
THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION 1981 – 86

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, June 5, 1984.

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 12.15 p.m. o'clock on Tuesday, June 5, 1984.

PRESENT

His Honour C. L. Bolden, LL.B., (Deputy Speaker)
Hon. L. S. Craig, (Minister of Parliamentary Affairs
and Leader of the House)

Hon. H. B. St. John, Q.C., LL.B., (Deputy Prime
Minister and Minister of Trade, Tourism and Industry)

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)

Hon. L. R. Tull, Q.C., M.A., (Attorney General
and Minister of Legal Affairs and Minister of Foreign
Affairs)

Mr. P. M. Greaves, B.A.

Mr. A. Truss.

Prayers were read by Fr. Derek Stapleton.

*Messrs. L. A. WEEKES and R. E. BRATHWAITE
entered the Chamber and took their seats.*

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The House is in session.

MINUTES

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Minutes of the
meeting of May 22, 1984.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg
to move that the Minutes of this Honourable House of
Assembly for Tuesday, May 22, 1984 be taken as read.

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

*Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN entered the Chamber and
took his seat.*

PAPERS LAID

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, on behalf of the Minister
of Finance and Planning, I am commanded to lay the
following:

The Financial Statement showing Net Customs and
Excise Receipts for one month ended 30th April,
1984.

The Land Valuation (Fresh Valuations) Order,
1984.

The Income Tax (Amendment) Regulations, 1984.

The Report of the National Insurance Board on the
National Insurance and Social Security Scheme for
the period 1st January to 31st December, 1981.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I
am commanded to lay:

The 9th Annual Report and Financial Statements of
the National Housing Corporation for the year
1981–1982.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to
give notice of: A Resolution to grant the sum of \$864,000
from the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the
disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates
1984–85, Part II – Capital, as shown in the
Supplementary Estimates 1984–85, No. 2, which form
the Schedule to the Resolution.

At this point I would like to inform members on the other side that Government proposes to do this measure in all its stages today. As a matter of fact, I would hope it could be put on the Order Paper today, if possible.

I also beg to give notice of the following Bills:

A Bill to revise and consolidate the law relating to betting and gaming and provide for related matters.

A Bill to amend the Criminal Procedure Act.

A Bill to amend the Magistrates Jurisdiction and Procedure Act.

A Bill to amend the Evidence Act.

A Bill to amend the Customs Act.

Messrs. W. O. FRANKLIN and N. K. SIMMONS entered the Chamber and took their seats.

FIRST READINGS OF BILLS

On separate motions of Hon. L. S. CRAIG, seconded by Hon. H. B. St. JOHN, the following Bills were read a first time:

A Bill to revise and consolidate the law relating to betting and gaming and provide for related matters.

A Bill to amend the Criminal Procedure Act.

A Bill to amend the Magistrates Jurisdiction and Procedure Act.

A Bill to amend the Evidence Act.

A Bill to amend the Customs Act.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS and Hon. V. L. JOHNSON entered the Chamber and took their seats.
12.25 p.m.

OBITUARY SPEECHES

Hon. L. S. CRAIG (St. James North): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise under circumstances which no member of Parliament would hope to rise — I rise to say a few words on behalf of the former Chaplain, the late Reverend Gilbert Vaughan, who was laid to rest at St. Philip's Parish Church on Saturday evening after what one would consider a rather impressive eucharist before the congregation that bore testimony to the way in which the man lived.

Father Vaughan was Chaplain of this Chamber for only one month, but prior to that, he gave us spiritual

guidance on many occasions in the absence of Father Cayless.

I believe that I can speak of Gilbert Vaughan, the man, because I knew him from about 1944 or thereabouts, when I had the opportunity to worship at St. Philip's Parish Church. At that time he was Sexton of the Church; I was a young chorister and also attended Sunday School. I then became associated with him when he went to Boscobelle in more than one way, and through all those years I found him to be a very soft-spoken and gentle person. His first concern to me at all times was his concern for the poor people, from whom he himself had sprung. He was a teacher, Christian, father, husband and a spiritual leader.

I recall that when he came to Parliament to give us his spiritual guidance, just before the sitting of the Chamber he would always have a kind word, and the sentiments he expressed when I was in the office of Mr. Speaker would be always of hope for the country and for his fellowmen.

On Saturday evening I was more than moved when I saw members of the choir, as I did draw it to your attention, Sir, with tears streaming down their cheeks. They knew they had lost not only a spiritual leader, but a friend.

During his years, as Bishop Drexel Gomez said, his desire at all times was to serve his Maker, and I believe that his chosen vocation demonstrated what was in the man himself. He was the type of individual whom you would see and you would have to ask him to speak up. He was always willing to take a back seat, but was always willing to lend an ear and to be a helping hand, especially to the poor. The residents of the district of Boscobelle would testify that he helped many poor children by giving private lessons that furthered their academic studies free of cost. He would assist all the people in the area with all of their problems.

When he was nominated to be the Chaplain of this House, I think that day must have been one of the saddest moments of his entire life. That is now history, and it is needless for me to recite any of the statements made on that occasion.

I have no doubt, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that we all share the sorrow at the passing of Reverend Vaughan. We share the feeling of the people whom he served and his relatives. I also have no doubt that the life which he lived on earth would allow him to enter, finally, into the life hereafter.

My colleagues, and the staff and Members of Parliament, the Clerks at the Table, the Hansard Reporters and all of those whom he came into contact with during his very short stay as Chaplain of the House would share

the sentiments and would wish that his sorrowing relatives would take comfort in knowing that he has completed his earthly duties, in the way which he thought they should be completed, and now he would be looked after in his Heavenly Father's kingdom.

I therefore move that a Resolution expressing the sentiments of this august Chamber be sent to his sorrowing relatives.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE (St. Andrew): Mr. Deputy Speaker, in moving the seconding of this Resolution, I want to make a few remarks.

The late Father Gilbert Earl Vaughan, Rector of St. Philip-the-Less in St. Peter, ministered to that area with honour, dignity and consideration for all the people who lived there. Boscobelle, as you well know, is divided between St. Peter and St. Andrew, and it was my privilege to go to church there on a number of occasions to attend funerals and weddings and to participate in a number of other activities.

12.35 p.m.

I have always during the period that I knew the late Father Vaughan, not as long as the Honourable Leader of the House but certainly long enough to know him, recognised who he was and what he stood for, a man of the people. Not only was he an educator and a priest, but he was a friend, one that you could call upon at any time and have discussions with on any matter, no matter how intimate, in the knowledge that as a priest he would respect what you told him, and he would conform as best as possible to any suggestions which might have been made to him. In his passing not only the people of Boscobelle, St. Peter and St. Andrew are the poorer, but the people throughout the length and breadth of this country.

It is seldom in life, especially in this age of materialism, that you can find a man as humble and as dedicated as the late Father Vaughan. He was what you call a people's priest, a people's man, and it was that type of simplicity that I respected about him, his humbleness. I was particularly happy on the occasion when the eulogy was made by His Lordship the Bishop that he referred to his humility and sincerity, which he no doubt possessed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, occasions like these are solemn occasions and they are not occasions on which to make statements which might be divisive or statements which might be considered harsh, but there comes a time when you must say things as they are, and I want to advert to the occasion on which he was selected to be the Chaplain of this House. I wish that where future officers have to serve in this Parliament, be it as Speaker, Chaplain, Clerk, Reporter or else, we seek to remove the bitterness and hatred which seem ever to present themselves. No officer

can properly function and feel happy and secure in a post after coming to that office on the heels of criticism and bitterness. I do not believe anything could have pained the late Father Vaughan more than the onslaught which was made on him by the two members of the Opposition, the honourable Leader (Rt. Hon. E. W. Barrow) and the honourable Member for St. Michael West (Mr. B. M. Taitt). It was a situation to be deplored, and I would hate ever in my life, whether in this Parliament or outside of it, to see a repeat of such behaviour. I believe he has gone to the great beyond a saddened man after distinguished service to his country and his people in Boscobelle, St. Andrew and St. Peter, being so roundly attacked and abused.

Even if you consider that you are an atheist, at least you should still have regard for the feelings of other people, and I think it could safely be said that over 99 per cent of the people in this country are of a Christian persuasion, and the Opposition stands condemned for the stand which it took on this issue. When on occasions like this it is the practice that the Opposition would second a motion of sympathy, today we saw no movement from them, at least up to now. It is a sad reflection upon our institution, a sad reflection upon man's inhumanity to man, and if this is what the country is to expect, God save them from that.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, there are times when people must say things. There are times when things must be said. I come not to bury or to praise, but to put it exactly as it is. I come to pay the last tribute from the floor of this Honourable House to a man who has served his country well. What is most significant is that the late Father Vaughan was the brother of a former Member of this Honourable Chamber, who came to Parliament at a very early period, and who assisted in breaking the capitalist stronghold on the country. It says something for the family of the late Father Vaughan that their parents could have produced a man of such stature in the community. He went on to be a magistrate, a judge and an Attorney General of this country in the ranks of the then ruling party, which now forms the Opposition, and that says something for the ingratitude of people. That behaviour is to be deplored.

We on this side of the House are happy to know that we had the good fortune to know the late Father Vaughan. We are happy to know that he lived among us and we are happy to know that God gave him to us, and now he has gone away, we commend his soul to the good God who gave it.

We on this side of the House were there in full numbers — I was happy to see the honourable Member for St. Philip North (Mr. W. O. Franklin) as well — and we want his family and his relatives and friends to know that we stand by them at this time and they have our

sympathy. We would like them to know that he will never be forgotten by us. I hope that the country will continue to produce sons and daughters of the stature of the late Father Gilbert Earl Vaughan.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD (St. Michael South): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise to speak on the particular motion that was moved by the Leader of the House, who in doing so avoided any kind of divisive or combative statements, and I would wish first of all to indicate that the speech made by the Member for St. Andrew (Hon. L. B. Brathwaite) was one which I think was motivated by his deep feelings on the matter, if indeed it was also motivated on this occasion by a little lack of judgment, which is uncharacteristic.

12.45 p.m.

I was pre-empted from speaking on this matter and rising to second it, because even before the Leader of the House had sat down, the Member of St. Andrew was virtually up on his feet. This was drawn to my attention by my colleague here on my left. I would like to make it clear that it was not due to any sense of knowledge or lack of the thickness of things on the part of the Opposition, but it was purely a question of the tactics adopted by the honourable Member himself.

Be that as it may, I wish to state that the Office of Chaplain is a very ancient and honourable one under the Westminster model of government, that post having been established in 1659. The Chaplain of the House of Barbados is appointed by this House under the Parliament Debates and Establishment Act, Cap. 10, and the Chaplain is appointed and holds office during good behaviour.

Father Gilbert Vaughan served this Chamber for only a short period, having been appointed on February 28 of this year. He was laid to rest on Saturday last. It is common knowledge that the Opposition did not confer in his appointment as Chaplain. Nevertheless, we can truthfully say that while he served during that short period as Chaplain, and on those occasions that he deputised for the then Chaplain, he could not be accused in any way of any breach of duty, inefficiency, negligence, or misconduct. He served this House well on those occasions that he acted as Chaplain and that he was Chaplain. In other words, he served with devotion and with dedication.

Father Vaughan also served his church in a long ministry, and he was a teacher for many years. There are those who can speak more fittingly of that kind of service, but I am certain that his contributions to the community will long be remembered.

I extend condolences to his sorrowing relatives and endorse the words of the Leader of the House on this

particular matter, and I pray that he will find eternal rest.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I too would like to join in extending condolences and sympathies to the family of the late Father Vaughan. I knew Father Vaughan when he served this House in the absence of the previous Chaplain, Father Cayless. Since he was appointed as Chaplain to this Chamber, I always found him to be very gentle and co-operative. I remember that on the days when we were without a Chaplain we could always call on Father Vaughan at very short notice and he would attend here to give us his blessings.

It is not for me to make a long speech, but I am sure his family would be happy and contented to know that Father Vaughan's service in this Honourable Chamber was of the highest that could have been expected as Chaplain. His prayers were very much impartial and to the point, and I am sure that all of us in this Chamber will miss the late Father Gilbert Vaughan.

I join in moving condolences to his relatives, and I beg that this Honourable Chamber now stand for one minute in passing this Resolution.

The House stood in silence for one minute.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Order No. 1, Sir.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The first matter of Government Business today is Order No. 1, the resignation of the Member for St. Peter, Mr. Walter Burton Hinds. In accordance with Cap. 73, the letter of resignation was read to this Chamber at the last sitting. I then directed that the receipt of this letter be noted in the Minutes. According to the Minutes which were confirmed today, the receipt of that letter was so noted. I now direct that the letter be recorded in the Minutes and that the seat be declared vacant.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, I have taken note of Your Honour's remarks, and I rise to move a motion of address of the Honourable House of Assembly to His Excellency the Governor-General for the issuing of a writ for the seat in the Constituency of St. Peter in this August Assembly that is now vacant.

The address from the Honourable House to His Excellency the Governor-General reads as follows:

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
ADDRESS
FROM THE
HONOURABLE THE HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
TO
HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR-GENERAL

This Honourable House presents our humble duty and has the honour to inform Your Excellency that Walter Clare Burton Hinds Esquire, Justice of the Peace, Member for the Constituency of Saint Peter and Speaker of this House, has resigned from this House in accordance with Standing Order 73 of the Standing Orders of this House made under Section 50(1) of the Constitution.

WHEREFORE in accordance with the said Standing Order and as provided by Section 45(1)(b) of the Constitution the seat of the Member for the Constituency of Saint Peter has this 5th day of June, 1984, become vacant.

Now, therefore, this Honourable House in accordance with the provisions of Section 5(2) of the Representation of the People Act, Chapter 12, humbly requests Your Excellency to issue a Writ for an election to fill the said vacancy.
12.55 p.m.

This address is to be circulated, if it has not yet been circulated.

Sir, in moving the motion I would have to say a few words about a man whom I describe as a champion in his own right. I became associated with the man Burton Hinds in 1966 during the election of that year. He was running for the constituency of St. Peter, which he so ably represented, and I was contesting the seat in St. James.

Those were some rough days. It took tough men with courage, with guts and determination to have thrown their hats into the ring against the formidable force of the Democratic Labour Party, led by the present Leader of the Opposition at the peak of his career. One of those men was Walter Clare Burton Hinds, the champion.

Burton Hinds had to take on equally as formidable an opponent in a man known as Frank Leslie Walcott, a man with international recognition as a trade unionist and politician, and he did that with what the man was made of, grit, strength and courage. That was the man, Hinds. He fought from the north in St. Lucy to the south in

Christ Church, the east in St. Philip and the West in St. Michael, and he fought tooth and nail for the party. He never surrendered; he never asked for an inch, neither did he give any.

Towering six feet and over, and standing at over 200 pounds, he was as powerful a man in his speech from the platform and in his newspaper as he was in physical stature. He was called every conceivable thing on the public platform and was never called a man, but we all knew he was a strong man and a man of courage.

If I may use the term, Sir, the "heavy roller" of the Democratic Labour Party had lambasted him. Clare Burton Hinds stood the test of time, and I remember his slogan, H & H, Husbands and Hinds, hitting hard. That was what the H & H stood for.

I know as a fact that he did this without any money. He and I shared a microphone and speakers together, which we both had to borrow, because the party had no money. But it had candidates of stature and courage, and Hinds was in the forefront of the battle.

The end result of the 1966 election is now history. He adorned this Chamber as the Member for St. Peter and then his true mark in life was to be made.

I have sat on both sides of the House and I have heard speeches made and debates in Parliament. Even before I was a Member of the House I would come into the Gallery and listen to debates, and with great credit to my colleagues on both sides of the House, past and present, Burton Hinds will go down for me, in my judgment — and I know that judgment is not wayward — as the finest debater that Parliament has ever seen during my time. My judgment is based on the fact that any time a debate or discussion is to take place and a Member of Parliament can take up something which is considered an innocuous Resolution or Bill and turn it into a full scale debate in the House, then that man must have a high intellectual power. That was what Burton Hinds was capable of doing, and how often did he do it!

We rolled through together until 1971, a period that was considered as heralding the demise of the Barbados Labour Party. The now Opposition and Government of the day came in with a majority of 18-6, and we were referred to by the members of the Government as "the dirty half dozen". I recall James Cameron Tudor, the world's biggest hypocrite, a political crow, a man for whom I have absolutely no respect, and history will record this referred to us on that side as "the dirty half dozen". Tudor is really qualified to know what is clean from what is dirty, so I had absolutely no quarrel with him, but time was on our side. When his colleague, a member of this Chamber, could say that living next to Mr. Tudor has devalued his property, what else can you

think of a man? The present Prime Minister, the Member for Christ Church West and myself were among those referred to as the dirty half dozen. You, Mr. Deputy Speaker, came in after, but it was the force of that half dozen that saw us through, and will continue to see us through.

1.05 p.m.

Mr. Hinds stood at that time like a towering giant in the debates on the floor of the House. I recall that on one occasion he asked 22 questions in one day, he made history in here. If you were to look at the Order Paper for the past eight years, the Opposition has never even asked 22 questions in eight years – and Burton Hinds asked 22 questions in one day, some of them still unanswered! What a powerful debater he was!

He was never late for Parliament and has never missed a day from Parliament – the records would show this – unless he was out of the country. What a giant of a man!

He, like all of us, had his faults, but show me a man without faults and I would show you a man that is not a man. Each and every one of us must have a fault.

As a journalist, I believe some of my colleagues would be more qualified to speak about him as a journalist.

Many stories can be told of Burton Hinds, not only as the parliamentarian, but the man in debate, a champion in debate. I recall on one occasion, in 1970 I think it was, we were dealing with a Resolution on the hospital, a simple amendment, and we were under the impression, from the caucus the Monday night, that we would finish very early in the day. I think cricket was playing. Mr. Hinds took up that Resolution and held the House at bay for almost five hours, turning a simple amendment into a massive and powerful discussion on the hospital that brought tears to Edwy Talma's eyes.

When Mr. Hinds was challenged on the floor of the House on certain statements, he opened his briefcase and just went through what I considered a briefcase full of all things. I wondered how was it possible for anybody to find anything in Burton Hinds' briefcase, and he had the biggest briefcase too. He pulled out a typewritten bit of paper and he said to the Speaker, "Mr. Speaker, pass this to the Leader of the House and let him see if what I am now discussing is not a fact of life." The Leader of the House said "I believe you. Once you have a copy of it, I know that you received the information from the hospital." When Burton Hinds put it down and I looked at it, it was a letter written to Burton Hinds from a constituent about a well. It was political bluffing, he was skillful in here. He took out the papers and showed them to him and Mr. Talma said, "I believe you",

without even looking at it, and Mr. Hinds put it back in his briefcase and continued his debate. I tell you, he was a man of several qualities. Mr. Deputy Speaker, on that historic day, in 1976 when the Barbados Labour Party Administration was returned to office as the Government, it was a challenge to men and women to hold the banner aloft internationally and locally. The prestigious and distinguished office of Speaker of this august Chamber was offered and accepted by Walter Clare Burton Hinds, and he, as Mr. Speaker, set about to bring back to Parliament something which former Speakers had thrown away.

I have seen Mr. Maxwell in a shirt-jac and sandals and a little beret on his head adorning that Chair. I saw Mr. Hoppin only sitting down and being controlled by this side. You only had to hear the Leader of the Opposition say something, and the Speakers of that day, both Hoppin and Maxwell, would go along with him. It came to a point when Mr. Maxwell could no longer tolerate the directives from the then Prime Minister, the now Leader of the Opposition, and he had to call on him on one occasion to take his seat, and then we heard those famous remarks, "The Lord giveth and the Lord taketh." He was the Lord. He gave Speaker Maxwell life, and because Speaker Maxwell asked him to take his seat, he was going to take it away. That was the rudeness of the Leader of the Opposition to the Chair.

When Walter Clare Burton Hinds ascended to that high position, it was a different story, and I do not believe that any single Speaker could have been treated the way that Burton Hinds was treated by the Opposition.

Sir, you are in that Chair at this point in time as Deputy Speaker. I do not believe you would have taken it after you had read and heard what was said about Speaker Hinds. You would have to take a man of some courage to accept the office and I recall one thing he said to me in his Chambers, "I am going to bring back to Parliament the dignity which I believe it has lost" and Burton Hinds was a man of dignity, a strict adherent, which I know as a fact, and there is no doubt in my mind that he gained the respect of both sides of the House in his rulings.

And he stood by his rulings – that is why he was a strong Speaker. I often heard him ask the Prime Minister to take his seat, because he was not hearing him. His famous words were: "Now, take your seat; now....." Of course "Now" used to irritate me a bit, and I made it very clear to him that I was not a child, but that was the schoolmaster approach he brought to the Chair. He ruled Parliament with that dignity, deep in the knowledge of May's Parliamentary procedure. That is where he was a giant. You could hardly fault the man on his ruling. At times I did not agree with him on the floor of the House, but when I went into his Chamber he could always bring

May's and prove to me that he was right; he had done a study of May's.

