with now?

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I beg to second the Resolution.

Mr. B. M. TAITT (St. Michael West): This is Friday evening, and the honourable Member says that he does not want a long debate, but I would not like him to go home with any misapprehensions. He drew a red herring across the trail today, and now he seems to have pulled out a black page, which he is drawing up for us to pay attention to it.

First of all: would you tell us how much money you are spending in Grenada? I would really like to know that. The public is interested in knowing exactly how much money you are spending in Grenada. We have our boys down there, and I am not really going to question you in detail, but tell us: How much money you have spent? When can we expect the boys to come home? You are talking about the public? Try and see if you can find a way to tell us when to expect the boys home.

Secondly he is talking about I really would like the Prime Minister to hear this, but he cannot consult with his officials and hear. The Foreign Minister should be able to take a note and give to the Prime Minister so he would listen.

The Prime Minister talks about this inviting your guest and not wanting to send your guest a bill. When your guest is over-eager to be invited, when your guest suggests to you the words in which you should invite him, when your guest actually gets the invitations printed and then puts them in your hand and you invite him, it is open, it is a moot question of whether he falls into

the same category as an innocent bystander who receives an invitation. So the question of guest might be stretched here.

I think that nobody would mind if he sent him a bill, because he is more than a willing guest. He is not an invitee in the truest sense of the word, he is a beneficiary.

You want to know if we supported you? I thought my speech in here was very straightforward. We told you that we reserve the right, when we got full information on the issue, to take issue with you.

Asides.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: You must talk to your Prime Minister. If he does not raise these red herrings, I am not going to respond to them. But he does not listen to you anymore. There was a time when, if you had spoken to him, he would never get up and try pushing that red herring. Now, apparently, he is not listening to you.

Asides.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: No, he said himself that he is beginning to get dotish. I heard him say so today. I want him to go outside and deny it. I heard him say in here that he is beginning to get dotish.

Asides.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I do not know the process by which Prime Ministers become dotish, so I am not getting into that.

The point is that we are not going to get into the Grenada debate on this one. We know that he is not going to bring Defence and Security into the Estimates, but, even so, I will let us go home, because Friday afternoon is not my afternoon for debating. I really go to another Cabinet on Friday afternoons and we are holding up the proceedings. I would like to know, approximately, when the boys will come home, and how many troops we still have down there, if that is still not a big military secret.

Do you know that when McMamara and those big fellows were Ministers of Defence in the US that it was easier to get information from them than it is to get from our Minister of Defence and Security? He would tell you now that how many people we have in Grenada is some big top secret, whereas if I call the US Embassy and ask them how many people we have down there, they would happily tell me.

If you do not mind, and it is not top secret, where only you and your Foreign Minister knows these secrets you must have heard recently that I had some discussions

with the Brigadier, I am sure you have heard that already — and if the Americans are making any contributions to it, I would be grateful.

I feel that the Americans should be making a substantial contribution to the Regional Force, because you are replacing a lot of their people, according to the information you put out. I want to know how the budget is being divided up in Grenada between the U.S. Force and the Regional Force, and approximately what it is costing us. We need the information for use later, but if the Minister can give us now, we would be very pleased.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The cash out-flow is about \$1 200 a day. There are about 100 people down there. There will be a supplementary, under Head 73, for \$300 000. That is what is needed to the end of the year. I am not in any position to tell you when "the boys will come home", to use a highly emotive expression, because the matter has not been decided yet. There is a continuing job to be done in Grenada and continuing negotiations.

The Americans paid for the maintenance of the force in Grenada up to December 19. Now, there is a division; the Jamaicans are paying for troops, we are paying for the police from the entire region and, technically, I suppose the Grenadian Government will be asked, in due course, to meet the cost of its law and order forces for a period of time. But all these are matters of negotiations and of generosity on the part of the three Governments, the Governments of Barbados, Jamaica and the United States of America, and all three Governments are considering how much they can afford to spend in these areas.