1.15 p.m.

Between the years 1966 until now, even the late Sir Grantley Adams and his present son, the Prime Minister, every one of us, was sent out of the House at some time. Of course I used to head the delegation. My wife used to beg me not to get sent out on Tuesdays. I was like a target for them. I only had to yawn, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and I was asked to leave. If I was out late at night and nodded and yawned, I heard "Leave the Chamber. Craig, leave." My name was Craig, not Mr. Craig, or the Member for St. James. I was Craig.

I have seen some Speakers in this Chamber, and I can only talk from 1966, and I must say it is an office of dignity. I have gone overseas as Deputy Leader of the Opposition and I have seen Dr. Horace King operating in the House of Commons, and I was thrilled. I had likened Burton Hinds unto him, knowledgeable and strong. But Hinds had the distinction. He was the only Member of Parliament who between 1966 until this day was never sent out of the House of Assembly, and I think the records will show that; and he carried the fight to the Government. I think that was because of the skill of the man in debate. He was able to get around a Speaker, and that is what made him a good Speaker, because you found it difficult to get around him.

He controlled the Gallery at times with what one would consider to be just the raising of his head. Though he should not have seen strangers, he had such an interest in Parliament that he ensured if strangers were there, they did not laugh or become any part of the debates. That is one thing he was very strong on. He would simply raise his head and push his wig back and the Gallery would be silent.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, what little tribute I can pay today to the man Burton Hinds is not how one would like to say goodbye politically under the circumstances. However, I believe that the party can still draw on his contribution, and whoever his successor be in St. Peter, he can rest assured that he would have to do quite a bit to surpass Mr. Hinds' work in that constituency, taking into consideration that he spent ten years in the Opposition first.

I have an experience with Speaker Hinds as Minister of Housing. There was some land in Maynards in St. Peter, and every Monday Burton Hinds would call from Mr. Speaker's Chambers and ask what about the house spots, and I would say to him: "Burton, we have to go through the normal procedures, get Town Planning approval for the laying out of the roads, installing water and light, because when we set out to do this, we want to make sure that they are satisfied." "How soon are you

planning to do that, Craig?" he would ask. I would say "Maybe in a month or two" and he would ask "What about now, now, now?" I did not hear Burton Hinds for about three months, and with my Chief Technical Officer and Chief Surveyor, I called Burton Hinds to come and go down to Maynards on what is known as a site visit. He told me, "I am not sure I can go with you today because I always pay a site visit there every Sunday." When I got to the area I saw about one dozen houses on the place, so I asked: "How did you get here?" Do you know what they told me? Burton Hinds discovered that it was Government land, and he used to go down on Sundays and measure out house spots and tell the people to bring their houses. He told them that when the Government was ready to do all the fancy things, as he put it, they would have to move back the houses and give them what was their due, but he wanted the houses on the spot now.

I became very angry with Speaker Hinds, and I mentioned it to the Prime Minister in a rather jocular way, and the Prime Minister told me straight and plain that only Burton Hinds can get on the houses, not me, and that he should have been Minister of Housing. Hinds used to go down there and measure out the spots with his feet, no tape. Twelve steps would be a certain amount, and if you walked 40 steps that would be enough for two houses, and 60 steps would be for a park. But he got the houses on.

I made that point, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to let you see what type of man he was. He had to get something done for the people in St. Peter though he was Speaker of the House, because he could not stand up in here and put a case for them, so he did what he had to do in his way. That was the champion Hinds, the man. So often you would hear Ministers on this side putting a case and they would be calling for something to be done in St. Andrew, St. James or St. Michael, and you would also hear coming from the Chair, "And when you finish down by St. James, just step over and do not forget that there is St. Peter." He always thought of his constituents and fought for them tooth and nail. He was a champion of a man, with a dynamic personality. All of these things can be said about the man.

No doubt he had his faults, but as I have said, we all have some faults. He has left, in my humble submission, an outstanding contribution to the life of Parliament and to Barbados as a whole. They say that miracles never cease, and such a courageous man he is that I would not be surprised if one day he had that strength, guts and determination that we will see him again on a political platform. If he believes in something, he is going to do it, and that may be the miracle. I sincerely hope that he would be restored to good health, and that in the evening of his years, he can enjoy peace and tranquility. That is my fervent wish and sincere hope.

Parliament has today suffered a loss without the champion Hinds, but we must part at some time. It is not a very simple thing for me to say to Burton, "Farewell politically". All I can say is "Well done, thou good and faithful servant".

1.25 p.m.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS (St. Thomas): In rising to second the moving of this address to His Excellency the Governor-General, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to associate myself with all the remarks made by the Leader of the House about Mr. Burton Hinds.

Burton Hinds, the Leader of the House and I are three of the survivors of the 1966 Parliament. Indeed, I believe that, along with the Leader of the Opposition, we are now the only survivors of a pre-independence Parliament of Barbados. We are the last four, now reduced to three, active politicians who once had the letters M.C.D. behind their names and were the first to have the letters of M.P. As we grow older and sickness, or possibly electoral misfortune intervenes, we are of necessity a dwindling breed.

We entered politics at the time of what was known as "the Windfall Affair", an issue of policy that brought many people into the Barbados Labour Party in the year of 1964, and into active politics later that year and in 1965. Those were years of great principles in politics. There were no issues of personalities that led yourself and the honourable Member for Christ Church West (Hon. H. deB. Forde) and even temporarily, the honourable Member for St. Michael South (Mr. L. E. Sandiford) to the platforms of the Under Forties in 1965, and earlier led Burton Hinds to the platform of the Barbados Labour Party in 1964. In 1964, it was the people's right to decide and not have it decided for them, a matter of the windfall; the agricultural worker's right to have money in his pocket and not to be treated as a child, even with the best of motives. That was what brought Burton Hinds into politics on our side.

In the following year we received a great reinforcement on another major issue of principle, one which was decided against us, and one from whose maleficent effects we are still suffering — the fragmentation of the Eastern Caribbean — the issue of independence alone, or independence within a federal framework that would have embraced smaller islands then known as the "Little Eight".

Girded up with the strength given us by the knowledge of the principles that motivated us in those two years, and by the experience which we sharpened on the angle of public meetings in a virtually unending campaign that went on for twenty-four or twenty-five months, we faced the last pre-independence election in Barbados. The resources of the Barbados Labour Party,

under the then Barbados National Party, were harnessed behind the overthrowing of a popular Government, one which was elected by, in fact, the greatest margin ever known, in 1961 — we should not be deceived by the arithmetic of the double Member system — and we were also fighting against a Government which was bringing independence to Barbados.

It is no small tribute to Burton Hinds that he could be regarded as one of the architects of the near victory at the polls on November 3, 1966. It was one of the upsets of the election — the people who believe that the then Government was impregnable. But we well knew that Frank Walcott had lost the temporary affection which he had enjoyed in St. Peter after his leaving the Barbados Labour Party, and which was bolstered by the then anti-Barbados Labour Party spirit that had informed the 1961 election, and I was as sure of Burton Hinds' election to the House in that year as I was of my own or that of the honourable Member for St. James North, who was elected as Senior Member for Saint James. A great campaign which we put in to the north of the island very nearly won us a seat in St. Andrew and one in St. Thomas in addition to those which we did win.

There are many political analysts who feel that if the Barbados Labour Party had had the full courage of its conviction in the summer of 1966 after we had returned from the Independence Conference, armed with the information that there was a secret agreement — indeed I could hardly call it an agreement — that there would be an election before Independence — we would have created a piece of history.

The reason why I say that it was not an agreement is that the Government of the day did not agree, but the British Government, as I discovered, had informed the Government of the day that although no reference was made to an election in the Independence documentation, yet an election would be held. Had we had the courage of our convictions, the analysts agree that it is highly probable that we would so have distributed our candidatures and so have asserted ourselves in the months of August, September, and October that we would have achieved the near impossible and thrown over the Democratic Labour Party Government after only one term.

But history is full of "might have beens", and it may very well be that the history of Barbados is better served by the stability of a longer period than one term of government for a political party than by elections in which the Opposition is always victorious, such as is the case in virtually every democracy in South America where the Government loses every election. I think that I prefer our system where the Government wins three or maybe four elections.

Asides

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I hear an aside — “I would not quarrel with five” — from the Government benches. But that is for the future and for other analysts to decide on. As long as Governments do change, the cause of democracy is well served.

The cause of democracy was well served in 1966 by Burton Hinds. Relentlessly he fought the forces that he had once supported. He never ran for the House of Assembly on any party ticket other than that of the Barbados Labour Party, but he had been a candidate in St. James as an independent at an earlier election. His support thereafter was not obviously given to the Barbados Labour Party — but once he had committed himself to us, he became one of our most powerful and committed members. Once Burton Hinds was with you, you felt the political weight of a political panzer. His stature on platforms, as he got up to mind his business, was one of the bywords of Barbadian political life for many years.
1.35 p.m.

I well recall having given a lift to an officer of the American Embassy to attend a political meeting at Ashton Hall in October, 1966. He came to that meeting, I have no doubt, under false colours, travelling in my car so as to assess the sentiment in the constituency. I recall trying to make my way through that meeting. Mr. LeVere Richards, who is now an Assistant Secretary of the Barbados Workers' Union, was then a civil servant. So little attention was paid to the rules of Civil Service conduct that there was no incongruity in Mr. Richards' having a choir at that meeting which sang and attempted to drown the speakers as they spoke. As I approached, Mr. Richards drilled the choir to surround me in a circle and shout out my name with some approbrious remarks.

I asked the Police Sergeant if he did not consider that the law was being infringed by such behaviour at a political meeting. Sergeant Springer he was then, now Inspector Springer, indicated to me that he found himself unable to do anything about the conduct because he was fearful of the numbers of persons involved. I observed the gentleman from the American Embassy flinching and falling behind rather than pressing through the crowd. On the platform, Mr. Husbands was speaking and was being booed to the echo, and after a very short time his nerves failed and he got down indicating that he knew they wanted to hear Mr. Hinds, that they already knew him well. He was right that they knew him well.

Burton Hinds got up on that hostile platform with an organised clap in the crowd shouting him down, abusing him. I will not tell you what they shouted at him, but you may well imagine, because the Democratic

Labour Party has never been kind to Burton Hinds. With the police refusing to do their duty and controlling the meeting, with persons physically afraid — by now the gentleman from the American Embassy had retreated far beyond the meeting and was concealed under a tree in the far distance — Burton Hinds stood on that platform and defied the crowd and told them what he stood for, why he stood for it and what he was doing there on that platform.

I have never in Barbados seen a more courageous example of a man facing his tormentors. No early Christian martyr could have faced the lions with more courage than Burton Hinds faced LeVere Richards and his minions, aided and assisted by the police at Ashton Hall, St. Peter, that night. It was this courage that impressed the people and led to his victory by 265 votes on that occasion.

He fought again five years later at a time when public opinion had surged towards the Democratic Labour Party. He fought against one of the Democratic Labour Party's favourite sons, my old and good friend, Mr. Asquith Phillips. Asquith Phillips played every card that could be played in that election. We heard from the Leader of the Opposition how Mr. Asquith Phillips was a Barbados Scholar, a gentleman, a lawyer, a distinguished person, and he drew a distinction between Mr. Burton Hinds and Mr. Asquith Phillips on this account.

Asquith Phillips was able to put up a big banner in Speightstown — it hung right across the road — saying “Vote for Phillips”. The weight in the Democratic Labour Party went into St. Peter. As I know now from my Personal Assistant, who on that occasion was on the other side of politics and was the manager of Mr. Phillips' campaign, unlimited funds were put at the disposal of the Democratic Labour Party by hoteliers and other wealthy persons in St. Peter to defeat Mr. Burton Hinds. He well nigh doubled his majority, one of the few examples in that election of a member of the Barbados Labour Party not having a swing against him, and got virtually the same percentage of votes as Mr. Husbands had got at the election before. In fact, he got a slightly higher percentage, .1 of a per cent more.

So, with a left and a right of the two barrels of a political shotgun, he slew the great kayaki and laid Mr. Asquith Phillips low in the first of his two humiliating defeats at the hands of people whom he effected to despise and treat with contempt from the platform.

Burton Hinds, to my mind, came to Parliament as a representative of the humble man, the down-trodden. It was his journalistic aim to put the case of the down-trodden. Today the *Nation* newspaper takes up the case for those who have a grievance against authority. An

anonymous phone call finds a ready response at the *Nation*. An offensive remark finds ready publication, and yet with all Mr. Hinds' reputation as a journalist for putting an unfair case against people, or an offensive one, he never had to face the libel actions that the *Nation* newspaper has to face and pay out on, because even in the last analysis, where his personal interests were involved, he yet used a discretion in his journalistic crusades on behalf of the humble people of this country. If you were mistreated by authority Burton Hinds would help you, but he gave authority a chance to put its case first, and he listened to all sides in dealing with these matters, always a friend of minorities and of the down-trodden in this country.

In 1976 Mr. Hinds gained the first of his electoral victories against Mrs. Leacock. He gained a second in 1981, and it will be left now to other hands to gain a third in 1984. Those campaigns were not characterised by the fireworks of earlier contests. Mr. Hinds by now had become almost a father figure in St. Peter. Perhaps not so well in touch with the younger voter as somebody younger in years and younger in Parliament might have been, he carried a weight derived not only from his activities in this Chamber but from his position as an international political figure within the framework of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association.

I had the honour for a number of years to serve on the Executive of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, and my duties took me to all parts of the world, to all annual conferences of the CPA and to other conferences held in smaller territories, the Caribbean, Africa, the Pacific and Europe at different times. When I became Prime Minister, I considered that I would no longer have the time nor would it have been appropriate for me to have continued in that position with the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, and it fell to me to nominate the successor to serve out the remainder of my term. Without hesitation I nominated Burton Hinds, and very early had to ask him to attend the meeting in Sierra Leone on my behalf. To his laurels in the political scene in Barbados, he added new laurels in the international political scenes in the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association.

1:45 p.m.

I venture to suggest that Mr. Speaker Hinds, a regular fixture at executive meetings, at general conferences and at Presiding Officer Conferences became one of the best-known political figures in the entire Commonwealth.

He was not new to Commonwealth politics. I well recall when I was in India about my duties on the Executive of the CPA, about 4 o'clock in the morning I was awakened by the hotel servants saying there were three gentlemen to see me. I asked where they were from

and who they were. They said they were from Barbados. I asked for them to be sent up to my suite, and Mr. Burton Hinds, the Reverend Gordon Matthews and Senator Deighton Griffith appeared.

They had gone to the airport and discovered only at the last moment that the Clerk of Parliament did not intend to travel with them to India to attend a meeting. Their baggage had been left behind. They had travelled for about 36 hours from New York to come to a strange country – and India can be a very strange country to travel to, Mr. Deputy Speaker – and Burton Hinds surprised me at that hour in the morning, after that amount of travelling, with his ebullience, his comparatively high spirits, his readiness to go out and buy new clothes.

He had no difficulty whatsoever adapting himself to the situation, and I told myself I was sure that he would be one of the stars of that particular annual general conference. True enough, his forcefulness, his capacity for speech and his knowledge of politics allowed him to make his mark on that occasion.

His race in the Chamber has run. I hope and think that he has many more years of life in front of him, but it falls to us to bid him farewell from Parliament at this time.

We are becoming accustomed to a change in Speakers. There have been more Speakers changed in the last few years, I would venture to say, than any comparable period before in our Parliament. The days of Sir Frederick Clarke, Speaker for 30 years, and losing the Chair only when he lost his seat, have not been repeated in our time. Sir Theodore Brancker lost his seat at the hands of his Party rather than at the hands of the electorate, otherwise it was at least possible that he might have had one of the long terms in this century. But since him, we have had Mr. Maxwell, who lost his seat under discreditable circumstances in the middle of Parliament, and Mr. Hoppin, who did not contest the election. He made way for what consideration we know not, for the new honourable Member for St. Michael South Central.

Many people may have been surprised when Mr. Hinds was elected Speaker in 1976. I want to go on record, Mr. Deputy Speaker, because I have never stated so publicly before, but at the same time as I indicated to the then Senator Tull early in 1976 that I wanted him for Education, I had already made up my mind that Burton Hinds was my candidate for the speakership of the House. His dignity, his interest in Parliament, his knowledge of the Rules and his capacity to command, pointed, in my opinion, in that direction. I was happy to nominate him. I was happy to put him in the Chair.

Again, in 1981, when the disgusting things were said about him by Mr. Frederick G. Smith and supported, at least, by the votes of a great number of honourable members of the Democratic Labour Party, who, in their hearts, have the decency to be ashamed of what had been said, again I had pleasure in putting him into the Chair. This duty will not fall to me again in respect of Burton Hinds, and I wish him a long and honourable retirement.

I have seen Mr. Hinds recently. His physical condition is that he has made partial recovery from the stroke. There is still some paralysis, but I am glad to be able to tell the House that he is alert, knowledgeable and is very well aware of events, political and otherwise, in the milieu of public life today in Barbados.

He wishes the people of St. Peter well with their new representative, he wishes the public of Barbados well with their Government, and he wishes the Chamber well with its new Speaker, whoever he is, when he is elected. He has been kind enough to write to me reflecting these views. Since that letter has already appeared in the Press, I will not make it a document of the House. He has also represented himself to the Press and thanked the electorate.

Mr. Hinds has been taken from us by an illness fortunately not fatal, but I venture to say that despite this interruption in mid-stream, he will go down as one of the most important Speakers to preside over the affairs of this House. He will go down as the best remembered Speaker to date abroad who has ever sat in that Chair. There is no former Speaker with an esteem in democratic parliaments around the world comparable to that enjoyed by Burton Hinds.

When we welcome his successor into this Chamber, a successor whom I have every confidence will be the representative of the same party to which Mr. Hinds belong, we will have to tell him that he is succeeding a great and worthy son of St. Peter, and that one son of the soil has passed on the torch to another son of the soil to carry for at least as many years in this Chamber, and I would hope for many more.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have much pleasure in seconding this address to His Excellency.
1.55 p.m.

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN (Christ Church East Central): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not know whether the Standing Orders have been suspended, but I would not miss this opportunity to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to Speaker Hinds. I was one of those who, with Speaker Hinds and the two previous speakers, dared in Barbados to be a member of the Opposition in the days when the Democratic Labour Party, in its height, believed that forever they would hold sway over Barbados. Honourable Members on this side would recall that every attempt was made to crush those who dared express an opposite point

of view. I am very glad that we live today in a period in Barbados when there has never been more freedom of expression in the history of this country.

I well recall, Sir, some of the great tangles with the law that were forced upon Speaker Hinds. I was one of the chief defenders in the magistrates court for the rare crime of abduction of an heiress which, when exposed to cross examination, was easily seen as a sham, a concoction by the establishment to disgrace the honourable Member. We could not forget those days when we had to journey day after day to the St. James Magistrates Court to see the unwitting instrument of the hands of the powers that be. I smile sometimes when I hear about interference in Barbados with the police or the judicial process.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is now 2 p.m. Will the honourable Member be able to complete his speech in the next 10 minutes?

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: No, Sir.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It now being after 2 p.m., this House stands suspended until 2.45 p.m. today.
2.02 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 Questions on the Order Paper. We now move to Private Members' Business.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: There are no items under Private Members' Business. We therefore revert to Government Business.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: When the suspension was taken, the honourable Member for Christ Church East Central was speaking. He may now resume his speech.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, throughout the celebrated proceedings that I spoke of, Speaker Hinds never lost his faith in the rectitude of his case, nor that in the end justice would prevail. I believe that it is these qualities that carried him through the other difficulties that he faced in his political career.

I can speak also of the titanic struggle that occurred prior to and after the 1966 election, which again culminated in James Street in the law courts, in the form of a libel suit brought against him by the former representative of the parish of St. Peter whom he defeated. The award on that occasion was not in his favour, but nevertheless I think that anyone who listened to the whole of those proceedings and who read the documents which were submitted in evidence would be able to testify to the power that Speaker Hinds wielded with the pen. It was a formidable power that could be used against all those who in his opinion were wrong, whether those wrongs were against individuals or against society.

The *Truth*, as the newspaper was called, was read in many households in Barbados. Many injustices were exposed in those columns. Many examples of the use of words in memorable contexts can be recalled. To me, one that Speaker Hinds, I believe, was particularly proud of was that famous headline in bold letters "BARROW GONE TO CANADA TO BULL", a powerful use of the words in the English language.

Aside.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I am corrected, Sir. I understand it was "BARROW AND BRATHWAITE....." When you saw him after those articles with those headlines, he always had a smile on his face, a smile of satisfaction in his ability to wield the pen.
2.50 p.m.