The Government of Barbados is giving some technical assistance as well as, of course, law and order assistance. The United States is giving a great deal of physical assistance and cash assistance, as well as technical assistance and law and order maintenance. The Government of Jamaica is carrying the brunt of maintaining law and order in Grenada. There is, therefore, a fairly even division of responsibility although, in my judgement, the Government of the United States is carrying, by a fair margin, the greater part of the burden.

All of these matters are subject to constant conferring and constant discussion, so I do not think that I can give any more substantial an answer to the honourable Member, not only because there are under negotiation, but because, absolutely genuinely, even inside the United States own Government, the Department of Defence sees one point of view and sees one fund as appropriate while the State Department sees another. There is basically the Regional Force, the Jamaicans, the Government of Barbados and its Defence Force, the American State Department and the American Depart-

ment of Defence, and there is an interplay between all of us, which is, as yet, unresolved. This makes it impossible to answer all of the honourable Member's questions. I have told him all I can.

The question that the Note be amended was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I beg to move that Head 72 stand part.

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1983-84 No. 24

Head 73 — Ministry of Finance and Planning — was called.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS (St. Thomas): I should really report to the House on the progress of Aero Services, but it really will take more time than I have available now, and I cannot guarantee that we will ever get to this Head in the Capital Estimates.

The fact is that Aero Services tried its best, but it has been beset by some difficulties. There are matters of some complexity, including the behaviour of the person who sold it to us, the state of repair of one of the aeroplanes and, the fact that there was far too large a staff, compounded by applying Civil Service methods to the staff.

For the first time, we are only now beginning to see ourselves out in the light, as a result of the Army seconding four people to work at Aero Services. The Defence Force's contribution to Aero Services by way of technical assistance is estimated at over \$100 000 a year.

The operations in Grenada cost Aero Services a great deal of money, because not only could it not run its planes — they were all requisitioned for military purposes — but it had, in effect, to meet the cost of its former civilian commitments. The people who relied on Aero Services to do civilian charters to other territories had to get other charters, and Aero Services was, in law, responsible for those other charters. The very hangar at Aero Services was requisitioned and could not be used for ordinary repairs and mechanic work, which is the most profitable part of Aero Service's business.

We therefore do need this sum of \$300 000, which is the amount of overdraft originally granted by Barclays Bank as part of the terms and conditions of the sale of Aero Services. We would like this sum to make it possi-

ble to pay off the overdraft and meet the extraordinary losses which arose through the military operation. The list is long, and, as I say, I can only hope that honourable Members do not ask for a long debate on this matter, because although I may be able to handle the answers, the question of time at the end of a long day so close to the Estimates comes up. If honourable Members particularly want to discuss it, I will try and accommodate them at the time of the Estimates in respect of it.

I beg to move that Head 73 – Ministry of Finance and Planning – stand part.

Hon. L. R. TULL: I beg to second that.

Mr. B. M. TAITT (St. Michael West): Let me say, Mr. Chairman, that I am going to accept that the Prime Minister has to go out and that we are not going to try to have a long debate on it. We are going to serve notice on him, though, that we wish the accommodation to discuss this matter, because it is a serious matter.

We are putting \$300 000 more into an enterprise which we warned was going to go in the direction it was going, although maybe for different reasons, according to what the Prime Minister has said. But it is a matter which needs public hearing, and which we intend to give some public hearing to.

I recall that when during our Administration some of the statutory corporations had difficulty, the Opposition of the day had no empathy or sympathy towards the Government, and I am glad to see that they are discovering that policies are not always accompanied by the best luck in the world. This is one in which they are having their problems.

There is one aspect of this that bothers me. He speaks about the seconding of four officers. My understanding of what is happening up there suggests that there is a lack of morale among the people who function because of a failure to place in position the right personnel. But I am going to leave it at that. At another time you can be absolutely certain that we will discuss this in detail.

The question that Head 73 – Ministry of Finance and Planning – stand part, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head 83 – Civil Aviation and Tourism Division.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN (Christ Church East Central): Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 83 – Civil Aviation and Tourism Division – stand part.

This money is to pay in this financial year the amounts that are due and owing to the contractors.

There is a question on the floor of the House in relation to this which will be answered – we are not in a position to give a definitive answer now. But under these contracts, at the stage of practical completion it is necessary to release one half of the retention money, 2½ per cent, and we have to do that now.