Others have spoken of his time in the House of Assembly, his capacity for debate and his knowledge of the Rules. I can only recall one or two occasions in which he may have been said to be under pressure in this Chamber. I recall, though, some of the most famous debates that he participated in, particularly in relation to education. The difficulties with the administration of the Ministry of Education in Barbados have a long history and the Common Entrance Examination, the allocation of places, the allegations of favoritism; all formed part of the searching examination of the Ministry when Speaker Hinds was shadow Minister of Education.

I remember one occasion in which he was challenged after he had made an allegation. He got up and, in his usual style, he came back and produced a sheet of paper, which was a photostat of the examination marks of the first 20 or 30 pupils. It was a devastating reply, for his allegation was entirely factual and proven with evidence out of the Education Department itself. So, to a large extent, his career as a parliamentarian in Opposition exemplified and illustrated the fact that in Barbados an Opposition can constructively participate in furthering the cause of democracy through diligence, research, and a determination to put over a point of view.

I join with all other honourable Members who spoke in regretting the circumstances which have arisen

and forced Speaker Hinds to leave us in this Chamber. But we are thankful that, as the Prime Minister has said, he has made a recovery; although it be partial, at least we know that his intellect is in tact. I am confident that he will derive great satisfaction from being able, if his life is spared, to join with his former colleagues in celebrating in the not too distant future the victory of the Barbados Labour Party in his constituency.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE (St. Andrew): Mr. Deputy Speaker, the three last speakers who spoke on this Resolution have dealt so adequately with the subject that very little is left for any person who comes after to say. However, I have been intimately associated with Speaker Burton Hinds for a considerable length of time. I recall, as the Prime Minister said, that he was much involved in the "windfall" issue which resulted in the battle of 1963 and 1964. While it was not my good fortune to enter Parliament as Mr. Hinds did in 1966, I, like most others, continued to carry the battle outside and to give support to the "dirty half dozen" referred to by the honourable Leader of the House while they were carrying on the battle in here. They were to some extent dirty, in the sense that they had dirty work to clean up, so, the reference may not have been too much mistaken. But we realised that the country was at the time saddled with a bad Administration, and we thought that even though we were small in numbers, the job had to be done.

We were fortunate at that time to have people in the vanguard like Walter Clare Burton Hinds, who eventually became Speaker of this august Assembly. As the Prime Minister pointed out, in the windfall issue, we were fighting for certain democratic principles; the principles as enunciated then were that the people who worked for the money had a right to a say in how the money should be spent. It was the Government of the day, the Democratic Labour Party, along with Mr. Frank Walcott of the BWU who thought that the \$1.6 million which the workers should have should be put into a fund. One might well argue that a fund for the workers might have been a good thing, but the workers themselves did not feel so, and who were they to say that they were wrong in determining what was good or bad for them?

The Barbados Labour Party thought it was fit and proper at the time to take up the cudgels on behalf of those sugar workers who felt aggrieved and disadvantaged; a mass of people who by themselves did not have the strength to fight, and who needed people to come forward and fight for them. In the vanguard of that battle you had people like Speaker Hinds. I was associated with him at that time and there were a number of other people in the country who felt as we felt that the Barbados Labour Party was solidly behind the sugar workers, as they still are now, and we earned the wrath of the powers at the time. But we were not disheartened or discouraged,

we fought and fought until we won the battle at the time.

Speaker Hinds was elected in 1966 at an election in which, if the Labour Party would have pushed a little harder, as the Prime Minister pointed out, we could have possibly won the Government then; it was only a matter of less than 100 votes that separated the party from winning the government. It was Burton Hinds good fortune to be there with the others to carry on the torch, and he did it with honour and dignity. I am happy that I was able to work along with him in the battle which was waged on behalf of the down-trodden mass of people in this country. He has nothing to be ashamed of and all to feel proud about. That illness has struck him down and made it impossible for him to function is one of the hazards of life which we all must realise can come to any of us.
3.00 p.m.

I recall the sad occasion on which he was elected to the high office of Speaker of this ancient and honourable Parliament and the unfortunate occurrences that took place on that occasion, an occasion when the Acting Governor-General was held up in the Senate Chamber for an inordinately long time over the wrangling of the Speaker and the antecedents of the person to be elected to that high office.

Again, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I must point out that I would hope the day would come when the selection of a Speaker or any officer of this Parliament will be done in a dignified manner. In Britain, there is an understanding between the parties that the position of Speaker should not be contested. By so doing, you remove the speakership from the arena of politics, and you put him in a position where he can feel that he comes in with the goodwill of all the parties in the land.

I would hope that when the time comes for a decision to be made with respect to the election of a Speaker in this Chamber, and it will have to be done shortly, that we do not find the rancour, the hatred, the malice, the spite and the bickering which we saw in 1976 when Speaker Hinds was elected to that office.

But it is said that out of evil cometh good, and the good is that Speaker Hinds turned out to be one of the better Speakers, if not the best Speaker, this country has ever had. He has restored dignity to this Chamber. There was a time when they walked in here with a little topee on their heads and you wondered what part of the earth they came from. There was no dignity whatsoever in here. They behaved as they liked.

I am not by any chance old-fashioned, I am as modern as anybody else except for the fact that I am not going to plait my hair nor wear it uncombed and

unkempt. I am going to keep it well as best as I can. But I feel that a number of the things we are accustomed to in this country should be restored. A former Member of this Parliament and Leader of the Opposition, a Minister at some stage or the other, who prides himself as the first Attorney General of an independent Barbados, recently commented in the law courts on the fact that attorneys-at-law were coming into the courts in shirt-jacs, and he is very upset about that. If he can be so upset about that in the law courts, how much more concerned he should be about Parliament, which is the highest court in the land?

There are certain things which I accept and certain things which I believe to be correct, and I feel that there are certain standards which must be accepted in a Parliament such as this, with its traditions and all that goes with those traditions. Speaker Hinds has been, in my view, a very serious and jealous keeper of the traditions of this ancient Parliament. When the history of Speakers is written, the historians will objectively recall that he did not fail to perform the duties, and to perform them well.

It was necessary, at that point in time, with the change of the Administration, to restore to Barbados certain norms which the people of this country were accustomed to and thought had fallen by the wayside. To his eternal credit it must go that he largely restored the respect for this Parliament. Many of us, and I myself at times, did not always agree with things he did in terms of ruling, but the presiding officer has a right to rule, and like a good cricketer, when the umpire says you are out, you are out, and you have to accept that as part of the system. When the judge sitting on the Bench says you must sit down, you must sit down, even if you sit and rise again to be put down another time.

I feel that Speaker Hinds has done his duty and that he has done it well. He has a lot to be thankful for and to be proud of. The fact that he has been able to carry on the noble traditions of many of the distinguished Speakers of this land is something to be proud about.

The constituency of St. Andrew during the 18th century had a distinguished Speaker in the person of Sir John Gay Alleyne, the first Speaker in Parliament who demanded the ancient rights and privileges for members of our Parliament. When he demanded those rights and privileges, the Acting Governor at the time, the Commander-in-Chief, was taken by surprise and he said he would have to adjourn the session for a week in order to give it consideration. When the next session came about he was still unable to give a decision. Parliament of Barbados has always been a very powerful Parliament. Parliament decided to adjourn because the Acting Governor was then unable up to that time to give a decision. After he found that Parliament was unrelenting, he decided to concede and said he gave unto the Parliament,

and to the Speaker, all the rights and the privileges according to the Royal prerogative.

Therefore, I myself as a guardian of those rights feel happy to think that Speaker Hinds was able in the judicial capacity as Speaker to bring this Chamber into line. It might not have found favour with all people but certainly posterity will acclaim him.
3.10 p.m.

It is sad that fate have not allowed him to be with us any longer. We can only drink richly from his examples and be happy that he was one of us. If his time in this Chamber as a parliamentarian from 1966 to 1976, and as Speaker of this Parliament from 1976 until today are the examples, then, to me, his presence among us would not have been in vain. I feel that we owe to him a deep debt of gratitude for all that he has done for us in the short period with us to restore dignity and respect to this Parliament and to uphold and maintain the ancient institutions of this land.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD (St. Michael South): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise from the Opposition benches to speak on this particular Resolution that is before us, one that is humbly requesting His Excellency to issue a writ for an election to fill the said vacancy, caused by the fact that the seat of the Member for St. Peter has been declared vacant and it is therefore necessary to take steps to fill that seat.

Speaker Hinds, who held that particular position, came into this Honourable Chamber in 1966 and has vacated it formally in 1984. During that period of time, he has seen service on the Opposition benches and in 1976 he was elevated to the high position of Speaker.

His tenure in this Chamber has been a tempestuous one. He was very combative in Opposition, and as Speaker, he ruled and controlled this Honourable Chamber according to the Standing Orders as he interpreted them and in accordance with his own likes. Many of his rulings did not find favour with the Opposition. Indeed, the Opposition did not concur in his elevation to the Speakership of this Honourable Chamber.

We are not, on this occasion, going into an assessment of his merits or demerits as a Speaker. We believe that that is for history to assess. The position of the Opposition on that period of time is recorded in the various statements made in the official records of this Chamber as well as in the motions which may have been tabled by the Opposition from time to time *a propos* of this particular matter that we are talking about, so we are not launching into that kind of assessment.

We live in a democracy, and the very fact that the processes have been set in motion for a by-election to

be held is testimony that we are still in a democracy. There are not many countries in the world which can claim to be democracies today, and we are fortunate that that particular form of Government is still dear to us at this particular time.

One aspect of democracy is that there should be freedom of speech, and particularly that the representatives of the people should be able to speak their minds freely as they see fit, whether it pleases the Government, the Opposition, interest groups in the country, or other groups inside or outside of the country. And if from time to time the Opposition has had to speak fearlessly about its reactions to the manner in which this House has been conducted from time to time, that is merely part of the democratic process and that is merely part of the privileges which are granted to all honourable Members.

A number of things have been said during this debate. Mr. Speaker Hinds has been described as a champion, and we have heard about all of the different things that might have been. We could spend a long time talking about what might have been, and we can spend a long time also talking about the champion qualities, but what I did note in particular was that two of the most outstanding examples chosen by the Leader of the House in praise of Mr. Hinds led me to wonder whether they were actually in praise of some other kind of impact upon the career of the honourable Member.

The Leader of the House said that Speaker Hinds held up a piece of paper and convinced the presiding officer that he was speaking from an authentic document, which then turned out to be a spurious document that had nothing at all to do with the issue that was under discussion. That, in my view, is not an example of the type of conduct that we would expect from an honourable Member.

The other example was his going to a place called Maynards in St. Peter and apparently appropriating the functions of the National Housing Corporation. Again, I would have thought that that would be one of the incidents that would be best left for the campaign in St. Peter. I did not think that would have been used on this particular occasion.
3.20 p.m.

From what we have been hearing, Mr. Hinds was a towering Member of Parliament, and as far as the questions are concerned, I had to deal with some of them. I believe it was 22 questions I heard asked. On one occasion he asked a question on education, and I believe it had 26 parts to it, and the only reason why it did not have 27 was because he had run out of letters of the alphabet. I can say that on that particular occasion I answered every one of the questions. One thing that the honourable Member for St. George South (Hon. L. R. Tull) and I share is that whenever questions were asked

in respect of education, we would supply the answers. I think that is a record which would be difficult to equal as far as Ministries are concerned.

As a Member of Parliament, Mr. Hinds was persistent, and as Speaker he was fearless in his rulings. We certainly regret the circumstances under which he has had to vacate his seat as well as his position in this Honourable Chamber.

I would like to assure the Prime Minister that being such a towering person, it will be very difficult, indeed it will be impossible, for that party to find a suitable replacement for him. That is why we are all confident on this side that the candidate in that particular election will be taking her seat in this Parliament on behalf of the Democratic Labour Party.

Finally, when that by-election comes, we do hope from this side that we will have an up-to-date register so that we can have a fair and free election, which is the hallmark

Asides.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: You do not want it to be fair and free? I am just saying that we want it to be fair and free.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: If they were not fair and free you would not be in here. You could not win by half a dozen votes all the time, you joker! Every time you won by ten or twelve votes and you are talking about free and fair elections in a country like Barbados where you shout about democracy. We agree with that, so stop talking about a free and fair election. Are you the Burnham Government? You have passed that stage, man.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is that a point of explanation?

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: No, Sir. That was an outburst.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: There is no such thing as an outburst in Parliament.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: We are talking about an election and a leading Government Minister is quarrelling because I say elections should be fair and free. Now what does he want us to say? This is really beyond us. I repeat that the elections should be fair and free, and fair and free elections, as you sent someone to advise Zimbabwe, should be on an up-to-date register, so tell us what you are objecting to in our saying the election should be fair and free.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Was there ever an unfair one?

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: I am sticking to that. They should be fair and free.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: On a point of order, I should have gone on with Branford Taitt and let Taitt cut you out. We should have had there in Henry's Lane still on it and you would not be in here today. You are talking about fair and free elections. You should know that I am your friend, too. I will start treating you very bad again, because I have my doubts about you now, you know.

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

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: I do not know what he is going into.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: That is the reason why I said it was a point of information. The honourable Member is giving you information.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: It is also a point of foolishness.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: We have no points of foolishness in here. Will the honourable Member please continue?

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: We rest our case there. It is always a source of regret when Members have to vacate there seats through illness, and that it is only common humanity that would cause us to pay attention to this, because none of us would be free from that hand of fate, and therefore we say nothing unkind about Mr. Speaker Hinds at this stage. We hope that his retirement would be a happy one.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: If I can just wind up on this Resolution very shortly, I have little doubt the temper of the Press.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Are you winding up on behalf of the Government?

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

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: You are entitled to wind up on behalf of the Government.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Thank you.

The Press being what it is, it is going to report "Sandiford calls for free and fair elections." That is what it is going to say. They did not say Sandiford called for Haynes to curb his blind ambition; they did not even report that. It is even hard to get CBC to broadcast it. They did not say that Sandiford constantly bad talks

Taitt, just as much as Taitt bad talks Sandiford, but not in the House of Assembly and only among his friends, because, truthfully, the honourable Member for St. Michael South (Mr. L. E. Sandiford) has never said anything to us on this side about the honourable Member for St. Michael West (Mr. B. M. Taitt), never to me. The honourable Member for St. Michael West talks about the honourable Member for St. Michael South, but not vice versa.

The Press is going to say "Sandiford calls for free and fair elections", and is going to say "calls for an up-to-date voters' list." Just to set the record straight on the body of this Resolution, in all by-elections the legislation and certainly the practice provide for an up-to-date voters' list. I have some information relating to the by-election. The following time-table will be followed: on a particular day a returning officer will be appointed; on the same day an election clerk will be appointed and a writ will be issued. A short time after the Governor-General will make a declaration relating to a special electoral registration period ending on a particular day. The notice of election will be given at the same time. A preliminary voters' list will be published thereafter the notice of election is given, persons will have seven days to claim to be on the electoral list, and there will be a further six days for objections to being on the electoral list.

3.30 p.m.

The two will be open together; a claims list and an objection list. You have to keep an objection list open after the claims list, because you have to give people a chance to object to those who claim.....

Asides

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I am very glad to hear the honourable Member for St. Michael North (Mr. P. M. Greaves) saying that is the present law. He should tell his colleagues that before they trot out a lot of foolishness that you must have a special register. The special register for the election will be published on..... and the election will be held on....., a couple of days after that. The publication of the register will be published on the same day as polling day at the overseas missions.

There is no question of holding the election on last January voters' list. A preliminary list will be published the day after the notice of election is given and there will be abundant time to register and or object. In the usual spiteful way of the Democratic Labour Party, I have no doubt that just as Dr. Haynes objected to Dr. Hassell being on the electoral list during by-election in St. Michael South Central, somebody will object to other good and decent people being on the electoral list in St.

Peter. At least I know that the Barbados Labour Party does not have to depend on a lot of petty fogging around with the electoral list to win or indeed lose an election.

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

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, I propose to deal with the National Health Service Board, a matter which was postponed for further consideration.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order No. 1 on our normal Order Paper.

NATIONAL HEALTH SERVICE BOARD ACT, 1984 (RESUMED)

Order No. 1 was called – To move the Second Reading of a Bill to provide for the establishment of the National Health Service Board.

Mr. L. A. WEEKES (St. Michael North West): Mr. Deputy Speaker, many important matters have come before this House from time to time, and I consider the Bill before us even more important than most others. It is a Bill which seeks to introduce into this country another form of national health care.

The right honourable Member who introduced this Resolution appears to be not as familiar with this subject as one usually expects him to be. The mere recital of Government's policy on some aspects of the service and a fair amount of criticisms of the doctors to me has not faced up to the real task before us. What is really important is the final product; good health, which will ensure longer life to many.

This Bill which seeks to provide for the establishment of a National Health Service Board for the management of those components of the National Health Service as specified in this Bill, seems to me to be the compromise of a political desire with that of a real National Health Service, and, to me, this has a certain amount of dangers lurking around. You cannot have a compromise on one's health. It is either you are going to produce a good health service or retain the one you previously had. So any tampering with the health services in this country could easily bring about a collapse, and the mere fact that the Bill provides for this service to be administered by a Board could very well bring about extreme difficulties in this service.

The magnitude of the scope of any health service is bound to be beyond the capability of ten or twelve people, and when you consider the composition of this Board as set out in this Schedule, you have to wonder, in the first place, why we are looking at a Board for this

management. The first Schedule of this Bill says that one person will represent the Pharmaceutical Society, and one will be chosen from among three. I have never been accustomed to this approach in choosing members for representation on any Board, and this seems to have some other meaning, which I hope the Government will explain.

It also says that the one representative from the medical practitioners will be appointed by the Minister from among three, and it is the same with the representative of the Nurses Association. But what makes it very interesting is that the Minister will have the power to appoint five persons — and the honourable introducer did not mention in his introduction the kind of people we are likely to see among these five. So that is five, and you have three professionals and five others, which makes this Board fall right into the category of all the other Boards that exist.

In explaining this, one has to look at the attitude of Government towards Boards in the past. When the Government was seeking to gain office, one of the criticisms that was laid against the then Government was that Boards were corrupt, were politically motivated and in many instances they were not suited for the task for which they were designed, and I believe a promise was made that on election to office, one could expect a reduction in Boards. It appears this is not the attitude anymore, and so we have another Board.

One has got to analyse the present performance of some of the Boards under the present Government. We have had the disturbing circumstances under which when a Minister changes, the Board changes, and as a result of that you sometimes get a lot of confusion in these departments. It also has a destabilising effect on many of the workers who are employed in these Boards. Therefore, if there is going to be any contention at all, it will be about the composition of this Board and the functions of the Board.

3.40 p.m.

The function of this Board must be a very important one. But I have to reflect on this as well, because in setting up this National Health Service, the Government spent a large sum of money to get information and assistance, and one knows very well that the consultants themselves did not ask for this kind of Board, they asked for an advisory Board, probably bearing in mind that the task for setting up this service would be to avoid as much political interference as they can. Therefore, the Board in itself for a service like this may very well find difficulty in recruiting the skilled officers that are so necessary to implement this service.

If you look at page 548 of the Kaiser Report, you will see that their argument is well explained. In terms of

looking for your Chief Technical Officer, they set out very clearly that the Director of this service must be of the highest calibre, since the task required to implement and operate the National Health Service would be considerable. They even went further, the study team recommended that the Director of this service be a medical doctor with proven administrative ability.

An officer of that kind would like to feel that if he is appointed to that task he would be free and able to carry out his task without any form of interference of any political nature. He wants to feel that he can give his technical expertise to the fullest. Boards do not operate, as we know, like this. Key management positions are very often associated with party affiliation, and this does not necessarily mean that we may not have the kind of people in any one party organisation, but the chances are that one may feel that that particular appointment may be tied in with his holding the post for any length of time, and he may have to compromise on situations where he should not. This is really the difference between having an advisory Board, which would purely act in an advisory position, rather than a Board which will have the authority to hire and fire. This kind of situation, in my view, would not encourage the best staff to be appointed in some instances.

The Board says that this officer must be a medical practitioner. Before we can get off the ground in any sense of the word with this National Health Service, we already have a confrontation with the doctors, and certainly, it is clear to me that any medical officer will invariably be very conscious of what he has to face up to and what he will have to do on behalf of the Board. Certainly that officer would be hard pressed in the circumstances which I just mentioned.

The Board itself will have to make arrangements for the administration of the services and to enter agreements with medical practitioners. This present service would necessitate a number of things. It would obviously bring about increased costs. There will always be the need to educate people to accept change, to change their traditional attitudes, and most important, you must have a sufficient number of key people and adequate services to implement this service.