In addition, the concept of running Heywoods was changed. As a result of three applicants only for the seven hotels, the Government decided not to run a split operation. The Tourism Investment Corporation now has to provide all of the services that the lessees would have had to provide, that is furniture, fixtures and fittings, so therefore part of the circulating capital has to be provided.

The other area would be in respect of the consultants. Under the agreement with the consultants, there was a fixed fee; not 12 per cent either – it was negotiated right down to 8 per cent or 9 per cent. But that envisaged a certain time span, and the time span having expired, an hourly fee for the number of hours of visits in the last four months had to be paid.

I may say this without answering the question. It still does not reach the amount that was provided in the revised Estimates on per room cost; it is still far less than the updated cost of the Hilton Hotel in 1966, which was Bds\$45 000, at that time per room. Anybody who projects the value of 1966 dollars today will discover the comparative cost, but when we are answering the question, we will deal with that. It is a little late to deal with these technical matters this afternoon.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to second the motion.

The question that Head 83 – Civil Aviation and Tourism Division – stand part, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE EXPLANATORY NOTE TO HEAD 73 – MINISTRY OF FINANCE AND PLANNING, SUB- HEAD 3

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS (St. Thomas): This is Aero Services again. I must say outright that although there were extraordinary circumstances during 1983 which contributed to a substantial loss, we do expect that Aero Services will need a subsidy. The reason for maintaining Aero Services is to service the air wing of the Defence Force. We continue to analyse it, and we discover that it will cost very much more to service the Defence Force aircraft by employing staff and keeping a stock of spare parts than it costs us to amble along with Aero Services.

I am fairly confident that under the very capable chairman of Aero Services, and a very knowledgeable ex-

British Army Officer, who is now an Officer in the Barbados Defence Force, and who has proved himself a very loyal, hard-working and capable officer, and with the assistance of the Defence Force, we will reduce the losses to a minimum. I just want to say this so that the honourable member knows what our goal is when he comes to the Estimates.

5.50 p.m.

We are also considering the replacement of some of the aircraft. We have been offered a deal by an aircraft manufacturer to exchange some of the existing aircraft for superior new aircraft under a very favourable contract, which we believe will move us towards the position that, at a commercial level, Aero Services will balance out. We will also be getting the work of the Barbados Defence Force done at perhaps only a third of what it would cost to do it as a straightforward direct labour operation.

We, therefore, want the note amended to allow Aero Services, as well as Caribbean Airways, to be financed by way of a subsidy. Caribbean Airways has to have a subsidy because we think it is a most vital and important link to Europe. We are expecting to link up with our neighbour in relation to Caribbean Airways, but I want to be there when the plane flies before we announce it.

So we are working on Caribbean Airways, and with Aero Services, we are working towards having a commercial operation to support its military importance.

I beg to move that the Head be amended.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I beg to second that, Sir.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1983-84 No. 25 \$3 306 703

HEAD 15 – CABINET OFFICE

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to move that Head 15 stand part.

Hon. L. R. TULL: I beg to second that, Sir.

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

HEAD 28 – MINISTRY OF LEGAL AFFAIRS

Hon. L. R. TULL: I beg to move that Head 28 stand part.

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

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

HEAD 30 – POLICE

Hon. L. R. TULL: I beg to move that Head 30 stand part.

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

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

HEAD 32 – FIRE SERVICE

Hon. L. R. TULL: I beg to move that Head 32 stand part.

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

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

HEAD 33 – PROBATION DEPARTMENT

Hon. L. R. TULL: I beg to move that Head 33 do now stand part.

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

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

HEAD 36 – MINISTRY OF HEALTH AND COMMUNITY SERVICES

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to move that Head 36 stand part.

Hon. L. R. TULL: I beg to second that.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS (St. Thomas): Mr. Chairman, Sir, while I want to hurry this through, this amount is for \$3 million, a fair amount of money, and I had better just explain.