In the first instance, increased cost has established the fact that it will not be that free at all. Therefore, we will have to expect, as the introducer said, increased levies, probably subventions and possibly loans to carry through this service. This is not to be so, because a service such as this which is likely to bring in people who might have used their discretion in seeking out medical aid would most likely feel free to do so probably on a more frequent basis, so that in itself will bring in an additional load of people, which will mean additional cost in the services, and it will also mean an additional cost in the backup services that are performed.

Children form a very large part of this service. In the past we have seen the attitude of parents to young children. Parents were able to do a bit of the remedying for themselves, and were not so eager to take children to the doctor as such, but I am almost certain that with the new advances in education and so on most of our people will send more children to the offices of these people, who, obviously, will have to bear the extra load.

This then brings us to the relationship between the doctor and the patient. The service itself in the initial stages is supposed to cater to the 65-year olds and the six-year olds, and I understand at a later date the entire community. The one thing we must learn about health care is that people consider this a very vital part of life. They will do almost anything to have healthy bodies, and the most important thing is that although patients will choose their doctors, they choose them very carefully. It seems to have some psychological advantage to most of them, and even though the service allows for doctors of their choice, it also limits them in another way, because if you say that a particular patient is on to a particular panel and that doctor is in private practice, naturally at some point the patient gets the feeling that he needs a special kind of attention, and he is likely to ask that doctor to see him in a special way.
3.50 p.m.

(Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: In the bedroom?)

Mr. L. A. WEEKES: If you want to interpret it that way, surely you can, but the tone of my speech is health.

Let me give you an example. In some of the clinics we have had, especially the polyclinics, where you had G.P.s, there were people who were eligible for free treatment and who went and got the free treatment. But at some point in time felt they would have had to go to the doctor's private office, and they went, therefore rejecting the free treatment. So the point I am making is that you cannot in any way deny a person if he feels that by paying an additional sum of money that he would get better treatment. Furthermore, patients like to shop around like anybody else, and they like to get another opinion.

My view is that there ought not to be any difficulty with that patient who wants to pay that extra fee. Let us say that if a doctor recommends someone to the hospital for specific services, he may not be denied that because that person is a private person. I am not too sure that you are going to treat those doctors who do not enter the scheme with the same measure of fairness. If that is the case, it would not be fair to the patients.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: If the honourable Member would give way on a point of elucidation.

I may have said in my opening speech that you will go to one doctor and be on his panel. The honourable Member is raising something else — suppose you want different treatment from your own doctor or from another doctor.

I would like to elucidate and make it quite clear that there is nothing in the Act saying that you cannot get private treatment from your own doctor, whatever that constitutes. If, for example, he sees National Health patients in the morning and you want to go and see him in the afternoon by appointment and pay him, we certainly do not intend to stop that.

You also mentioned going to another doctor. There is nothing in this Act to stop that either, nor is it intended. I believe that is a matter of medical ethics. Technically, if you go to one general practitioner with a complaint and you want him to treat you, I believe the ethics of the medical profession, not the legislation or the proposed legislation, demand that he ask you who was treating you before and he is supposed to clear it as a matter of medical ethics with the former practitioner. I do not think that has anything to do with the Government's intentions in this matter, but I believe that is the way doctors are supposed to operate.

Mr. L. A. WEEKES: I raise that because there is always the possibility of one misunderstanding what are his rights in respect of this kind of service when it comes into being.

One of the things that we must still consider very carefully is that the change of a patient to another doctor is not going to be that easy, because from my understanding, the doctor will not have the power to send one person from one panel to another. It appears that the Board will have to regulate this situation.

Let us assume that a patient really wants that change. The doctor could not immediately tell him to go over to another doctor; he would probably have to go through the Board. But it may be the kind of illness that that patient believes some other doctors are better able to diagnose, and it may very well be that that patient may have to go through long suffering before he is treated. So I really fear that it will not be that easy to transfer one patient from one panel to another as simple as that, and that is another problem I think the Board will have to face up to from time to time.

If you are providing a service such as this to replace the one you have, it ought to be a better service. If you are thinking in terms of a twenty-four-hour service, one has to be very careful that you are not asking people to operate under laws that are not consistent with other areas. A twenty-four-hour service means that a person would be available for twenty-four hours, and under the

labour laws of our country, one should not work more than X hours a day. Be that as it may, I believe the Board would be able to make some arrangement in which they could work out this twenty-four-hour day.

There are still one or two other questions in respect of this doctor and patient relationship. How speedily will one be able to replace a doctor that is on holiday? It appears to me that the onus rests with that doctor who is going on holiday. Before he can probably take his holiday, it seems to me that he would have to find a replacement. Already we are getting the feeling that the full complement of doctors in Barbados are not likely to be involved in the service from the initial stages, which probably mean that doctors who want to take holidays may not be able to do so.

Take refresher courses. I wonder what will happen with refresher courses when doctors become part and parcel of this Service. Would there be replacements for this?

Also, although we are dealing with primary health care, there are also secondary health care services which some of these doctors will have to deal with. The whole approach to this twenty-four-hour service and appointment of panels will in some way create hardships. It is fair to believe that a doctor, like any other human being, will probably become fatigued after working many long hours. But since one is not sure what period of the day that the GP who is now attached to the service will have to offer to the patients on his panel, then one will have to seriously consider a position where private practice is being carried on and where the National Health Service is being carried on, and ensure that the two times do not interlock, because there is the possibility of denying the private patient an opportunity to possibly get what he has paid for.

The twenty-four-hour service also brings in the question of security. When doctors are on call, they are on call at all hours of the night, and in some countries protection is provided for some of the medical personnel who have to go on call. In these days where crime tends to emerge, I wonder if the Board will be providing some form of protection for those officers who may be called out at odd hours.

4.00 p.m.

In the present situation in which the doctors operate, they have a clear understanding as to their patients, because they have a small number to deal with and they can always handle them, but in a case where you have a panel of nearly 3 000 people, one has to be very careful of the dangers that these medical personnel are exposed to. There is a possibility that one can expect with a family doctor that there can be a problem, and I believe that if you search through some of the existing

practices you may well find that in some countries where you have a similar service, these must have crept up somehow. I think the Board will have to ensure that those who are taking part in the service have a certain amount of security.

We have said in the past that polyclinics have a very useful role to play. The position with the polyclinics as they stand now is that you have doctors going in at short intervals and attending patients. You are going to remove all the outpatients' clinics, then you are going to leave them with the polyclinics.

Now, we have the situation where, from the honourable Member's speech, provision will be made to upgrade the private premises of these doctors who are going to enter the service. There is one problem that is likely to arise. Most or some of the doctors rent properties. Will the Board be prepared to upgrade rented property? If so, do you not see there are chances that you will have to go into some kind of long lease or something like that with the owners of these premises?

But let us assume that the premises are made up to date and are well prepared to serve the service. I do not understand how you will get any of those medical practitioners to move from their private setting into the polyclinics. It is very difficult for one to see a doctor in his private area willing to give up that area and turn up in a polyclinic. He would either have to split the services or remain in one area.

It seems to me that the polyclinics themselves will eventually become glorified health centres. They may very well not be utilised in the way that they had been expected to be utilised; so that the whole question of setting up this service requires quite a lot of thought and personnel to deal with it. The only alternative that we can see to the solution of the polyclinics would be a large influx of foreign personnel and foreign doctors who would be willing to come to Barbados perhaps to take on that responsibility, but from the evidence before us, it would appear that the present staffing is only favourable to a limited service in respect of what we want to put forward.

I come to another interesting part of this Bill. One of the areas in which the Board will have to function is in the area of discipline. We have all had our experiences with how Boards discipline people. One area of discipline which I find very interesting is that the Board will have the power to fine a medical practitioner if he is found in breach of any particular aspect of his service.

I am not sure that there are other Boards with this power, but it seems to me that it is a very serious power that this Board will have in its hands. It is not a difficult thing in health matters for people to make complaints

against a medical practitioner, as has been done before, to the extent that it may prove very difficult for the medical practitioner to get the whole thing in its right perspective. I consider this a very serious matter, and I believe that this ought not to be in the hands of any Board.

I feel that the courts are the place where you impose fines, but for a Board, as probably politically dominated as this would be, it would be a very serious matter, and certainly that in itself could scare away people from entering the service. It may even cause an exodus of professional people who may not want to submit themselves to unprofessional people, and I feel that that particular aspect of the Bill needs to be looked at. The powers delegated to this Board may very well be a way of preventing the service from developing into what it could be.

The Board will not only deal with the discipline of medical personnel; it will not only deal with the allocation of patients to panels, but this Bill will also seek to bring the Drug Service under its control. At present, I believe the Drug Service personnel are paid from Central Government funds. The chances are that when the Board takes over it will have to take over those people who are now employed in the Service. It is true that you can second them to the Board as well, but at the same time you will have to make sure that those people are quite willing and ready to serve in that capacity, in the same way as they have been doing in the past.

Certainly it is obvious to me then that the functions of this Board will be far and wide. It is a new Board which has never functioned before, and it will have to have the kind of administration to implement its programmes. The report itself stresses very much that the success of this service must lie in the type of administrative policies and people capable of implementing the service. I hope that the Board will be able to get the kind of administration that will see this measure through.

There is also another danger that the Board will have to watch. The present situation is that if you take the National Formulary and you analyse it carefully, you will start to realise that it is gradually becoming a dominating factor in the importation of these drugs. It is possible that this development may come about because of the business acumen of a particular firm, or interest in getting the best drugs available, but it has got to be very carefully watched by the Board where one particular supplier could probably be supplying nearly 50 per cent of the drugs placed on the Formulary. A monopoly may step in, and you may likely get drugs which may be inferior. I do not want to cast any aspersions on people who bring in the drugs for the Government, but at the same time, one has to issue that caution.

4.10 p.m.

In general, after those comments, we have to look at this Bill from the point of view that in Barbados we

have a service in operation. We have a service which up to this point in time has been serving the 65-year-olds and the six-year-olds without any additional cost to those people. We are introducing as a first phase these groups of people, and they are being called upon to pay more. One will have to ask, will this Board, when it is functioning, provide a better service, a more timely service, with better results in comparison with what we have got now? Because the report itself actually agrees that there ought not to be any major changes, but that we should only try to straighten out the weaknesses in our present system.

I hope that this Bill does not allow for any of the inconveniences and unpleasantness that we have seen and heard about in other areas controlled by Boards. I hope that the Director will be able to bring to the Board the kind of inspiration necessary, so that where now there is a problem with the doctors not willing to run into the service blindly, I hope they will be able to settle that matter and at the same time be able to inspire the users of this service to use it effectively and for the betterment of their own health.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have confined my remarks primarily to the functions of the Board rather than to the political aspect of it. I believe that the health of any nation or any person is far more important than gaining any political mileage out of a Bill such as this. That is why I specifically confined my remarks to the functions of the Board and the dangers of the Board. I hope that this Bill will be a credit to the people of Barbados if followed along in the right lines.

Thank you, Sir.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD (St. Michael South): This Bill is for the establishment of a National Health Board for the management of those components of the National Health Service that are specified in the Bill. We on this side view health as the birthright of all Barbadians, indeed of all peoples of the world. We define "health" in accordance with the definition given in the Constitution of the World Health Organization, that health is a complete state of mental, social, and physical well-being and not merely the absence of disease, and to that extent, it is indeed the birthright of all people.

We on this side believe that all Barbadians are entitled to the highest possible, attainable standards of health. I do not think that anyone can quarrel with that kind of overall objective; indeed, it may be like motherhood — everybody agrees with that. The question, however, when we come to deal with health services, or with the attainments of such goals, is not only what is desirable, but also what is affordable within the resources of a country, for the time being and in the foreseeable future.

I want to make it absolutely clear that it is my view, and the view of the Opposition, that Barbados has a National Health Service already, and it is a very sophisticated service at that. It provides services at the primary level, secondary level, and at the tertiary level, and there are a lot of sophisticated services put in there for the people of Barbados. It has been in place for quite some time, built up by, first of all, the Conservatives when they were in charge of the affairs of this country, and then by the Barbados Labour Party and by the Democratic Labour Party. There is no doubt about that.

What we are really talking about is the nationalisation of certain aspects of the health services of Barbados, and I would not like us to get confused about this matter. I think it is best that this be put into perspective. What the Government is attempting to do is to nationalise certain aspects of the provision and delivery of health care in this country, and to bring it directly under the control and administration of the Government through this particular statutory corporation or board that we are establishing.

This raises a lot of questions, some of the implications which we cannot go into now because the statutory corporations or the para-statal organisations, as one member of the Government likes to refer to them, constitute one of the major problems in the public administration of this country at this present time, and they are causing a great strain of the economic resources, slender as they are at this time, of this country.

4.20 p.m.

Aside.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Oh, there is a lot of inefficiency in them as well, and all kinds of things which perhaps we should leave for a more substantial debate!

At the present moment the people of Barbados can get health services through the public institutions or through the private practitioners. There are certain problems in the delivery of that service at the moment, one of the main problems being that after dark it is very difficult for the ordinary Barbadian who does not have special contacts to get service as readily as he or she would wish. I do not know whether this particular measure will give any solution to this specific problem. The other one, of course, relates to the cost for those medical services.

In dealing specifically with this matter that we are looking at, we believe that an adequate cost and benefit analysis may very well show that the additional benefits which we are hoping to get as a result of the establishment of this nationalised health service may far outweigh the benefits that we will gain. Many countries have established nationalised health services. One of the premier countries in this regard is Britain, and there is also a service in, I believe, West Germany. I believe under that service it is possible, and there have been cases of it, where persons can actually obtain a wrist watch as part of the treatment under that nationalised service, I

believe on the grounds that you need a watch to tell the time when you should take your tablets or pills or whatever the case may be, and such a chronometer may be permitted under the services.

I make that point in order to establish that the costs under a nationalised health service can escalate and can get out of all proportions to the projections which the administrators and the politicians may give. This warning, as I recall it, was given by the consultants on the health plan itself to the Government. They issued a very sombre warning that the cost of this nationalised health service will be very great and will present a burden on all persons, both employers and employees, as well as the general population who pay taxes in one form or another. I believe they warned that there might be the feeling that the impact on the employee might be slight, but in actuality, in the long run the employees will shoulder most of the tax burden. The employers, they speculated, may probably raise their prices to cover part of their tax burden, but the share that the Ministry of Health would have to carry for this particular service will come mainly from the taxation of the general population.

I am going to predict that the cost for this nationalised health service is going to be significantly higher than those figures which the Government has been giving so far, and that it will present a tremendous burden on the economy of Barbados, and will be most expensive. It is for this reason that I am advising extreme caution on the implementation of this particular programme. One cannot quarrel, as I have said, with the objective of bringing health to all and of persons merely going under a nationalised health service and getting the treatment that they should have, but it is a question of what this country can afford.

The economic outlook does not indicate that our situation will be that buoyant that we can go in for these kinds of schemes which, on evidence and on the experience of other countries which have gone in for them, have proved to be tremendously burdensome.

In Britain, they are complaining about the cost of a nationalised health service. In Germany and in other places they are complaining, and we must not allow any of what we may consider to be desirable to get into the way of what might be affordable for a country, especially a small economy such as ours. Some of the things that we are attempting in this country, we are attempting, I believe, out of a certain degree of rashness, forgetting that we are not a developed country, and that even though others may put us in the category of a middle income country, we are still under severe strain to find the economic resources to run our very existing services.

We have got to take a very broad look at this question of health. It has been established that if we pay

especial attention to a lot of factors and components relating to health, we may in fact improve significantly the health status and health profile of the people of this country, and of the country as a whole, without going in for very expensive schemes, the additional benefits accruing to which may indeed be in doubt. The only thing that is certain is that it will place a tremendous financial burden on the people of this country. Of that there can be no doubt.

We on this side have a very clear approach to this particular matter, because what we believe is that we can improve the national health service that we have now by looking specifically, as we have said quite clearly on a number of occasions, at those groups in the community which are particularly in need of the delivery of health care, some of which are the under fives, the over sixty-fives, the groups which are specially at risk, mothers and children, those who suffer from those illnesses which may be the major cause of hospitalisation, and those ten causes or so, the principal causes of mortality in this country. The specialists use some special words — morbidity and mortality I believe are the words they use; — those ten leading causes of morbidity and mortality, of hospitalization and death in this country.

4.30 p.m.

If we do that, I think we would be doing something that is affordable in this country within our own resources, but when we are going in for these very expensive schemes, and at the same time we send letters to lay off some public health workers and cause threats to the very public health in this country which has been the backbone of the development of our health services, we have to stop and ask questions. When there are so many problems inside of our health institutions which no nationalised health service can solve, we have to ask ourselves whether we have our priorities right in this particular matter.

We set it out very carefully — education in the terms of the health problems and the methods for their prevention and control. You do not need a nationalised health service for the promotion of proper nutrition and an efficient food supply system, and adequate supply of safe and pure water for all parts of Barbados, the maternal and child health care of which I referred — complete coverage and immunizations in respect of infectious diseases as well as the treatment of common diseases and injuries. And when we look at the special areas and the incidence of morbidity and mortality, if we were to set up special programmes to deal with such cases as hypertension, diabetes melleus, cardio-vascular diseases, malignant neoplasms and invest the kind of resources into them, expand our community nursing programmes and improve public health services, I believe the investments in these areas will far out-weigh investment in an administrative and bureaucratic structure that is

likely to prove very burdensome and perhaps not very efficient.

As usual, I do not think that on these matters the Government will listen to what is being said from over here, but it is our duty as an Opposition to make these points. They do not listen and then when the Government finds itself blundering and floundering in a morass of high costs and inefficiencies, and they have to come back and are stuck with the problem, pride prevents them from taking the necessary corrective action. But what we have set out is a clear programme based heavily on preventive treatment of the health problems of Barbados, as well as choosing a balanced programme for bringing and delivering better health care for the people of this country.

I am not going into details of this Bill at this stage, but I want to draw attention to two specific points which bother me, and I would hope that in replying the Government would give some answer to the problems which I am going to raise. One relates to the question of complaints in respect of the delivery of health care for which the Board will be responsible. We want to know how complaints from the general public who are participating in this programme will be dealt with.

I know that a section in here says that the Board may deal with such complaints, and that if there are complaints against the doctors, they may fine the doctors. This is a very strange provision, and I am calling upon the Government to do something about that because I do not think it is proper or right.

Secondly, there is the whole question of referring matters to the Medical Council. I am not going into that part, I know that under other systems where there is a nationalised health service, you have set up a specific person with an office, an Ombudsman.

The National Health Commissioner in Britain is responsible for hearing complaints from the general public concerning the nationalised health service in Britain. It does not go to any particular Board or anything like that. You have a person who is given the independence of a High Court judge. In other words, the judges hold office during good behaviour, or as they will tell us, *quam diu se bene gesserit*.

That man is given that kind of independence so that there can be no question of any political pressures being brought upon him, or any kind of pressures for that matter. He can investigate the matters that are referred to him directly, have consultations with the appropriate interests involved, and then make his report on the matter. But in this case, if you have a Board responsible for these aspects of the nationalised health service and then

there are complaints about that very service which go to the Board, this may be a case of Caesar going to Caesar.

You may have a problem against the Board. You may have a problem against an employee of the Board or persons working with the Board. To whom do you appeal? To the very Board?

It seems to me that if we are setting up a system in order to give maximum freedom to people — and some persons do not like to hear the word “freedom” — independence and a feeling that they are not being pushed hither and thither, then it appears to me that you would need some independent body to which complaints may be made, even if there are complaints after you have gone to the Board.

But, then, do you see what we are talking about? We will have to make the bureaucracy a little bigger and bigger. When you are getting into that kind of ball game, we are now talking about money which, in the first place, might better have been spent directly on the services involved. So we are going to come back to where we started. This is a very massive problem that we are dealing with. I have no doubts that we can afford this kind of system that we are going into.
4.40 p.m.

It appears to me that what we are being told now is that we will have certain aspects of this service in place, the very aspects that we have been telling the country would be provided in any event, and then they are saying the rest of the service will come later. We have to have our eyes wide open on these particular matters.

Another point which I want to raise relates to the power of the Auditor General in relation to the proposed National Health Service Board. In quite a number of Acts relating to the statutory boards, we have on the Statute Books provision whereby the Auditor General on his own initiative can carry out investigations and audits of the finances of these statutory boards. For one reason or another, and I would like the Government to say why, no such authority is given to the Auditor General in this particular Board as far as I can glean.

I read that it is the duty of the Auditor General on being required by the Minister to carry out at any time an investigation into or special audit of the accounts of the Board. But if for any reason the Auditor General on his own initiative believes that he should make an investigation, I see no special power being granted to the Auditor General to do that on his own. I know the provision exists in relation to other statutory corporations, and I would like to know why the Auditor General has been excluded or whether indeed he has been excluded, particularly in view of the fact that there are Health Service contributions in Part IIA of the National Insurance and Social Security Act.

There are public funds involved, and we want to know why the person who acts as the independent auditor in this respect under special provisions of the Constitution, given an independent status, has been excluded from the investigation or auditing of those funds, when, in fact, in quite a number of statutory boards he has that initiative, and he can take the necessary steps, even though the Minister has not requested or required him to do so. We believe that it should be spelt out very clearly in this piece of legislation that the Auditor General should have that particular power, and we will be moving in Committee for an insertion.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: You will not have very much more time to move anything else.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: In Committee, Sir?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: You have reached the end of your allotted time.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Well, having made these very cogent and incisive points in relation to the National Health Service, I will allow my case to rest.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES (St. Michael South Central). Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise to speak to this Bill which has as its Objects and Reasons the provision for the establishment of a National Health Service Board for the management of those components of the National Health Service that are specified in the Bill.

First of all, I believe that I have spoken in this Chamber on many occasions on this whole question of what the Government, for political reasons, deems it necessary to state that they are establishing a national health service in Barbados. I believe that it is important that the public should know that there has always been a national health service in Barbados since the days of slavery, that when this Government came to power, just as when the Democratic Labour Party came into power, almost all the secondary medical care services in this country were free, that is, the hospital services, all your public health services were free, and about 90 per cent of your primary health care services were free.

All services were provided free of cost apart from those services provided by general practitioners if patients elected to go to general practitioners rather than to go to the public services, and for those persons who elected to go into private wards, which, in any event, were heavily subsidised. The only segment of a health service in Barbados which was subject to nationalisation would be the service provided by general practitioners for those persons who opted for that service, for those who elected to go to private specialists. But without any additional taxation by way of levies or otherwise, all medical services were totally free to all Barbadians; in fact, all residents in Bar-

bados and in the past all persons who fell ill on Barbadian soil. That is an absolute fact.

Whether a health service works or not can be assessed by looking at the vital statistics of a community; you look at things like the infant mortality rate, the perinatal mortality rate, the average lifespan of a community. I would say that there has been a progressive improvement in all the major health indices in Barbados over the past fifty years, and that it has reached a point that if you spent \$500 million a year it would probably take you 50 years before you can get enough statistical information to work out whether that \$500 million a year has had any improvement. In other words, if the maternity mortality is one a year and the next year it is two and you spent \$500 million on health in the second year, you have no statistical evidence to demonstrate that you have improved anything because of the very high levels of health care that have existed in Barbados, under the Democratic Labour Party in particular.

So let us make it quite clear that this is largely a political matter. This is not a professional matter, this is not dealing with the fundamentals of health care in Barbados. This is a question of a Government in 1976 being badly advised, where the Minister of Finance, then the Leader of the Opposition, made a statement in this Honourable Parliament to the effect that with the expenditure of another \$3 million to \$5 million, we could have a free national health service in Barbados. They then proceeded to put in their manifesto that they were going to introduce a free national health service.

The Minister of Finance made it absolutely clear that nothing is free. What he did not say is that he has been collecting about \$16 million a year since 1981, that he will probably have collected about \$48 million from the public of Barbados to date, and all that he has offered them is a highly compromised drug service, offering the people of this country a series of inferior drugs when in fact they once enjoyed totally free drugs, of good quality.

4.50 p.m.

They not only did that. Over the past year I have been very disturbed by the fact that they feel they have to pursue the same political path as other countries in trying to denigrate the medical profession in order to impose their political will. I do not have to declare any interest, because this particular Bill does not apply to me professionally. In any event, having worked in a National Health Service system, and having worked in the mixed system which we have in Barbados, I have no doubt in my mind that there is a higher standard of professional delivery of health care in Barbados, on average, than in many countries with highly developed national health service systems. The average general practitioner in Barbados, I would reckon, is about twice

as competent as the average practitioner in the United Kingdom, who has almost been reduced to a position of a clerical officer over the years.

We have had the benefit in this country of some extremely talented medical practitioners. We have had general practitioners who are capable of doing surgery, some who are capable of doing eyes at a fair specialised level, some ear, nose and throat surgery, some obstetrics and gynaecology. We have generated a remarkably high level of skills in this society over the years, and we have to be very careful how we tamper with this situation.

The stand of the medical profession is very simple. They are not concerned about money. What the medical profession has been concerned about in this matter, and in the St. George's Medical School matter, relates to professional health care delivery. They have tried to guide the Government in a direction, which the Government has now fallen back on, in order to ensure that with what resources that are available you can try to improve your existing health care system.

The government has allowed what they found to go into a state of decay. One only has to look at the physical and other aspects of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital to recognise that our secondary health care institutions have deteriorated significantly over the past eight years or so.

One heard when one first came into this Parliament that their major thrust in primary health care development will be the development of polyclinics around the country. Not long afterwards we heard of the collapse of the polyclinic programme. Then there was an attempt to get the polyclinic programme going again, and I do not think that any of the polyclinics in this country are functioning above 25 per cent of capacity. So you have the polyclinic programme which, purportedly, is to cater to the primary health care needs of the community, and now you have super-imposed on that another programme, for which you are going to be taxing the people of this country to provide a service which already exists.

I myself am satisfied that the Government is playing a political game in this matter. There is a St. Peter by-election around the corner, and it is necessary to include such things in Budgets and to come with Bills of this nature at this point in time. But let us all clearly understand on the floor of this House that what is being done represents a permanent commitment of a substantial proportion of the resources of this country in an area where, it is my humble judgment, there will be the least returns to the community.

I say for a number of reasons. First of all, it is going to be permanent. Make no mistake about that. Secondly, the Union of Aneurin Bevan, for example, was

one of the first unions to recently take out private insurance because the problems in the National Health Service in Britain are such that the unions have found that their own membership cannot get proper service within that structure, and the fastest growing industry in the United Kingdom today is private health insurance spearheaded by B.U.P.A. in the United Kingdom. So one thing you can be sure about is that cost will escalate. That is almost unavoidable, because it is an open-end type of service.

It is a fundamental error to feel that because you are not paying doctors on a capitation basis, you are offering them a flat salary, that that in itself will represent a method of controlling your cost. That is one ingredient that you might be able to control, but the fact is that there are many other elements that this does not cater to. The least costly element of health to a patient in Barbados is his visit to his doctor. In many instances the taxi fare to get to the doctor's office and back is far higher than what he pays the doctor. Then he may have to go and buy drugs. If he has to go and get investigations, and you order a full blood count and other tests, that is about \$80 or \$100 just like that, and all you are looking at are a few basic simple tests. Did you ever do a complete profile on a patient in today's world at today's prices? You are probably talking about \$500 in investigations.

What the Government is tackling here in paying for the visit to the doctor. You wonder what is going to happen to the other costs. How are you going to meet those other costs? It is a matter of fact that as things are today, the infrastructural services in Barbados in health can hardly cope with what you have to provide right now. It has taken us about forty years to produce three radiologists; one came and stayed here for a couple of months and left and two have remained. The number of pathologists that we have are very limited. Your resources in the infrastructural area are extremely limited, and when you hear this foolishness that you are going to put an X-ray department in a polyclinic — who is going to read the X-rays? In today's context of diagnostic radiology, you have to have that special skill and knowledge. Perhaps I may represent a breed of physicians who at one stage had to do this kind of thing, but certainly when you look into the future there is no way that you can look at an X-ray and give the same kind of opinion on an X-ray that a radiologist looking at X-rays day in and day out is going to give. So you have to find a radiologist. You have to find the equipment. You have to pay for those, and these are highly expensive.

What kind of service are you going to offer if you cannot provide the infrastructure in order to provide for proper investigation of the patients and so on? That is the kind of problem that you have. And what is more important is that you should have the infrastructure in

first before you try to superimpose this sort of thing. You are going to significantly compromise the quality of service which is being offered in this community. Selectivity of tests will be a thing of the past. It will be like in the United States, where when you walk into a doctor's office he orders an SM12, chest X-ray, this and that, and ask for about twenty different consultations, and all you might have had is a headache. That is going to happen.

Then there is the facile, indeed the asinine belief I say, that because you established this service you are going to reduce the load on the secondary health services. There can be no greater nonsense. All you have to do is to look and see what is happening in the United Kingdom, what has happened in Canada, and what has happened in the Western European countries. Far from reducing your demands on your secondary health services, you are going to increase them, not only in the infrastructural areas but also in the superstructural areas.

5.00 p.m.

I will give you a simple example, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Some years ago when I was Chairman of the medical staff of the hospital, I received a directive to put six doctors in Casualty and that the waiting period in Casualty should be no more than half hour. The directive was duly carried out. I cautioned the Hospital Director that this was going to cause no end of problems. Six doctors went down to Casualty, patients came through Casualty, no one waited more than half hour for a while, and then at 5 o'clock one morning the Hospital Director called me and asked me to come down to the hospital. Do you know what happened? The queues moved from Casualty to the Dispensary. So when you are doing this kind of thing, you have to recognise that with more patients going on more visits to the general practitioner, then you are going to find that the general practitioner will be referring more and more patients for use of your secondary services, and this is what has happened over the years.

The only mechanism that has been found to control the cost and to stop the rapid deterioration in the quality of these health services is to cut back on the services delivered. This has happened in Ontario, as we all know. They have taken the simple decision. They have cut back on the number of doctors entering Canada, the number of doctors being put out by medical schools in Canada, and are going to close down many of our health facilities. That is what they have had to do in order to control escalating costs.

You are thinking now of 100 doctors, so when you have 100 doctors in the service and more doctors come into the country, what are you going to do? Are you not going to employ the extra doctor? There are serious problems involved in this kind of effort you are trying to

put into the health service in Barbados, and my humble opinion is that you should concentrate on improving what you have, concentrate on, at least getting the polyclinic services going, and then after that see what additional needs you have.

As far as the doctors are concerned, when I look at the ultimate thing here, if you are going to offer a doctor \$104 000 a year and pay \$81 000 in expenses, the doctor should take the offer, because to earn that kind of income he will probably have to generate a gross income of about a quarter of a million dollars at today's office costs. So it cannot be the money that the doctors are objecting to, the doctors know only too well what is involved here.

I have had the benefit of training in a national health service system. I have had the benefit of doing G.P. locums in quality areas like Edinburgh. I did my first G.P. locum, I went up, wonderful situation, but then I went down to the east end of London to do a locum and I will never forget the first morning, the first patient came in coughing and spluttering. I asked her to go and undress. She looked at me and said, "Doctor, I have been coming here for ten years and no one has ever asked me to do this yet." I realised what the name of the game was in certain sections of the health services in the United Kingdom, that is, on to the hospital. You write a prescription, you come back coughing next week, on to the hospital. That is what happens in this kind of system.

I am not imputing the integrity of any doctors because as a legislator I have a responsibility in this matter, but I believe that looking at the gross health indices in Barbados, all you can really do is to improve on the quality and the comfort arrangements in which health care is delivered in this country. There is little that that side or this side can do in our lifetime to fundamentally influence the vital statistics of Barbados. That is an absolute fact, so when you are talking of a health care system and an outlay of money, then you have to look very carefully and see what the implications are.

The honourable Member for St. Michael South made the very valid point that you are going to get not only escalation of costs, but you are going to get an escalation in administrative costs, and if you were to look at the projections when the full health service comes on stream, you will see that already out of a total of \$21 million, almost \$2 million will go on administration largely for this Board. That is 10 per cent, and that is for starts, and you will find yourself like the United Kingdom where less than 25 per cent of the billions of pounds that they spend on the national health service would actually go into direct health care, and would be absorbed in a massive superstructure that nobody would

hope politically ever to dismantle. Government after Government in the United Kingdom, whether it be a Labour Government or a Conservative Government, have tried to modify that health service, some have tried to dismantle it, and they all know it is politically impossible, so they continue with it as a millstone around their necks.

I believe the Australian Government was the only one to take that decision, and they took that decision because the health services in that country were relatively young and were so structured that it could be terminated at any point in time without removing the constitutional or other accrued rights of individuals. I believe they had a partial payment up front for the health services which were delivered.

This Bill is obnoxious to the medical profession in certain respects. For example, how can you ask a profession like the medical profession or any other organisation to submit to you five names and you would select two? I hope that the Barbados Association of Medical Practitioners would treat that with the disrespect with which they have been treated and make sure they submit two names, and only two names.

Then there is the whole question of discipline of the medical profession. Let me tell you something. As a consultant physician in this country, I would reckon that about 30 or 40 per cent of all patients who you see come with all sorts of complaints about other doctors, and in 99.9 per cent of cases they are the wrong perceptions of the patients. The doctors had done nothing professionally incorrect or otherwise. How can you have a Board of this kind dealing with complaints?

Do you realise that any person who is a beneficiary of this service only has to write a letter to the Board saying he called a doctor at 10 p.m. and he did not come? That can be a complaint, but there is one problem. The doctor may not have gone, because if a patient calls a doctor and tells the doctor he has chest pains going down both his arms, and the patient lives in Christ Church and the doctor lives in St. Michael, and the doctor did not get on the telephone and call the hospital and send an ambulance right away to get that patient to the hospital, I would consider it malpractice if the doctor left his home and wasted that valuable half hour or hour going to the patient's home. We all know that it is that critical half hour to an hour that you need to get to an intensive care unit, but the patient does not know that. He does not know that the doctor not coming to his home represents the correct thing to do, and might be life saving.

On the other hand, a patient might be feeling terribly ill, a bit giddy, with cough, fever and this kind of thing at one o'clock in the morning. He calls a doctor,

but it is clearly a case of influenza. Again, another complaint. The point I am trying to make is that complaints often arise in matters of a professional nature, and, therefore, for any complaint of a professional nature, all this Board should do is refer the matter to the Medical Council. The Board should not put itself in a position where the Board itself is reporting the matter to the Medical Council, because the Medical Council has a Complaints Committee which was established by law, and it is no function of this Board to be dealing with professional complaints whatsoever.

5.10 p.m.

The whole idea of a fine being imposed by this Board, I think is a bundle of nonsense. If there is a breach of a contractual relationship between the general practitioner and the Board, then that is a matter that should be settled in the courts. No Board should be informed with the authority to fine a conducting officer like this. If he is not satisfied with the doctor's services, then fire him. If the doctor is not satisfied that he has been fired in accordance with his contract, then let him go to the courts and seek redress, but I think those abnoxious provisions should be removed.

I believe the Association has made representations in terms of certain fines. I see that those fines have been reduced, but these are refinements that I need not concern myself with too much.

The principal role of this Board should be one of auditing, I am not talking about professional complaints. I also hope that we would not see the usual yardfowls, whether they are professionals or not, being placed on the Board. There are all sorts of yardfowls in Barbados, people who find themselves in ticklish positions having to carry out their masters' wishes.

Asides.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I do not know like who so, but that is all I am saying.

Asides.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: You are so confused that you do not know what is a yardfowl. As a matter of fact, I am very concerned about your position in Cabinet.

To continue, Sir, I happen to know that the Government realizes that the arguments on this side are sound and that they are correct. As a matter of fact, elsewhere I made a suggestion that instead of spending \$1.9 million on the Board, all in fact they had to do was to tell the patient that he is allowed twelve visits to the doctor per year, Government will pay for X amount, supply the necessary infrastructure, have a small computer inside the office and the patient can go to any doctor he

likes. If there are any visits in excess of twelve, then there should be a special panel to review that.

You can pay the doctors quarterly; and when they submit their bills and they owe, the whole thing can be audited. You can save yourself a considerable amount of money, because all you would need is one or two accountants sitting down with mini-computers that cost \$2 000 or \$3 000. The process could be done within a three-month period. But the Government is being misled by a whole lot of bureaucrats.

You must also understand that whereas we feel, and I have always felt, that no one should have to pay a doctor when they go to a doctor in any situation, it is a more comfortable relationship for the doctor. It is also a more comfortable relationship for the patient, provided the patient accepts it, because there are many situations where this is not accepted, even though the country may have had a National Health Service for many a year. Harley Street today is far more prosperous than it was twenty-five years ago, despite a National Health Service; and better too, after a heavy influx of the Arabs.

Asides.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: We do not have any Arabs down here, unfortunately.

The point I am trying to make is you do not need this bureaucratic structure that is being set up for a small place like Barbados. What you want to do is to pay for the patients seeing the doctor and you want some simple system to facilitate that payment and to prevent any abuses.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: That brings you to the end of your half hour.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Half-hour, Sir?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Half-hour.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Actually it was thirty-one minutes.

Thank you, Sir.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN (Christ Church East Central): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I always listen with interest to any speech made by the honourable Member in this area, and also any by the spokesman for Health on the other side.

I think it is generally accepted that it is the duty of all societies to endeavour by some means to ensure that those who are in need of medical attention are able to receive that medical attention in a competent environment and for a price which they can afford. In short,

people should not be denied medical attention because of their inability to pay.

Many statements have been made by some members on the other side as to the adequacy of the existing services in Barbados. There have been suggestions even that that which we have now with a little tinkling up would be sufficient in that it would satisfy their conception of the needs of the people in Barbados. I do not believe that that is so. I genuinely believe that there are a certain number of people in Barbados who cannot receive the medical attention that they would like to receive or which they need at a price which they can afford. It is therefore the duty of the Government to take steps within the means and the resources of Barbados to remedy this situation.

I am not accepting for one moment that the system that we have now, in which medical attention to a large extent is delivered at the Casualty, or the equivalent of the old District Medical Officer, or in the confines of medical offices in which your care is sometimes rationed in accordance with how much money you can bring, is adequate. I do not believe that that is satisfactory, so we start off with a basic disagreement with the other side, and I am willing to submit our views and their views to the ultimate test of all, to the electorate. I have no fear in that respect. So with that difference we now come to the question of the need for the improvement and the methodology for improving it.

I think that there is one true thing that always comes out in the speech of the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central on health services. He is absolutely correct when he says that the medical profession as a whole is vulnerable, especially when it comes to containment of costs.

There will be fraud. Doctors are notorious for tax evasion, for the provision of false claims under systems of reimbursement. They are also notorious for over-prescriptions and things of that kind. That is my experience of many health services. The Government is not under the illusion that the doctors in Barbados are any different from the doctors anywhere else.

We in the Ministry of Trade, in our usual quest for suitable industries for Barbados, have made a very careful study of the health service industry. It is one of the fastest growing industries in the whole world, both the training of doctors and the delivery of health care, and we see a lot of potential, particularly in the off-shore area for delivery services. We also recognize that some of the problems that one gets with the question of containment of costs are problems which we feel we have a duty to bring to the attention of the Ministry of Health and the Ministry of Finance in particular, and that we have done.

5.20 p.m.

Anyone or any Government that is today contemplating the bringing into force of a health delivery system must take into account the experience of other countries which have gone into this before. I believe that part of the reason for the period of time which it has taken to implement Government's laudable intention in this respect has been partially because there is a need to proceed cautiously. The fact is that no matter what the other side says or would have people believe, it is a fact that this Government proceeds particularly where the end result is to impinge upon traditional habits and practice of professionals and other groups only after the maximum consultation. Sometimes the consultation is so extensive that if we are not careful we are forced into a position where to carry out the wishes of the people we consult, we land ourselves in trouble constitutionally or otherwise, but that does not detract from the principle of consultation. With this method of approach the time that it has taken for us to reach this stage is not time that we should regard as being wasted or time that we should regard as being a confession of failure in trying to implement what we want to achieve.

To me, there are still some outstanding questions which I would like to be satisfied on, because I think that there is a fair amount of confusion still in the minds of many people as to the relationship between the general practitioner service and the service which was traditionally performed by district medical officers and by the public health doctors at each polyclinic. Knowing Barbadians, I really feel that, given the concept of providing a total service at general practitioner level, there has got to be full integration between what is provided at that level and what used to be provided in the past at the district medical officer level and at the level of the public health doctor. We are not going to get public health doctors to work under the terms and conditions that they now work under if general practitioners are going to work under the terms and conditions that are provided, because it would pay all of them to retire and become general practitioners.

Secondly, and this is a very important one, we still have to find out what is going to be the relationship between the general practitioner service and the so-called specialist service, which in other countries may be a genuine specialist service but in Barbados, in truth and in fact, is a general practitioner service performed by specialists. Are the specialists going to join the specialists general practitioners? The honourable Member will know what I am talking about very well. He would understand the distinction in this area.

This is a very important point, because I do not want a situation to arise in Barbados, which seems to be the view point as expressed by the spokesman for the Opposition on health as being the one which he sees as an inevitable consequence, namely, that although you are

part of a family, you must pay for extra attention. I believe there is a row going on in Canada now between the National Health Service authorities in some provinces and the federal authorities on reimbursement because of the fact that it was discovered that a number of services were being charged for privately in order for priority to take place. These are dangers, and I have always said that you cannot operate on the assumption that you are not going to get this kind of conduct in Barbados.