Much of this relates to the problems in straightening out the staff difficulties at the Ministry of Health. I am not going to touch on that. A lot relates to mere bad management of the Ministry of Health, bad estimation, refusal to try to make expenditure fit the vote and a belief that all they have to do is to spend the money and then ask for a supplementary and if they do not get the supplementary, send home somebody or whatever.

I want to touch on the biggest sum, which is almost \$2 million for the Sanitation Service Authority. This

reflects the fact that the Sanitation Service Authority has decided to close 46 public conveniences throughout the country, baths and so on, for which there is no longer any demand.

These 46 baths are used in total by perhaps no more than sixty people spread all over Barbados.

The Government has decided that if anybody complains that he cannot now get a bath because of the closure of the public baths, arrangements will be made for water to be furnished to his premises. Nobody has complained so far.

The baths were *de facto* closed anyhow. The only purpose of these baths is that a few old gentlemen sit on the steps and have their talk. I believe they will still be able to do so, because we are not knocking them all down.

As a result of this, which is a reflection of the prosperity of Barbados in the last eight years, there is now no longer any real demand for public baths in this country outside the urban area and a few other locations. As a result of this prosperity — because people now have water in their houses — 84 caretakers will have to be severed.

The Government is not going to make any argument about severance, about the fact of these people being former Local Government employees and, therefore, perhaps you could send home some of them with only \$400. It might be possible to send home some with very small sums of money, based on the old Local Government Act and their entitlements thereunder since they were taken over.

We are giving these 84 people the sum of \$895 390 in severance. We have decided that it is foolish arguing over a dollar here and a dollar there. It is true that some of them will come off very well, numbers of them are over sixty, and with one or two, we have calculated, it would actually be cheaper to pay them — somebody aged 63 — it would be cheaper to pay them until they are 65 than to sever them. But the Government has decided that the problems with severance, and people's feelings when they are severed, are such that it is cheaper to pay them all an average of \$10 000 each, or whatever they are entitled to, but it works out to around \$10 000 each.

I am glad that some of the ladies who had given service for 20 or 25 years at a public bath, and who are now severed in late middle age, will get \$15 000 or \$20 000 in their hands, and will have a sum of money which will enable them to cushion the fact that it is most unlikely that they will obtain similar employment again.

The Government is going to pay them the \$900 000. We have already given them all four weeks in lieu of notice, so they have got that in addition to their severance. I am very happy to say that we have had no complaints, none that I know of, or we have had no assaults from the union or otherwise. We have an example of severance pay doing what it is really intended to, making it easy for people with little prospect of further employment to have a lump sum in their hands — and none of these will be taxed; the highest is under the taxable limit, I understand — and perhaps be able to turn to a little self-employment late in life or make some improvements to their homes so that they can retire into them.

But I think that since the amount is so large that honourable Members would like to know how we are supplementing a vote in March for \$3 million. That is the reason. Nine hundred thousand dollars-odd is for severance and for various things related to the Sanitation Service Authority.

Mr. B. M. TAITT (St. Michael West): Mr. Chairman, we have a remarkable Prime Minister. The Prime Minister just got up and made going home for these old ladies seem like something just short of going to heaven. To have listened to him, you would think that these old ladies are going to be beating cymbals and jumping for joy and carrying on.

He said he is so glad for them that they are going to have a little lump sum in their hands. Then he started to quote the figures, and suddenly realized that this lump sum was going to be a fairly small lump. But to those old ladies, I suppose \$15 000 is a lot of money.

The truth is that he acknowledged in the statement that many of them will not ever find employment again. And many of them will have great difficulty after the first few months because they are mostly going to get between \$14 000 to \$19 000. If they are smart, and I have so advised the ones who have spoken to me, they will pay all their major debts, because the problems facing the little people outside today is that they are unable to pay the debts which have accrued, and they have no prospect of money coming into the coffers to assist them in what is a very difficult time.
6.00 p.m.

The Prime Minister said that he has not had any complaints, but I assure him that there will be complaints. The truth, as I understand it, is that they got notification last week, but they do not know who is going and who is staying. At least that was my information up to a few nights ago. It may very well be that they now know.