The honourable Member for St. Michael South Central has repeatedly warned us covertly that you must expect to have that kind of conduct, that that is the norm, and he has gone further and said not to rely on the professional bodies to discipline the members, they are not going to do it. That is why we have to have disciplinary provisions in here. No professional body disciplines anybody in small communities, neither doctors, lawyers, accountants nor anyone else. Only politicians would like to discipline one another. Nobody gets discipline in these small countries because we are living in a small community, so we have to be very careful. We must build in systems and mechanisms to ensure from the very outset that the exploitation, which has been the experience of other countries, of the laudable objectives of Government does not take place.

I would have thought that in a community like Barbados, honourable Members on the other side would be helping us to try and provide the checks and balances. The only check I hear coming up here today is the suggestion by the honourable Member that from the outset we should only pay for twelve visits. What happens if you need fifteen? Do you mean you have to rake out the money out of your pocket and go and pay somebody? Suppose you cannot afford it?

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: On a point of elucidation: all I said was that it would be cheaper to give an option of twelve visits and if more are required then have a professional review.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I understand what the honourable Member is saying. The honourable Member is saying that there will be abuse, and the best way of containing the abuse is to limit beforehand in some way the maximum probation cost of the system in any given period of time. I believe that the experience of other countries would justify that opinion. That is the abuse that arises out of the fact that the people, the beneficiaries of the system, because of the manner of delivery, would tend to abuse it, but there is something else.

I have read reviews — I have not read the whole book, and I have suggested to the Ministry of Health in Barbados that they buy the book — of health services systems in a number of journals lately. Economists

started a whole comparative study in the health systems in the western democracy. There have been a number of books written on the American system. I believe that is one that has been the subject of abuse, and mechanisms have also been built in to ensure that doctors do not abuse the systems by over-recommending either drugs, tests, operations or things of that kind.

It appears to me that that particular area of potential abuse is restricted because of the very nature of the service that we are providing, except, of course, our definition of general practitioner service is sufficiently wide to lend itself to that. I am only raising these points, but I feel that in our attempt to get at the principles of what we are trying to deliver, we should try and look at this matter on the assumption that it is going to be abused. You must start off with that.

I also feel that a clear position should be made known from the very beginning, that as a result of the introduction of the National Health Service in the form in which it is introduced, it is not going to result in the neglect of other areas of health, namely, your public health services and your community services. We also want to know the relationship between this and what will obtain at the hospital level. I feel that the community must provide some means of ensuring that those people who wish or who have to have hospital care can get it without having to undergo the trauma of raising the money at the particular period of time.

5.30 p.m.

Am I to understand, Sir, that the National Health Service in its full implementation stage will cover hospitalisation or not? I think this is very important that we have an answer to that. In short, Sir, what I want to get across very clearly is that we tried to sensitize the public's mind to the viewpoint that all taxpayers in Barbados in effect are paying for this service. That mechanism have to be built in to control abuses by patients as well as abuses by those who deliver the care; that it has been the experience of no country in the world, certainly I have not read of any, that has had a health service at the state level that it is a perfect system. There will always be dissatisfaction at some period of time with various aspects of the health delivery and Barbados is going to be no exception. But the fact that we have these difficulties in my opinion should not turn back the government. This government is not a government that is burned back because you meet difficulties. We analyse the difficulties and we regard it as our duty to overcome the difficulty. I do not see that this change in delivery, Sir, with the improvements which it has the potential to deliver should be one that should evoke and provoke all of the fears and controversy that has arisen in Barbados.

I think that the government has treated the doctors exceptionally well. They have been consulted from the

very beginning. They have a choice. There is no law at all that says they must join the National Health Service. There is absolutely none. They are free as any individual to exercise their calling in circumstances in which they wish voluntarily to exercise it.....(*Asides*).....Obviously, the Honourable Member on the other side with experience in this matter will know that the level of remuneration is exceptionally generous. He constantly advocates in here that they take it. I believe that he is going to take it. I believe that. Now this is the quarterly earnings that he talks about....(*Asides*). So that, Sir, this bold experience that we are undergoing, Sir, with the full knowledge that it has its pitfalls. But a good further public relations must be done in relation to the differences between what is in existence now and what the service will provide and I hope, Sir, that now that it is clear that this scheme will be implemented that all those who from the very beginning felt that it was their duty without examination, without analysis to oppose it for the mere sake of opposing it will now lend their hand to try to see the successful implementation of it. Thank you, Sir.

Hon. V. L. JOHNSON: Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, this is a revolutionary piece of social legislation that the Barbados Labour Party has structured on behalf of the people of Barbados. We have always been at the forefront of this type of social legislation; legislation that takes fully into consideration the needs of our people the public that we serve, and that tries to come to grips with the present day realities of providing a medical service to a growing community and a community that is becoming more sophisticated in every aspect including that aspect of health care.

In 1976 when I first came to this Honourable House of Assembly, I pointed out something which has always bothered me. I had been away from Barbados for a number of years and returned to this country in 1973, and having spent a good portion of my time abroad in close affiliation with medical systems as a Medical Technologist in some of the larger institutions in Metropolitan New York, and in that environment I had an opportunity, Sir, to see health care administration at various levels and one aspect that always concerned me was the fact that deprivation for medical services always seem to be the preserve of the persons who occupied the lowest socio-economic grounds. When I came back home I was careful to observe what was happening in our own community and was shocked to see the number of people because in my view because of inadequate medical care was dying prematurely or who were losing limbs because of inadequate medical attention primarily associated with diabetes and circulatory problems. If you were to look carefully to see those persons in this country who are operating from wheelchairs because of loss of their lower limbs, you will see, Sir, there is a very strong correlation between that kind of medical state and poverty.

5.40 p.m.

The Barbados Labour Party, therefore, in trying to reconcile this position and provide universal access to medical attention for all of our citizens, had to develop a programme that would answer the needs not just in some aspects, but across the spectrum.

The honourable Member for St. Michael North West (Mr. L. A. Weekes) is now the representative for the Farm Area, but I can remember a particularly tragic incident in the Farm Housing Area where a young boy, 12-years-old, died because he did not have the opportunity to get the quality of medical care that he would have had if time were on his side, if resources were at his disposal. Considered opinion is that he would have been alive today. Those kinds of tragedies need not occur in a society such as ours, they need not occur in any society that has any care and concern for its citizens. Accidents will occur from time to time, but I believe that we can predict with a fair measure of certainty those cases that are likely to occur, and it is our duty and responsibility, as enlightened citizens with sensitive concepts with respect to the care of our people, to look after them.

If we were to listen to the Democratic Labour Party, we would get the feeling that they are modern-day Simons and Garfunkels — “slow down, you move too fast, you got to make the morning last” — because every time we attempt to introduce a bit of legislation that goes to the heart of the social problems in this country, we are always cautioned not to proceed, we are always accused of having political motives, we are always told about the cost, and all these other considerations which always seem to daunt the spirit of persons who do not recognise that what we are engaged in is an activity calculated to improve the lot of our people.

When the School Meals Programme was to be introduced, the Democratic Labour Party thought that we ought not to be too ambitious with that, so they extended it only to a limited number of our citizens, our young children. When the Tenancies Act was to be introduced, they told us to slow down with that, and as a matter of fact actually had the gall to vote against it, because they could not see the relevance of that kind of legislation in a society like ours. School uniforms and school books and all those other measures are measures which were introduced, taking into consideration certain sectors of our community, sectors of deprivation that needed our assistance.

They tell us that the bill incurred in this exercise is going to be too exorbitant for a country like Barbados to absorb. We listened to them but remain undaunted, because we recognise that health is a matter which cannot really be priced. There are only two ways to look at it, that a person either has the resources to provide for himself the medical attention that he needs, or he does not. If he does, he lives, and if he does not, he dies. It is as

cold-blooded as that, and there are a number of people in this country who are shuttered away in little sections of our community who are sometimes too proud to let anybody know the level of their suffering, and consequently they sit down there and nourish ailments that need not in every case be terminal, but because they do not have the money to go to a doctor and pay for that service, they stay home and try to nourish conditions that will ultimately lead to their demise.

The honourable Member for St. Michael South Central says that he understands quite clearly the politics of the situation. I do not know that I would want to say that the providing of a medical health service free to the citizens of Barbados is a political consideration. It may ultimately redound to the credit of the party that had the foresight to implement it, but I do not think that it is descriptive of the motives that surround the introduction of this programme to call it political.

For a long time we in Barbados have been moving in the direction of social legislation, expanding our social welfare base in a way that would provide more and more services for those persons who need them, and this is a measure of any progressive society, because if they were to look at the successful models — I do not know why it is they always choose to look at those models which have failed — they would discover that it is possible to offer the kind of programmes we are describing without necessarily courting bankruptcy.

At the base of it all is that we are pitting all of this against the integrity of our citizenry, who we feel are not so cavalier about this kind of service, that they would not wish to get up every morning and go to a doctor just for the sake of going. This is not something that is infinitely elastic, the freer it is the more times a patient would want to visit a doctor. That is not the way it is. I believe that in most cases patients go to doctors to consult on matters of health that are genuine to them, and that when the conditions no longer exist they no longer need to go to see a doctor. That is how we view it.

We also have a fair measure of confidence in the integrity of our doctors that they will not want to be encouraging people to use these services just for the sake of using them. Never mind they will from time to time appear to be giving trouble in respect of the introduction of this programme. Doctors, like everybody else in this small community, do not like change. They have become accustomed to a set norm, and modification of that norm under this system is threatening, but after they have been introduced to the system, and after they have recognised that it holds no threats for them, they will adjust. That is one of the remarkable things of human nature, that even though we manifest and express fear in certain unknown circumstances, once you become introduced to the new phenomenon, we accommodate ourselves to it and recog-

nise the benefits that were always inherent, benefits which were there which we could not see because of the prejudices which informed our actions at that time. I am a strong believer in the National Health Service. Incidentally, I happen to know that a good many of the doctors who are silent are equally anxious to see the service introduced. I was only about three or four weeks ago discussing this very matter with a section of the medical community. They told me that they hoped that we were not under the mistaken impression that because a certain section of the community is making a lot of noise, that all doctors are opposed to the service.

5.50 p.m.

There are certain doctors in the community at present, who do not regard the profession only as a means of becoming rich, but doctors who have an inherent concern for the discipline, who are touched by human feelings, and consequently they see a lot of patients free. So, in effect, a good many physicians are carrying some of the burden of providing for patients who are not in a position to pay.

I would think that a large percentage of the medical community in Barbados are in this category because I do not really see a doctor looking at an old aged pensioner and telling her that she cannot have access to the service because she does not have the \$20 to pay. I have a feeling that the vast majority of them would be inclined to provide the service and waive the charge and put it on to the bill of the honourable Member for St. Michael North when next he goes to see the doctor.

The honourable Member for St. Michael South was Minister of Health for a short time in Barbados and, therefore, he would have been exposed to some aspects of the medical health problems that we are encountering in this country. He is out of one side of his mouth saying what a wonderful thing it would be to have a National Health Service and out of the other side of his mouth he is suggesting that it is a horrible thing, we cannot afford it and that what we need to do is to look at what we have now, make a few small adjustments to it and pawn that off to the people of Barbados as a National Health Service.

The Barbados Labour Party has never gone about these problems in that kind of half-hearted, non-committal way. We are a party with a social heart. This is the distinguished and fundamental difference between our two political parties. From time to time I hear people saying that we are the same, but that is only a fantasy. We have always been in the forefront and in the vanguard of social legislation. They have always been in the back, scotching back and urging caution. That has not changed and it will not change in the foreseeable future.

As far as the administration of this programme is concerned, I believe everybody knows that malpractice

suits in Barbados cannot succeed. I cannot think of a single case. Honourable Members who represent the legal profession may be able to cite one, but I cannot think of a single case of malpractice in Barbados that has succeeded before the courts, because the responsibility of presenting evidence in a community as small as this will rest upon the same medical community, which is even smaller. It is a fraternity and, therefore, one doctor is not likely to go into court and testify against one of his colleagues.

Every doctor knows the other doctor. There are only a few of them, and they all know one another on a mostly intimate basis. Therefore, it is unreasonable to think that they will go into court and help a case to succeed. We therefore have to provide alternative mechanisms for safeguarding the welfare of all the persons who are likely to be using this service, and we cannot therefore agree with the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central that you would just need to go around and let the Medical Council deal with this.

One of the facts of life that we have to face is simply that doctors, like every other professional grouping, have certain inherent interests of their own which they will serve. That is not an abnormal condition. It is a phenomenon which informs the actions of most professional groupings, and, therefore, the Medical Council is going to come out almost in a unified voice and speak the same word. Never mind that there will be a few of them behind in the background disagreeing; when it comes to collective public action up front for everybody to see, there are very few doctors who are going to be heard putting forward a dissenting voice.

The doctors that were giving me the message that they are anxious to get in have not yet been heard once in public saying that they are anxious to get in, and they will never be heard.

(Aside: Name one).

Hon. V. L. JOHNSON: I am not going to name them. I could easily do that, and I could name more than one.

(Asides)

Hon. V. L. JOHNSON: Never mind. Just take my word for it that they are out there anxious and that they are saying that they are anxious behind the scenes. But they are afraid of the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central and his gang, so they are not going to come forward bravely and speak up front.

I believe that this National Health Service Scheme is a scheme that is going to be, once it is given a chance to succeed, one of the most significant programmes in

this country. It is the function of management to look after cost, and once the management structure is set up to make sure that the kinds of things that can go wrong are monitored and controlled, I believe that all of these prophetic statements from the doomsayers amongst us will go for naught, because what is really going to be the final measure of the success or failure of this programme is the way it impacts upon the health of those persons amongst us who would otherwise have been deprived, were it not for the fact that such a service existed — and there is a sizeable number of such persons in our community who cannot be denied.

I think that this legislation needs an opportunity to succeed. The Board may not accord in every respect with the expectations of the medical community and the Member for St. Michael North West, but I do not think we can select a Board small in size, that will meet all of the variables that you would regard as being essential for inclusion, but at least it can address a central problem and give as broad a cross-section as possible the opportunity to represent itself or its views, or the views of its own interest group on the Board. To that extent, I believe that the Board is worthy of notice.

The Minister has gone out of his way to be accommodating and to give all of the various ideas and opportunities to be heard and represented, so that a balance can be inherent in the Board. I think that in those circumstances, the Opposition party should be a little ashamed to come in here and make so much noise about what is indeed the most significant piece of social legislation in this country.

Thank you, Sir.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Sir, the debate has been without the heat that we associate with medical matters, and I find myself on this occasion having to welcome not only the speeches of the Deputy Prime Minister, the Minister of Transport and Works, and the honourable Member for St. Michael North West, but also the speech of the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central. 6.00 p.m.

The honourable Member for St. Michael South Central did mention to me beforehand his idea of rationing visits to doctors. I think that although it may be a bit brutal to tell people that they can only get sick once a month, and if they get sick more often they have to pay — that undoubtedly is how his political opponents will represent it on the platform — nonetheless I think his idea has some merit. I do not think that it could be a substitute for the whole scheme, but I think that as an instrument for saving costs, it is something that the administrators must bear very well in mind, some limitation on the number of visits which it is possible to make to a doctor unless the purpose of your visits is assessed and certified subsequently.

I also think that the honourable Member in emphasising the quality of secondary health care in Barbados was providing a very useful counterway to the wild and fanciful speech of the honourable Member for St. Michael South.

I really have to wonder whether the perception of the general public of Barbados is the same as the perception of the Democratic Labour Party where it comes to health care. I heard two honourable Members begin speeches with the same theme, that in Barbados medical care is already free. That was the burden of the speech of the honourable Member for St. Michael South. I do not believe that out there in the highways of this island anybody thinks that medical care does not cost money in Barbados. I think there are a whole set of people out there, 252 000, who know that you have to pay doctors to go and call on them if you do not feel well, and that those who cannot pay have to go and suffer with the long wait at the Casualty. I do not think the public of Barbados believes that we already have a free health service.

I think that the Democratic Labour Party does itself little credit by seeking to oppose this initiative of the Government on those grounds. This is a case where intellectual argument breaks down against the over-riding mass of the common sense and ordinary perception of the people. This is a case where perception also coincides with reality and truth.

The honourable Member for St. Michael South Central, having delivered himself of the general sentiments in order no doubt to keep within the mainstream of his party's criticism, then went on to make good points about the amount of money that we are spending on secondary care already, and suggested one or two good solutions to deal with a few problems, which I am sure will be taken into account by the administrators of the system.

We have put outside figures for the cost of the system. We do not anticipate such a bureaucracy as will absorb all those costs. For example, built into the system is a costing figure for secretarial assistance for doctors at \$24 000 a year each when the full scheme is in force. The proportion that it is proposed to pay a secretary during the preliminary phase of dealing with the old people would mean that when the entire phase comes in that that figure would be reached.

I wonder how many secretaries in Barbados today get \$24 000 a year. I wonder how many girls who work as secretary-receptionists in doctors' offices opening filing cabinets, taking out cards and making entries on cards, not computerised systems, just ordinary steam train entries with pen and ink, get \$2 000 a month. You may be absolutely sure, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that no Government with the kind of Cabinet that now exists is going

to agree to give a doctor \$2 000 a month to pay a secretary. We would have to have some idea that the secretary is getting \$2 000 a month and would be qualified were she working in the Public Service where the maximum salary for a Secretary, I believe, is \$1 450 a month, to receive a salary of the maximum plus. That is an example of the calculations which have been on the general side so that we can see the worse that can befall us in the preliminary period where cost is concerned.

The British National Health Service is partly a mixed system, with some element of a fee for service, and that perhaps explains the escalation, although clearly management costs are enormous. Yesterday it was announced in Britain that in future in most districts, Boards of Management for area health services are going to be abolished and General Managers will be appointed in their place, and indeed a General Manager for the British National Health Service is apparently now being selected from numbers of top management in other areas. I gather that somebody who manages a supermarket chain is one of the leading candidates. In other words they are looking to fill management positions.

That is not something that we would look at in the early days. We have negotiated a Board of Management system with the doctors, and despite the criticisms, many of which are valid, of the potential abuse and the potential wastage in the system, we are going to hold on to it in the short term.

There are one or two little matters which were mentioned in speeches dealing with complaints and discipline. Apart from representatives of the Barbados Association of Medical Practitioners indicating to me effectively that they would not want to have a system by which the Minister's nominees ultimately could decide whether or not a doctor could practise, they are, so far as I know, no basic complaints with the disciplinary procedure, and I think that honourable Members' minds could be set at rest on that part of it.

6.10 p.m.

Certainly, as far as we are concerned, it is for doctors to discipline doctors. If there are real abuses, if doctors start to operate on people when they are falling down with alcohol, and other doctors do nothing about it, will not give evidence; if doctors recommend surgical treatment for patients when they have already had the removal of appendix and matters of this sort; if doctors tell women that they are pregnant and charge them for abortions and we discover that other doctors find these things out and then do nothing about it, the general public would expect the Government to have to step in. But, so far as I know, none of these examples have reached such a stage as to make it necessary for the Government to have to threaten doctors with discipline by outside

bodies. We are content to leave the medical profession to police itself, and that will include the right to work in the National Health Service, equally as it includes the right to be registered as a doctor.

Very generally, doctors have not abused their right to grant or refuse registration to persons qualified outside of the scheduled territories. We have seen some examples of petty spite in which a person, well known to everybody to be qualified for registration, was brought by the police before the courts, I gather, for writing a note asking that Milk of Magnesia to be supplied to someone. These things arise out of political hysteria at times, and they put the police and other authorities in a very awkward position, but I think this is a departure from the norm. The petty telephoning and harassment by a few members of the profession should not make us think that the entire medical profession is irresponsible or malicious or petty in its approach to matters concerning medical practice.

I have confidence in the doctors. They are dealing with their own financial interest at the moment and, therefore, you cannot expect them to be entirely dispassionate or unselfish, but I have confidence in them in the long run.

Arising out of that, I should advert to a point in which I touched earlier, the question of this special care that some patients might want from their doctors. I am told that although the legislation does not forbid a doctor from giving private treatment to one of his NHS patients, ethics will ultimately deal with this. The professional view is that these things should not happen; that a doctor may be free to give private treatment to somebody else's patient but he should not be free to give treatment to his own patients; that this creates ethical problems for the profession. I am very glad indeed that the profession has been concerned itself with these ethical problems as well as the misdeeds of the Government in this, that, or the other spheres.

I can say very little on the topics generally raised, because I think everybody, except the honourable Member for St. Michael South, was making a sincere speech and putting forward views that can reasonably be held about National Health Services. I would have to discount the rubbish uttered by the honourable Member about we should spend the money on investigating malignant neoplasms. I do not think that the \$10 million a year, that is the maximum budget for the Health Service at the moment, would go very far towards investigating the cause of cancer. I really think that is merely a little spouting of the jargon that the honourable Member learned in his few months as Minister of Health. I think it is absurd to say, without any figures, without any attempt at quantification, that we should spend the \$20 million on improving the public health services and the district

nursing services. Twenty million dollars exceeds all the money that is now spent on personal emoluments at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, and I really wonder what extensions to the district health service could justify the spending of even \$2 million, far less \$20 million.