I hope that, in the meantime, the Prime Minister and the Government will not fool themselves that there

is not need for some kind of modern convenience in the Bridgetown area. The point is that whereas you may be closing down the baths, those of us who have gone to developed countries know that there are areas in the suburbs and other places where sanitary conveniences are immaculately kept by persons highly trained for the cleaning of these sanitary conveniences. I think that the Government must not talk in terms of our development in Barbados when in fact, like the calypsonian in Trinidad said, there is nowhere to spit at all. I think we ought to look at re-training some of these persons who are going home, with a view to having at least two very modern conveniences in the Bridgetown area.

I heard the Minister responsible for Transport and Works (Hon. V. L. Johnson) who, unfortunately, cannot be with us at this time, saying that he intends to beautify the Lower Green. I hope that in the beautification programme we will be spared of the ugly Barbadian sight of persons urinating in various places whenever the need hits them.

I think that the Prime Minister and Minister of Transport and Works would also wish to look at that stretch that runs from the Port all the way up to where the post office is anticipated to be. A number of people walk along that stretch from the Port, and there is no convenience anywhere along that stretch; and for those taxi drivers, who have to be down there on an ongoing basis — I think I saw a letter sometime ago from one of them to this effect — while it is unseemly and unsanitary for them to be urinating in the open by the Port, at the same time they have no where to go. I think Government should pay very serious attention to that kind of call.

So while you are closing down the baths, and it may very well be that that is a good decision, I think you should look at the replacement of the concept that brought the baths, for although the baths may have gone because pipe water is now more available, we still need to have conveniences. We need to have a high quality of conveniences as opposed to the bad smelling thing in the Lower Green. If we are to modernise the conveniences, let us make sure that we include in our planning the provision of modern conveniences.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. L. L. SISNETT (St. Michael North East): I would just like to correct the honourable Member who stated that there is no facility there. On the contrary, there is a facility at the Port for the taxi men, but, unfortunately, they do not use it. There is a lavatory and a rest room there.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I am told that there is some difficulty with that. I understand that the convenience is inside of the Port and the taxi drivers have some dif-

ficulty in crossing the line. It is assumed that they are going in to solicit. They have some difficulty, but the point is well taken.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: This is really just for the record. I really have to say when I see these three honourable Members in the House that we are all friends together. All it needs is the honourable Member for St. Philip North (Mr. W. O. Franklin), for us to have a party in the House capable of carrying on the Government when it behaves itself.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Do not start with that. You stay over there and I will stay over here. Do not give that impression to the gallery.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The honourable Member has put the case for a convenience in Bridgetown. It is the case which Miss Miller, the honourable Member for Bridgetown has been putting to Cabinet unceasingly when she was Minister of Health. She was frustrated on several occasions when she wanted to use a side of the wharf and it did not come off, and her greatest achievement has been to get the Town Planning Department to insist that whenever anybody put in lavatory facilities in Bridgetown, they must put in lavatory facilities to which the public will have access.

We do intend to reshape the Lower Green and when we move the buses from the Lower Green, which will eventually happen, one of the roads will be closed, and the building which we see going up there will have lavatory facilities. That will be the nucleus of public lavatories. We are also looking at the site in Marhill Street, and in the development of Marhill Street, we are looking at providing public lavatory facilities.

I do not know about other honourable Members, but I have never seen the inside of a public lavatory in Barbados. I would hope that my physical condition would remain such that I will never need to see any of the present ones.

We will open the facility at the Pondsides, and that is a 24-hour-per-day bath and lavatory. There is another one in the New Orleans area — I am not quite sure where — which I think is to be converted into a 24-hour-a-day convenience when it is improved.

I know that our aim in the City is to have some 24-hour-a-day lavatories and baths maintained by, as the honourable Member said, skilled persons. I assure the honourable Member that his concerns are the concerns of the Government and the Sanitation Service Authority, and now that it has been able to reduce the staff of baths attendants to the really efficient ones, we will be able to do some training, and there will also be some money to be spent on the upgrading of the existing facilities.