But there is a more substantial objection than that; an objection based on a point that no honourable Member has made or indeed seems to have considered, and that I myself omitted to deal with in my second reading speech. The \$20 million is not new revenue coming from nowhere which the Government is diverting to the National Health Service. Most of the \$20 million represents, basically, the savings effected by the fact that Barbadians will no longer have to pay to see general practitioners. We are raising it by a special levy. People are saving the consultation fees of doctors, the \$20 a throw that they have to carry. I understand that that is the present amount unless you have an appointment or a night call, when it might be more. I myself only have statistics to go on, which are statistics collected in 1980 by the Statistical Office in the course of a Household Sample Survey, and that Household Sample Survey found that Barbadians spend more money on going to doctors than they spend on transportation. They spend more money on going to doctors than they spend on any single item of food — more than on chicken, more than on beef!

To reach the figure of \$20 million, you would only have to have four visits a year by or on behalf of every Barbadian; 4 by a quarter of a million is a million; a million by 20 is \$20 million. So I do not think it is unreasonable to believe that we will be saving Barbadians \$12 million or \$14 million, at least, as a result of the money that they will no longer have to pay from their own pockets to call on doctors. Therefore, it is not a question of the Government having money and deciding to pay the doctors with it when they could have decided to do something else. We are diverting the money that people already used to pay the doctors towards a more equitable scheme. We are diverting the money that the rich now pay doctors to help the poor who have to go and suffer in Casualty to have a little more privacy and dignity at a private doctor. That is what we are doing, and that does not seem to be recognised by honourable Members who are speaking on the other side.

There is also another point that is not recognised. I venture to suggest that if there is one common trend on National Health Services in every country in which they have been introduced, it is that they become the most popular aspect of the Government's Social Security Scheme. This is not why we are introducing it; we certainly would not be introducing it for the by-election, since we have been fighting with it for seven years. But for all the criticisms, you cannot ever tell a population that has enjoyed a National Health Service that it is a

bad thing, and that has a message. It has a message that people care very deeply about their health and they believe that, as a matter of moral principle, they should not be disadvantaged in obtaining health care by poverty.

The greatest criticism that we can ever read that persons of Eastern Europe make of the United States — they do not tell you about Central America; they do not tell about the arms conflict in Germany, the 1000 nuclear weapons within fifty miles of each other along the German frontier — is that America does not have a free medical service. That is a criticism heard in Western Europe and in countries such as Barbados from people such as us who intend to make primary health care free to the citizens of this country.

The only issue in the last general election in Britain in which the public opinion polls showed that the Labour Party was favoured was the issue of the National Health Service. Somebody in the Labour Party got hold of the "secret manifesto" of the Conservative Party, as it was called, the subsidiary document which was supposed to be the real manifesto — the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central will know how these things can be discovered, or manufactured — and a part of the secret manifesto was that Mrs. Thatcher was going to destroy the National Health Service. That was the only issue in which the Labour Party had any credit. And if there was such secret manifesto, it was denied from the moment it was revealed, and the Government has had to hasten after the election to say that there is no intention of dismantling it.

I am going to see some honourable Members eat some very big words in here. The honourable Member for St. Michael South Central has covered his bets; he has hedged. Never mind he does not gamble, he well knows what I mean. He is careful that we are not going to quote anything against him that says that he was against old people getting free medical care. He has given some good advice too, sometimes privately and sometimes publicly. But the ultimate view and the ultimate verdict will be that as set out by the honourable Member for St. Michael West Central, who spoke, from his own experience, of the desirability of such a service as we are going to provide.
6.20 p.m.

It has taken a long time, Mr. Deputy Speaker, but we are determined, and it is going to go through.

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

On the motion of Hon. L. S. CRAIG, seconded by Hon. H. B. St. JOHN, Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. J. G. ODLE in the Chair.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The House is in Committee.

Amendments have been circulated, as far as I understand.

Clause 1 was called and passed.

Clause 2 was called.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to move that Clause 2 stand part.

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

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, I propose to look at these various clauses very carefully as they go through. I think it is important to do so, because not many people recognise the long term significance of what is taking place here today.

The honourable Member for St. Thomas just before he sat down, in relating the story about Mrs. Thatcher, made the point that once this goes through it is there for ever. No Government, neither them nor us in the future, can dismantle it, so it is important to get these things straight.

I want to look at the definition of general practice services. My own feeling is that that area is a little loose, because it can lead to all sorts of confusion unless you have a Board which, as I said in my second reading speech, is specifically designed to really do a professional audit, because in the context of Barbados, general practitioners services go far beyond just a matter of consultation. There are general practitioners who do minor surgery in their offices. There are general practitioners who are quite capable of doing a herniotomy in their offices. There are general practitioners who are capable of doing a termination of a pregnancy in their offices. There are others who are not competent to do it, so the level of competence and experience varies considerably. The question therefore arises, where does one draw the bottom line as to what constitutes general practitioner services?

That problem not only arises in relation to general practitioner services, but the same problem arises in relation to specialist services, in a sense, which appears elsewhere in this definition. The technological changes in medicine that have taken place over the years have made for some very interesting definitions of the term "specialist". Twenty years ago you had, broadly, medicine and surgery, then medicine was further subdivided into adult medicine, physical specialist and paediatrician. Then with the change in technology you had the clinical cardiologist, clinical gastro-enterologist, the whole lot.

Today, there seems to be some confusion. Paediatrics is a specialty, there is no question about it, but

there are a whole lot of sub-specialties within paediatrics which revolve largely around the use of technical instruments, technical skills, and so on. So people get confused between the specialists and the sub-specialists in these areas.

It is the same thing in adult medicine. A cardiologist, say, of fifteen years ago is not a cardiologist of today. As a matter of fact, unless you can push catheters and do certain specialised studies, you would not be considered as a cardiologist up north, and that is what has happened even within my lifetime, within twenty-one years.

The same thing applies to surgery. General surgery was a specialty. Now this has been subdivided over the years into paediatric surgery, orthopaedic surgery, cardiac surgery, thoracic surgery, the whole lot.

So I think it is absolutely important to recognise two things. First, that you have to find a bottom line in relation to general practitioner services. I suspect that that can cause problems. In relation to specialist services, you have to draw a clear distinction between the sub-specialist and the overall specialist within this discipline, because in the final analysis it is the paediatrician who is the specialist and who would refer somebody to a paediatric cardiologist for a consultation, but the overall responsibility still remains that of the physician specialist, the paediatrician, the surgeon, and this kind of thing like that.

You also are going to run into some very serious problems in the context of Barbados, and this happens from time to time, where you may have general practitioners in Barbados in a particular area more skilled than any of the specialists in Barbados in that particular area. I can think, for example, of one general practitioner in reading X-rays related to tuberculosis. He had done it for twenty or thirty years, and I think he is as good as any radiologist, but certainly probably better than most physicians, because there are few physicians after my time who would have seen any number of cases in tuberculosis. We closed down those wards in 1972-73 and the odd case is seen now.

I am referring to Dr. David Payne. I do not think he would mind. David Payne did this for years. I am sure if he were looking at an X-ray to exclude tuberculosis, he would be far more competent to do so than any of the younger physicians in Barbados. I might be only marginally equally competent, because I happened to come into Barbados at a time when I had responsibility for tuberculosis wards. But you are going to get this crossing of situations.

I think that Board you are setting up should be substantially a professional Board which is capable of, say,

handling a complaint. Suppose somebody goes to a doctor with a cut on his lip and the doctor says he cannot handle it, he is going to refer him to the hospital. There are G.P.s who can do that and there are G.P.s who cannot. There are G.P.s who would do it and you end up with a permanent scar and distortion of your lip. If you make it mandatory to do it, there is another G.P. who would have spent a little more time in surgery and would have a little more dexterity in his hands, who can handle small instruments and can do more delicate sutures. So the question arises, should a complaint arise that one G.P. did not do what another G.P. around the corner normally does, what happens in that situation?

That is why I feel there ought to be a bottom line, and I believe that bottom line has to be the consultation as meeting the requirements of the service, and the discretion has to be with the general practitioner as to what happens from there on. That should be clearly understood and properly spelt out in regulations. Otherwise, you are going to have trouble.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The honourable Member is making a very good case for his membership on the Board, because clearly this is the kind of professional knowledge which the Government would want to see on the National Health Service Board.
6.30 p.m.

As politicians, we can only be advised and we can only listen to the sort of analysis that we have just heard from the honourable Member. I would like to pay him an unusual and further tribute in respect of the contribution he has just made. The Barbados Association of Medical Practitioners would have been infinitely better served if that kind of argument had been the daily matter of discussion and negotiation rather than the kind of argument with which even I have had to put up on this very clause of the general practice service.

I take it that the word "appropriate" in the Definition, would cover something like surgery for cuts. An ordinary, everyday, up and down person like myself would not appreciate that it would not be appropriate to ask every general practitioner to suture the lip of a teen-aged girl, and that if he does it badly, he might scar the girl and twist her lip. That would not have occurred to me.

I take it that the word "appropriate" coupled with Clause 4(2) allows the general practitioner to decide that for that purpose, his services would not be appropriate. If you look at Clause 4(2) you will see

"where in the opinion of the medical practitioner the treatment that is required by a patient who is a beneficiary is not within the nature of a general practice service, but is in the nature of a specialist service or, may be provided as a social service elsewhere, he shall refer that patient in the manner prescribed."

I pointed out to BAMP, which wanted the words "necessary" and "appropriate" removed, that those words were a protection for the general practitioner, coupled with 4(2), which gives the general practitioner the discretion to decide at what point the specialist must be called in, and, as I understand it, and I have been advised on this particular point, if the GP says that it is inappropriate to be asked to provide the service and he is going to refer you to a specialist, that is that. Complaints can be made to the Board, but one hopes and imagines, based on whom I know the Minister has in mind for the appointment to the Board, that complaints at Board level will be dealt with with the kind of expertise displayed by the honourable Member who has just sat down.

I cannot argue about the specialties, except as a layman who listens occasionally to doctors and occasionally read medical articles in a scientific journal to which I subscribe. But I do know that specialties have increased and multiplied. Some of those specialties cover so small an area that you would not expect a man to survive by practising them in Barbados. Even neurosurgery, I believe, is not offered as a specialty in Barbados, and that is quite a substantial area. Instead, the Government normally undertakes to pay for neurosurgical operations outside the country.

I cannot review the whole range of specialties, but paediatric-cardiology does not seem to me to be one in which one could make a living in Barbados. The number of children who require cardiological examination perhaps might be too small to support even a single doctor. These are matters on which we hope that the Board will have flexibility and advice, and be able to handle what we know is a great and potential source of friction in National Health Services, and what in particular in Barbados might become a source of friction for reasons unconnected to medical practice.

Undoubtedly, the specialists, even under the current negotiations between the doctors and BAMP, are not going to be rewarded as generously as the general practitioners. These are the hospital specialists who will be paid by the Government. Those specialists, I am quite sure, are not going to accept references for indigestion. They will make their enquiries, and if they feel that a lot of work is being put on them by highly paid general practitioners, I imagine they will make their feelings known to the Board in due course, this being a straightforward question of economics rather than simply of medicine.

I think that there are enough checks and balances arising out of that, and a sufficient protection in the legislation for us to be able to make a start on dealing with the problem the honourable Member outlined. I really would like to say that he has put his finger on the problem even more efficiently than the representatives of the Barbados Association of Medical Practitioners at the

time when I saw them and spoke to them about this very clause and that very definition.

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

Clauses 3-5 inclusive were called and passed.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I do not know, but to save time I wonder if Members on the other side would rather do this in Parts. If they have anything to say on this they can say it on Part 1 or 2. There are also amendments to Clause 17 and the First Schedule, but you would know what you want to say rather than by going through clause by clause.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: It does not appear to be the wish of the Committee to have this done in Parts. I find no concurrence.

Clauses 6-8 were called and passed.
6.40 p.m.

Part III was called.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Part III stand part.

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

Mr. M. A. KING (Christ Church West Central): Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the points made by the honourable Member for St. Michael South (Mr. L. E. Sandiford) in the course of the second reading speech that the accounts of the Board should be properly audited by the Auditor General and should not be, as required in subsection (3) of Section 11, his duty only when he is required by the Minister to do so. My reason for saying that is that the funds which are going to be administered by this Board are essentially public funds. Under Clause 9 the funds will consist largely of contributions made as health service contributions under the National Insurance and Social Security Act.

We have seen recently that the tendency of legislation is for certainly the Transport Levy funds to be administered by a Board which is appointed by the Minister, and which really is not answerable to Parliament, and we have the concern that the funds of the Transport Levy Board can be disbursed without control by Parliament. Similarly, we have the problem and the concern that the funds to be administered by this Health Service Board can be administered, spent and disbursed without the prior approval of Parliament.

I know the argument will be advanced, for instance, that in Section 13 "the Board shall as soon as possible

after the expiration of each financial year and in any case not later than 30th June in each year submit to the Minister a report containing among other things a statement of the audited accounts. And then, subsection (2) of Section 13 provides that a copy of the report referred to in subsection (1) must together with a copy of the audited report on the accounts be laid in Parliament and published in the Official Gazette. But our problem about Section 11, where the Minister may appoint an auditor, or where an auditor may be appointed with the approval of the Minister to audit the accounts of the National Health Service funds, is that in that kind of situation, and in the circumstances especially where we are dealing with funds which are being provided largely out of the National Health Service Levy, we are gradually minimising the prior control which Parliament has in dealing with matters of this kind.

Let us say, for instance, that the National Health Service Board has a certain project in mind and may be assigning substantial sums of money to that project, and that it is appointing certain officers to do certain kinds of work. We would like perhaps to be able to comment on that before disbursement of those funds and before expenditure of those funds on projects of that kind.

So there are two aspects of the argument: one that we have a great concern about Boards administering funds which are largely the result of contributions from the public and, secondly, the limited control which Parliament can exercise in relation to the disbursement of those funds. This area of the National Health Service, and the possible use to which funds could be put in the promotion of that service, may be a matter which we will need to comment on up front and not after the funds have been disbursed.

We are seeing here a further minimisation of the role of Parliament in the control of expenditure. We think that is a retrograde step, and one which should be halted at the earliest possible opportunity.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Sir, I have every sympathy with the honourable Member, but that contribution goes to the very root of all quasi-public corporation operations in Barbados. It is not something simply for the Health Service Board. As far as I know, every single Government Corporation has a clause like this in the Act that sets it up. The only one about which I was doubtful was the Housing Corporation, and I have just looked it up and the Housing Corporation has the same section.

Long ago the whole concept of setting up the corporations was that they would be freed from Civil Service budgetary procedures involving a preview of their spending programmes in Parliament. That is a basic and most fundamental difference between a Civil Service department and a corporation, and on that basis all the corpora-

tions, so far as I know, are allowed to appoint their own auditors. There is a difference in the case of the corporations which receive subventions from the public Treasury or, as in the case of this one, which are allowed to receive what was virtually a tax directly, and the corporations which are purely commercial, some of which may not be subject to the Auditor General's right of review.

I cannot remember whether the Central Bank can be audited by the Auditor General. Maybe it can, but I cannot remember. Certainly it has never crossed my mind to order such an audit. This, so far as I know, is so fundamental a matter that it cannot be dealt with *ad hoc* on the basis of a few criticisms by the Leader of the Opposition as to the Transport Levy and the Health Levy and no parliament control, because if you do it for one, there is really no reason why you should not do it for all.

I think honourable Members agree with me that this Board is much less likely to misspend than the Housing Authority. The honourable Member for St. Michael North (Mr. P. M. Greaves) will have no difficulties accepting that at the Housing Authority there were many spending programmes which submission to Parliament might have averted. The fact, however, that one Board has misused its right of independent action — and I could multiply the example — does not mean that we must abandon the whole *raison d'être* for the Board system.

Either you have the Boards or you do not have them. If the Boards, like the Post Office, had to submit their budget in advance and have it debated in Parliament, what would be the point of having them as Boards? You could as well let them be staffed by civil servants accustomed to preparing Estimates for Parliament. I do not feel so strongly about it as to dismiss it with contempt, without respect for the ideas that have given rise for the submission and proposal by the honourable Member for Christ Church West Central, but it is a very fundamental matter.
6.50 p.m.

I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, with diffidence, that perhaps the Public Accounts Committee is the place where such arguments should be canvassed, and reported on to the House if they consider that some preview of expenditure is desirable. The Auditor General's office does not have the staff to audit every Board. I can tell you that in the early. At present, the function of the accounting officer, in the case of Boards that get subventions, is discharged to the satisfaction of the Auditor General once he signs that Parliament voted X millions of dollars for the X Board and he paid over that money over his signature under the general warrant of the Minister of Finance, which I give at the beginning of every year. If the Auditor General had to go further and analyse all the accounts, you would have to multiply the staff of the Auditor General — you surely would have to double it just comparing the number of people employed

by the Boards and the number of people employed by the Public Service, and comparing the complexity, say, of auditing the accounts of the Transport Board with auditing the accounts of the subvention.

I would not mind the Auditor General auditing the Transport Levy, because I will tell you quite frankly, Sir, the Leader of the Opposition is perfectly right when he says that the funds for the Transport Levy are spent just like any other funds coming from the Ministry of Transport and Works. They are not misspent, I am satisfied of that, but they are spent in the same manner, by the same people, in the same programmes; they just have a different source. So there may be a case for the Transport Levy being audited by the Auditor General.

But something like the Health Levy could never be an exception. These are complicated finances. The collections are not so complicated, but there are a number of areas where there will be some complicated financing. You are going to be keeping trace of 250 000 accounts. The Auditor General does not have so many accounts in all of his responsibilities. So I think the Public Accounts Committee should really go into this and see if changes are needed.

Even with the best will in the world, Mr. Chairman, Boards can go astray slightly. Even where there is not the slightest trace of stealing, a Board can still put one over on the Ministry of Finance, as the Industrial Development Corporation has managed to do over a number of years and save enough money out of its subvention to build a building out of cash. You talk about the Central Bank. Why do you not worry about the IDC? It is only because the Central Bank involves a lot of money that you will notice that. But the IDC has managed to save up the taxpayers' money to the extent where it can pay cash for a building. Parliament might have voted money for a building for the IDC if it were asked to, but I do not think Parliament would have voted such a subvention as would allow them to bring it with the arm.

I am not particularly angry about that example, because I think some Government building was necessary to restore the construction sector. I have been glancing at the import figures of construction materials into this country. The import of construction materials is now less than 6 per cent of our total imports, a trivial proportion of our GDP; less than two or three years ago. If the Central Bank was not building its building, it would be even less. In fact, construction materials imported last year only amounted to the cost of the Central Bank — \$60 million. So if the Central Bank was not doing construction work now, we would have even less construction work going on. So I cannot blame the IDC for giving 80 or 100 people employment on a building without making any new charge on the taxpayers because they saved the money when the money was there.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: I wonder if the Prime Minister will give way. I think he is missing the point that is being made from over here. We are not saying that the accounts of this Board should be audited by the Auditor General. We are saying that the Auditor General should have a right, if he so desires, to inspect the accounts of this Board, as he has the right in a number of statutory corporations, including the Barbados Water Authority, and including the very I.D.C. to which he referred. We are not saying that the auditor for this particular Board should be the Auditor General. What we are saying is that the Auditor General should have an initiative on his own, rather than simply be able, on the direction, instruction or request of the Minister, to audit these accounts.

The Barbados Water Authority Act 1980(42) says at Clause 24, Section 5:

(4) The accounts of the Authority must be audited annually by an auditor appointed annually by the Board with the approval of the Minister.

(5) The Auditor General may at all reasonable times and must on the direction of the Minister, carry out at any time, an investigation into the accounts of the Authority.

The Prime Minister did say that he checked most of these things. But this is the Water Authority, an Act passed by you in 1980. With IDC it is slightly different, but it also gives authority to the Auditor General to go in even though the corporation can appoint its own auditor.

It is wise, with a minor amendment to this clause, to put in, "or on his own initiative". It does not preclude the body from having its own auditor, but if the Auditor General so thinks, he can go in. This is what we are pressing. We do not want to make the amendment from here. If you can accommodate that in your amendments, we will take it.

As far as the IDC is concerned, I did not realise that the Member for Christ Church East (Hon. Dr. R.L. Cheltenham) had pulled a fast one on you. He is very clever, you know. I was listening very intently to what you were saying, that he was able to build up these kinds of resources. He is as usual pretending that he is not hearing what I am saying. I thought at first it was the Minister of Trade.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The honourable Member has made the point which the honourable Member for Christ Church West Central would have made if he heard my speech first. All that I have said is, and I think that all

the honourable Member was talking about, because he mentioned parliamentary control over the board, is that, in general, all the Boards do have the right to have their own auditor to deal with their accounts.