I would just mention this to the honourable Member for his interest. They do indicate that there is a small need for public baths and lavatories, but not complete and enclosed, and any honourable member can speculate as to the reason why. But even that notwithstanding, Bridgetown is much under-supplied with these facilities. I would not know where to go if I could not get in the House of Assembly.

The question that Head 36 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

6.10 p.m.

*Supplementary Estimates 1983-84 No. 26
- \$35 000 - was called.*

HEAD 80 - MINISTRY OF INFORMATION AND CULTURE

Subhead 15 - Erecting of Statues (New)

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to move that Head 80 stand part.

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

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

*Supplementary Estimates 1983-84 No. 27
- \$113 251 - was called.*

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to move that Head 12 stand part.

Hon. L. R. TULL: I beg to second that.

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

On the motion of Hon. L. S. CRAIG, seconded by Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of seven Resolutions, one with amendment, in Committee of Supply, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. L. S. CRAIG, seconded by Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW, the Resolutions were read a first and second time and agreed to.

NATIONAL INSURANCE AND SOCIAL SECURITY (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1984

Order No. 8 was called - to move the Second Reading of a Bill to amend the National Insurance and Social Security Act.

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW (St. Michael South East): Mr. Deputy Speaker, this Bill seeks to include those non-established members of staff who now serve in our overseas Missions, in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs as well as in the Board of Tourism abroad, in our National Insurance Scheme.

It has been recognised for some time by this Government that this category of persons has been placed at a disadvantage, in that they do not benefit from the benefits which are derived from National Insurance. It is true that in some countries in which Barbados has Missions, some of these staff members have had some representations made on their behalf in order to give some benefit from a scheme, but in North America this is not so. Therefore, Government considers that the members of this non-established staff ought to be given this sort of protection and benefit under the National Insurance Scheme.

It is therefore proposed in this amendment to bring them under the ambit of the National Insurance Scheme so that they will be able to contribute, and it is thought that the contributions should be on a compulsory rather than optional basis. We feel that it is the duty of the Government to ensure that all Barbadians benefit from the scheme.

Additionally, it is proposed to deal at the same time with employers and persons who owe National Insurance contributions, the national Health Levy, Transport Levy, the Occupational Training Levy and so forth. There are lots of persons who, from time to time, have failed to pay over these levies to the National Insurance Scheme, and we have heard a lot about this particular matter in the past, where employees after being ill have tried to claim compensation from National Insurance, only to find that their deductions had not been handed over.

It has been of some concern to me personally, and to the Government, because we cannot condone this type of conduct from anyone. It places a burden on those persons who have been making regular contributions to the scheme, which I do not think is fair. I think it is only fair that if persons deduct money from employees and they, by law, are required to pay over a counterpart sum, that they should pay it in accordance with the law.

From time to time we have seen an accumulation of vast sums of arrears. We recognise that the system presently used to get them to pay up these arrears is a little loose. It is proposed, therefore, that we tighten up this particular area. We will have unpaid certificates, which will deal with the unpaid sums to the National Insurance Board, lodged in a magistrate's court - in this case the District A Magistrate's Court - or with the High Court for judgment. In this way we feel that we will be

able to expedite these judgements and arrest this malpractice by some employers in respect of their contributions to the National Insurance Scheme.

I think that this step will be welcomed by this Honourable Chamber in the light of the expressed concerns in the past over the non-payment of such contributions to the National Insurance Scheme and the disendowment of those persons who should be entitled to claims, and have not been receiving them, because employers have not been paying them over.
6.20 p.m.

These are the two changes proposed in the particular amendment to the Bill. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

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

On the motion of Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW, seconded by Hon. L. S. CRAIG, Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. J. G. ODLE in the Chair.

COMMITTEE

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The House is in Committee.

Clause 1 was called and passed.

Clause 2 was called.

Mr. B. M. TAITT (St. Michael West): Mr. Chairman, I just want to go on record as supporting this Bill. I did not speak on the Second Reading because I did not want to delay the House.

Having worked in New York, I know the difficulties that some of these persons have when they find themselves somewhere between the devil and the deep blue sea. They do not have a status in the United States which allows them to accrue Social Security, they are not functioning in Barbados and they do not always get the benefits which the workers in Barbados get, and yet they do yeoman service for Barbados and Barbadians, so I am very happy that this has finally come to fruition.

This started back in 1975, with the IDC and tourism offices trying to get the officials in Barbados to understand that they were going to have to extend some of the laws to cover this kind of thing. I am very pleased to see that the Government has brought the legislation down, and I want to go on record as supporting it.

All of us on this side support it heartily, and we hope that it works well.

The question that Clause 2 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clause 3 was called and passed.

On the motion of Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW, seconded by Hon. L. S. CRAIG, Mr. Chairman reported the passing of one Bill in Committee, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW, seconded by Hon. L. S. CRAIG, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT WHITE-PARK ROAD, RE CARIBBEAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

Order No. 6 was called – To move the passing of the Resolution to approve of the compulsory acquisition of land at Whitepark Road, for the purpose of inclusion in the plan for redevelopment of the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, this Resolution is quite straightforward. I beg to move 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.

GRANTING OF A RIGHT-OF-WAY ETC. TO GENERAL TRADERS LTD. OVER GOVERNMENT-OWNED LANDS AT UPTON, ST. MICHAEL

Order No. 7 was called – To move the passing of the Resolution to approve the granting of a right-of-way and the right to lay water mains and to erect public utility poles to General Traders Ltd. over Government-owned lands at Upton, St. Michael.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Again, Mr. Deputy Speaker, this Resolution is rather straightforward. It speaks for itself.

I beg to move 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.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: This brings us to the end of Government Business for this afternoon.

I beg to move that this House now stand adjourned until Tuesday, March 6, 1984 at 12 o'clock noon.

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

6.30 p.m.

CONTENTS

MINUTES

Confirmation of the Minutes of Tuesday, February 14, 1984	421
--	-----

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER	421
---------------------------------	-----

Accounts and Statement for the month of January, 1984, as prepared by the Accountant General.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. L. S. CRAIG	421, 436
-------------------------------	----------

The Annual Report and Statement of Accounts of the National Petroleum Corporation for the year 1983.

Statement showing Net Customs and Excise Receipts for six months ended 30th September, 1983.

The Betting and Gaming Duties Order, 1984.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. L. S. CRAIG	421, 436, 461
-------------------------------	---------------

Resolution to approve of the compulsory acquisition of land at Whitepark Road, for the purpose of inclusion in the plan for re-development of the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation.

Resolution to approve the granting of a right-of-way and the right to lay water mains and to erect public utility poles to General Traders Ltd. over Government-owned lands at Upton, St. Michael.

Resolution to amend the Explanatory Note to Head 72 – Defence and Security.

Resolution to grant the sum of \$413 352 from the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1983–84, Part I – Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1983–84, No. 23, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Resolution to grant the sum of \$1 944 010 from the Consolidated Fund and to place it

at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1983–84, Part II – Capital, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1983–84, No. 24, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Resolution to amend the Explanatory Note to Head 73.

Resolution to grant the sum of \$3 306 703 from the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1983–84, Part I – Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1983–84, No. 25, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Resolution to grant the sum of \$35 000 from the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1983–84, Part II – Capital, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1983–84, No. 26, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Resolution to grant the sum of \$113 251 from the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1983–84, Part I – Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1983–84, No. 27, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

A Bill to make provision for the insurance of certain persons employed abroad and for an improved method of collecting unpaid national insurance and other contributions.

A Bill to amend the Health Services Act, Cap. 44.

Resolution to grant the sum of \$75 000 from the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1983–84, Part I – Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1983–84, No. 28, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Resolution to amend Resolution No. 48/1983.

A Bill to authorise the Government to borrow from the Government of Canada a sum not exceeding CDN. \$6 000 000 and to provide for related matters.

FIRST READINGS

Hon. L. S. CRAIG 436, 461, 477

A Bill to make provision for the insurance of certain persons employed abroad and for related matters.

A Bill to amend the Health Services Act, Cap. 44.

A Bill to authorise the Government to borrow from the Government of Canada a sum not exceeding CDN. \$6 000 000 and for related matters.

QUESTIONS

QUESTION BY RT. HON. E. W. BARROW OF MINISTER RESPONSIBLE FOR CIVIL AVIATION (HON. H. B. ST. JOHN) RE RUNWAY AT GRANTLEY ADAMS AIRPORT. 422

APPOINTMENT OF CHAPLAIN TO HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY. 422

Mr. Craig, 422, 423, 428, 430, 431; Mr. Deputy Speaker, 422, 423; Mr. Barrow, 422, 429, 434; Mr. Taitt, 424; 435; Mr. Forde, 432; Mr. Adams, 434.

COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT STATION HILL, ST. MICHAEL RE GLENDALRY PRISON 437

Mr. L. B. Brathwaite, 437; Mr. Franklin, 437.

INCOME TAX (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1984 438

Mr. Adams, 438, 440, 444, 456, 460; Mr. Greaves, 438, 460; Mr. H. A. Blackman, 441, 446; Mr. St. John, 443, 457; Dr. Haynes, 444; Mr. Johnson, 445, 451; Mr. Taitt, 447, 454; Mr. King, 449; Mr. Forde, 453.

HEALTH SERVICES (AMENDMENT) ACT 1984. 461

Mr. Adams, 461, 497, 498, 500, 501; Mr. Weekes, 476, 477; Dr. Haynes, 481; Mr. St. John, 486; Mr. Taitt, 488, 500. Mr. Tull, 492; Mr. Sandiford, 496; Mr. Sisnett, 498.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1983-84 No. 23 501

HEAD 14 - ESTABLISHMENTS 501

Mr. Adams, 501, 503, 506; Mr. Taitt, 502, 505; Mr. Tull, 506.

RESOLUTION TO AMEND EXPLANATORY NOTE TO HEAD 72 - DEFENCE AND SECURITY 507

Mr. Adams, 507, 509; Mr. Taitt, 508.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1983-84 No. 24 509

HEAD 73 - MINISTRY OF FINANCE AND PLANNING 509

Mr. Adams, 509; Mr. Taitt, 510.

HEAD 83 - CIVIL AVIATION AND TOURISM DIVISION 510

Mr. St. John, 510.

RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE NOTE TO HEAD 73 - MINISTRY OF FINANCE AND PLANNING 510

Mr. Adams, 510.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1983-84 No. 25 511

HEAD 36 - MINISTRY OF HEALTH AND COMMUNITY SERVICES 511

Mr. Adams, 511, 513; Mr. Taitt, 512; Mr. Sisnett, 513.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1983-84 No. 26 514

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1983-84 No. No. 27 514

NATIONAL INSURANCE AND SOCIAL SECURITY (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1984. 514

Mr. Bradshaw, 514; Mr. Taitt, 515

COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT WHITE PARK ROAD RE CBC. 515

GRANTING OF RIGHT OF WAY ON GOVERNMENT LAND TO GENERAL TRADERS LIMITED. 515

SUSPENSIONS. . . . 430, 436, 460, 477, 498.

Mr. Taitt, 477; Mr. Craig, 477; Mr. Deputy Speaker, 477.

ADJOURNMENT 516.

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

ADAMS, Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. (St. Thomas)
BARROW, Rt. Hon. E. W. (St. John)
BLACKMAN, H. A. (St. Philip South)
BOLDEN, His Honour C. L. (St. Joseph)
BRADSHAW, Hon. DeL. O. (St. Michael South East)
BRATHWAITE, Hon. L. B. (St. Andrew)
CRAIG, Hon. L. S. (St. James North)
FORDE, Hon. H. deB. (Christ Church West)

GREAVES, P. M. (St. Michael North)
HAYNES, Dr. R. C. (St. Michael South Central)
JOHNSON, Hon. V. L. (St. Michael West Central)
KING, M. A. (Christ Church West Central)
St. JOHN, Hon. H. B. (Christ Church East Central)
SANDIFORD, L. E. (St. Michael South)
SISNETT, L. L. (St. Michael North East)
TAITT, B. M. (St. Michael West)
TULL, Hon. L. R. (St. George South)
WEEKES, L. A. (St. Michael North West)