I really have no strong feelings one way or the other about the matter of the wording, such as:

"the Auditor General may at any time and on being required by the Minister do so, shall carry out any investigation into, or special audit of....."

I have no objection to that if that is what honourable Members want. But before doing it, I would like to postpone the clause so that I can let somebody speak to the officials so that they can get in touch with the draftsmen to use the precise words.....

Aside

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS:

"The Auditor General may at any time, and on being required by the Minister to do so shall, carry out any investigation into or special audit of the accounts of the Board."

If the officials will take down those words and get in touch with a draftsman, we can proceed.

Asides.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Section 12 of the Transport Levy Board Act in effect says that what I am saying could well be done is done, that the Auditor General does audit the Transport Levy's accounts. The Transport Levy is audited by the Auditor General. At least unless the Minister says otherwise, the Auditor General is the primary authority for auditing the Transport Levy's accounts. 7.00 p.m.

I beg to move that Clause 11 be postponed and the remainder of Part III stand part.

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

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

Part IV as amended was called.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: In Part IV, I beg to move that Section 17 be amended by deleting the words "\$5 000 or imprisonment for 5 years or both" and substituting the words "\$1 500 or imprisonment for 12 months or both". This is 17(1) of Part IV. The doctors have said this is too hard on them. This is specific representation by BAMP, which I have accepted.

I beg to move that Part IV as amended stand part.

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

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, Clause 15(2) is a matter of some concern to me, and I think it needs to be looked at very carefully. It reads as follows:

"The Board may, if it is satisfied that the participating medical practitioner has committed an act that is prejudicial to the efficient delivery of the general practice services

- (a) censure the participating medical practitioner;
- (b) impose a fine not exceeding \$500;
- (c) report the action complained of to the Medical Council;
- (d) remove the name of the participating medical practitioner from the medical list."

I would like to submit that this is an inappropriate clause generally speaking, to have included in this legislation.

If we were to look and see what obtains at the moment, let us suppose a doctor is employed at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. In respect of the terms of his contract, he is employed by the Public Service Commission and is only subject to any disciplinary action by the Public Service Commission if he is in breach of his contract, and I think the Public Service Commission might have the power to censure or the power to dismiss from employment in the Public Service. I do not know whether they have the power to fine, but I do not think so.

Here you have a very different matter — this question of reporting the action complained of to the Medical Council. I do not think the Board should be performing that role at all. I think that if a complaint went to the Board which was a proper matter for referral to the Medical Council, the Board should advise the complainant to make the complaint directly to the Medical Council.

The reason is that, here we have a very vague statement, "..... if it is satisfied that the participating medical practitioner has committed an act that is prejudicial to the efficient delivery of the general practice services" The Medical Council acts as a different matter altogether.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: It is now after 7 o'clock.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I will finish in two minutes.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: One minute, probably, but go ahead.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: The Medical Council has the power to censure, or to strike somebody off the register, or something like that. The fact is that the offences are specifically set out in that Act; and where they are not set out, there is a body of historic legislation over hundreds of years that determines how a Medical Council should be guided, and there is provision in there for appeal to a judge in Chambers. I cannot see how you can handle this matter this way.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I must report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

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

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is now ten minutes past seven. This sitting therefore stands suspended until 8.00 p.m.
7.10 p.m.

ON RESUMPTION

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: This sitting is now resumed.

When the suspension was taken, the House was in Committee. To that it now reverts.

COMMITTEE

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair and the House resumed Committee, Mr. J. G. ODLE in the Chair.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The House is in Committee.

The honourable Member for St. Michael South Central.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, I was trying to make the point that if you were to give this Board the power to remove the name of a participating medical practitioner from the Medical List, which I understand in terms of this particular Bill is the list of persons employed by the Board, and you were to imagine a scenario where most of the medical practitioners in Barbados are employed by that Board, I would think that that is tantamount to depriving the doctor from making a living, particularly a young doctor who has just come into practice in Barbados.

If you are going to assume that the scheme is going to be successful, I think it is important to recognise that that particular provision is almost tantamount to the Medical Council removing the name of a person from the Register of Medical Practitioners. The *de facto* effect will be that a doctor will be unable to function in a small community when a panel of 3 500 people would know that he is no longer an eligible medical practitioner, for one reason or another. Therefore, it is my view that this particular section should be struck out all together, and substitute in its place "that the Board should set up a discipline committee comprising of professional people who will deal with matters which do not impinge on the functions of the General Medical Council in Barbados."

I was one of the strongest advocates of a National Health Service twenty-five years ago. My change in position

largely emanates from the practical experience of seeing what has happened in countries with such services, and I am just trying to give the House the benefit of my own particular experience in this area. If I were speaking on this Bill in the House twenty-five years ago, I am sure that my position would be largely from an emotional socialist conceptual view, but when you have to face the harsh realities of what can happen, I, believe that we have to look in this area, and I would certainly remove that section involving a fine and all the other disciplinary matters to come under a professional committee.

Let me give you an example why I say that. Under this present arrangement where a doctor is paid a given amount to see X amount of patients, a doctor can do 30 patients in 30 minutes in his office and comply with the law and have the rest of the day free and not breach the law at all. If you had a Disciplinary Committee, they could perform an auditing function that have authority through seniority and so on to say that that is not satisfactory. You are dealing with a different ball-game, and then you are then in a position as a disciplinary professional body to report that matter to the Medical Council and say that the person is not performing in accordance with the standards expected of someone with experience in medicine. I am saying that no lay Board would be in a position to do that, and I believe that if this section was struck out and if that authority was delegated to a professional body within the context of that Board, that you are likely to have more positive results.

I am aware of the statements made by the Member for St. Michael West Central, the honourable Minister of Transport and Works, but I think that he underestimates the disciplinary effect of professional bodies in Barbados. Although they may not go in court as often as in the United States and give evidence against each other in the way that you get one psychiatrist giving evidence against the other, nevertheless it is still a powerful body in Barbados. I can assure you that the Medical Council is a powerful body. I believe that the Bar Association, from what I can gather, can exert a considerable amount of influence, even if they do not go as far as they do in the larger countries.

I would recommend to the Government, in the interest of the functioning of this body, that this section be struck out, and that we embody the idea of the honourable Member for St. Michael South — really set up a disciplinary body established by the Board, consisting of professionals, who could deal with this matter, because if the Government is being lawfully short-changed, there is nothing you can do about it. I am telling you that if I were a general practitioner, and if I were ruthless enough I could collect \$100 000 working half an hour, and there is no way that a lay committee could challenge me in my position. A professional committee would be able to do it.

Thank you very much.

Mr. M. A. KING: Mr. Chairman, I want to support the point which has been made by the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central in respect of the query which he raised in relation to Section 15.

The Board has the power to hear and determine complaints against participating medical practitioners and has other powers, including the power to censure, impose fines, report the action complained of to the Medical Council and removal of the name of the participating medical practitioner from the Medical List. These are all penal powers which the Board has the authority to exercise, but it seems that if the Board makes a mistake somewhere along the line in its determination, there is no right of appeal to any other body against the decision of the Board.

This does not, in my view, give the medical practitioners a fair break. It does not give them the right to question the decision of the Board if they are aggrieved by a decision, and it seems to me that when you deprive persons of the right to appeal, you are hindering, to some extent, the full rights of those persons who are so affected to justice, to a fair hearing and to a right of appeal, to have their issue heard and determined as judicially as possible.

It seems to me that to create these penal powers without right of appeal is something which should be reviewed, and I would invite the Government to reconsider this aspect of the legislation.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: All I can say is that the Barbados Association of Medical Practitioners has spent a great deal of time negotiating over this Bill and have not objected to the form of Clause 15.
8.10 p.m.

Clause 15 is drafted in the way it is because of precedent. The British National Health Service has been the principal model, and these powers, although not necessarily expressed in these terms, are contained in the British legislation. The British legislation allows for the withholding of remuneration, which is the same as imposing a fine of a much larger amount than \$500. It allows the remuneration withheld in cases where there has been a complaint about overcharging by a patient to be paid to that patient. That is undesirable, and likely to give rise to fractious complaints, and therefore we have not included it.

There is no reason for a person necessarily to lose his right to practise as a doctor if he does not meet the rules of the National Health Service. If his name is removed from the Medical List, presumably he is still allowed to practise elsewhere. What the Medical Association has asked is to ensure that the medical practitioners

are not disciplined by persons who do not understand their problems or who conceivably could be prejudiced against them, and the regulations in fact have already provided for a sub-committee of the Board, consisting of some of its medical members, to deal with complaints.

Asides.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I do not only think it is a majority, I think it is all, is it not? I believe it could be provided that the Chief Medical Officer will be the Chairman of the medical sub-committee. Perhaps that has not been provided specifically, but there will be a lot of medical members on the Board.

When I hear them talk about who are the Minister's people and who are the doctor's people, I go down the list and this is how I see it as the doctor's people: the Chief Medical Officer, the Pharmaceutical Society, the two from BAMP — there is only one in the draft but it will be two — one from the Nurses Association, and perhaps two doctors that the Minister is going to appoint among his representatives of community interest. I can only say that it is not the policy of the Government to appoint a disciplinary committee dealing with doctors' matters on which the doctors do not have a majority representation or a majority voice. That is my understanding of the Government's policy in the matter, and I see no reason to believe that it would be other than this.

There is no specific right of appeal to the Administrative Appeals Tribunal, although this can be given at some time in future when that Tribunal is brought into force. But in the same way that the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central can give of his expertise in the medical field, I can very humbly suggest from my knowledge of the days when I was in the legal field that it would not be possible for the Board to act in a capricious way.

The jurisdiction of the courts is not excluded, and the jurisdiction of the courts not being excluded, it would be impossible, for example, for the Board to accept a complaint. If you imagine that the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central is a participating practitioner, that he told untruths about the St. George's Medical School and therefore should be removed from the participating list, theoretically, on the face of it you could do it, but no lawyer could advise a Board for one moment that such an action can prevail. Obviously, it would not be an action taken in good faith.

I would not wish to set up an appeal procedure for something that so obviously can be dealt with otherwise. I think you appeal from one committee to the whole Council. I do not think there is any appeal from the Medical Council to something else. Even if there is, I

do not myself believe that it is necessary for this particular circumstance.

It is not as if you are taking away everything that a man has. I do not want to compare the medical profession to taxi drivers, but how far do you carry the principle of appeal? If a taxi driver has his taxi licence taken away, that is the end of him, but the power is not abused, and it is not abused by a Minister. What reason have you got to believe that the power would be abused by a Board, particularly a Board on which doctors are represented? The Barbados Association of Medical Practitioners has accepted this clause and this is an instance where I think I would have to go along with them.

The question that Part IV as amended stand part, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clause 11 was called.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: In rising to move an amendment to the proposed Clause 11, I will beg to move that in Clause 11(3) the words from "It is the duty" to "Board" be deleted, in other words, the whole clause except the number, and the following substituted:

"The Auditor General may at any time, and must on the direction of the Minister of Finance, carry out an investigation into or special audit of the accounts of the Board."

I beg to move that Clause 11, as amended, stand part.

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

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

The First Schedule was called.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: In paragraph 1(1) of the First Schedule, Mr. Chairman, I beg to move the following amendments: the number "10" in the first line shall be deleted and "12" substituted. In paragraph 1(1) (d) the words "one person" be deleted and "two persons" be substituted, and the figure "3" be removed and "4" substituted, and in paragraph (f) the figure "5" be removed and "6" substituted.

I beg to move that this Schedule as amended be the First Schedule.

Hon. L. R. TULL: I beg to second that.
8.20 p.m.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, the First Schedule, 1D has been amended to two persons instead

of one person, from what I gather, representing the Barbados Association of Medical Practitioners appointed by the Minister from among the names of four persons submitted by the Association. I have found it very difficult to work out why the honourable Minister of Finance, who I understand — I have not been officially informed; I heard — met in person with BAMP — and agreed to increase the number from one to two, but did not agree to the other objection, that is if they submit two people, then they should be the two people accepted by the Government.

I find it very difficult to understand why the Government wants to retain this power to select two of four names submitted by any professional organization. I am very concerned about this, because I do not think it is in the interest of the Association or the Government, judging from the general tone of the debate so far, that the honourable Prime Minister would even suspect that there could be any element of bad faith residing in the hearts of those nominating the two, or the nominees of the association.

I believe that if the Association nominates two people, then that should be acceptable by the Government, because, after all, the Government has a remarkable majority here. It is very interesting. I do not know how BAMP seemed to have got tricked by this. They have moved from a situation from one out of ten, and instead of remaining with getting two out of ten, they are now getting two out of twelve. In other words, they have moved from 16 per cent to 10 per cent representation. I think that was a very clever trick to work on the unskilled negotiators of BAMP.

I think there is something behind this, and I would like to hear the reason behind it. I would think it difficult to ask the Bar Association to nominate two people to serve on a committee and then reserve the right to select two out of four. If the person is not functioning, then you report it to BAMP that they do not attend meetings and ask BAMP to withdraw the nominee or something like that. But I do not think it is very respectful to ask a professional organization to submit four names of which you will pick two. I do not quite see the point behind it. I would be very interested to know what is the policy situation.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, with the best will in the world I would like to be able to say that all organizations are so trustworthy that if they nominate two representatives that you can accept them. But I have to deal with the Chamber of Commerce. We asked them to nominate somebody to the National Economic Council, and they nominated a man who is so ignorant that he did not know that he was a member, or that the Council existed — although he has attended a meeting! Can anybody believe that I would

have ever agreed to Al Knight being a member of the National Economic Council?

It could not be in the Chamber of Commerce's interest, if it really wanted its views known and its interest represented, to have Al Knight there. But I suppose they had a rule, and they sent the President, and Al Knight turned up. I am not criticising the man, but the fact is that he was so ignorant that he came to a meeting and then read out his speech that Frank DaSilva amended for him — the speech was written by a young man at CAIC and then sent to Frank DaSilva because it was not sufficiently anti-government; and DaSilva made amendments — and he read out an amendment calling for the Government to establish a National Economic Council where they could be a dialogue. Not only has he attended a meeting, but I remember having to pass a note to the Director of Finance and Planning about his attendance at the meetings. I cannot go on to say what was in the note.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Perhaps the Prime Minister should say that meetings were held so infrequently that he forgot that he was a member of this body called the National Economic Council. Could it be that, Sir?

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I very much admire the honourable Member's tact. Of course, Al Knight forgot. I went to a social function one evening and heard Al Knight say loudly, "No black man has got any advancement of any kind under this Government." Somebody had to say to him, "How could you ever have been President of the Chamber of Commerce if there was not a new wind flowing through the corridors in Bridgetown?" Anyway, I will not worry anymore with Al Knight, except to say that the *Advocate* newspaper took Senator Arthur to task, criticised him, for suggesting that possibly the Government did not have a great deal to learn from Al Knight. It said he must not be so arrogant. There was no criticism of Al Knight when he proved not arrogant but ignorant in his comment about the necessity for a National Economic Council.

That is not the only example. I pass over LeVere Richards at the Tourist Board. How do you deal with the Barbados Marketing Corporation, where a certain organisation formed the impression that it had the absolute right to nominate a member, and nominated a member who did not give them a great deal of satisfaction. Then one day they told that member not to go back to the BMC and that they sent somebody else in his place. On the agenda the day when the second member went to the meeting was an item which dealt with a subvention to an arm of the organization which had nominated this man, and the Cabinet had indicated that this subvention was no longer to be paid. This man was actually drawing a salary from the organization whose subvention Cabinet had withdrawn, and he sat on the BMC Board, without having an instrument from the Minister, and he spoke and voted,

and his vote was responsible for the Cabinet's decision being flouted by, I think, a vote of four to three. Whatever it was, his vote was ultimately decisive.

Under these conditions you must understand that the Government has found it somewhat difficult to accept the principle that organizations must be represented by delegates rather than representatives. If a man comes to a meeting to do nothing else but put the case for the body that appointed him, we think that that is to some extent negating the representative principles which we prefer to accommodate on Boards. What is a rule for one has to be a rule for all. It would, in our view, be invidious to take the power of simple nomination away from the Barbados Workers Union, Barbados Agricultural Society, Barbados Hotel Association — I cannot even think of all the bodies — Employers Confederation, Chamber of Commerce, Manufacturers Association — trying to send Frank DaSilva to sit on a Government board; that is only inviting the board to cease to function — and not one.

8.30 p.m.

If we take these privileges away from all the other associations in society, how can we extend it to the Barbados Association of Medical Practitioners? It is not pointed at BAMP; we feel that a principle is a principle, and once we adopt a principle, we adopt the principle. We know there are certain organisations which contain people that do not intend to work with us, but contain people who intend to sabotage the Government, to obtain the Government's secrets and private documents and publish them to the Government's inconvenience at the earliest possible opportunity. We know that such people with a lack of a sense of responsibility exist, and while we do not think that this is so in the case of BAMP, what is sauce for the goose has to be sauce for the gander.

I do assure BAMP that their wishes will be given every consideration. I even said to BAMP that not only would we accept their suggestion that among the Minister's nominees was to be a specialist doctor who could represent the interest of specialist doctors, but we would even listen to them on the appointment of such a specialist doctor. This will be a third in addition to BAMP's own two. We are not pointing at them, but we feel that this is how we must go about business.

They are quite happy to have the nurses pick one from three and the pharmacists pick one from three. The last time I saw the file it did contain nominations from those bodies of three people, but we have had nominations from those bodies in accordance with the terms of the Act, and I really do not want to treat BAMP any differently. There is a letter here of 11th April nominating four people from the Pharmaceutical Society, asking that one be chosen to sit on the Board. I cannot find the nurses' letter at the moment — it may be on the file at a point where I cannot immediately put my hands on it.

I really do not see why BAMP should hold itself above the general rule that the Government has adopted. They have made representations to me since and I will have to reply to them now that I have considered the representations, I have given them every sympathy, but I cannot agree. Originally I told them it would be two from five, it has come up in draft two from three.

I suspect that that is a Ministry's step at a compromise, but my step at a compromise would be two from four, not two from three as might be more agreeable to the Ministry and BAMP; not two from five as I told BAMP, but two from four, so that they and the Government have a reasonable choice, but we have to get away from the delegate principle.

(Dr. R. C. HAYNES: What happens if they submit only two names?)

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I have told them already that if they submit only two names we will not be able to carry out the conditions laid down by the Act. The Act will have as a pre-condition that you submit four. Once they obey the law, we will obey the law.

I beg to move that the First Schedule as amended be the First Schedule to the Bill.

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

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

The Second Schedule was called and passed.

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

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

On the separate motions of Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, seconded by Hon. L. S. CRAIG, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

GUARANTEE OF \$10 MILLION BOND ISSUE

Order No. 2 was called – To move the passing of a Resolution to approve the guarantee by the Minister of Finance of the payment by the Barbados Development Bank of a principal sum not exceeding \$10 million for the fifth issue of Bonds.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS (St. Thomas): Mr. Deputy Speaker, this Resolution seeks to authorise me

to guarantee a proposed issue of bonds by the Barbados Development Bank to a total value of \$10 million. These National Development Bonds are planned to be issued very shortly, as soon as the Resolution can pass. They will be issued at par. The interest rate is 8 per cent, not 10 per cent as stated in the Addendum. There will be a maturity of ten years. My guarantee will be issued under section 10 of the Barbados Development Bank Act for the payment of principal and of interest.

The bank has made four previous issues of bonds, except for the third issue, of which \$3 million was cancelled, all have been fully subscribed. The bank has an authorised capital of \$30 million, of which \$18 742 000 has been fully subscribed. As against this, there is a loan liability of \$55 381 000.

I consider that the equity loan ratio is very moderate at the present time, very much less than one in four, and therefore that the present equity capital can well support this extension of loan capital.

The Central Bank of Barbados now owns \$7 million worth of the paid up capital, and the Government \$11.7 million.
8.40 p.m.

Six and a half million dollars in short-term paper of the bank is held by the Central Bank, \$1 million by the Insurance Corporation, and we have also taken a deposit from the United Insurance Company of \$½ million. I would like to thank them for the faith which they have shown in the Government's banking institution.

There are long term loans with \$22 million outstanding in National Development Bonds. The Inter-American Development Bank holds \$30 million of our bonds, the European Investment Bank \$6.7 million and the World Bank \$5.7 million. A further loan to the CDB for housing has been passed on to the Barbados National Bank.

I do not want to keep the House for a long time discussing all the details of the Development Bank's portfolio. Sufficient to say that the bank is now profitable, that its profits over the last four fiscal years have varied between a profit of \$61 000 in 1980–81 and it has gone as high as \$554 000 in 1982. In the last full year it made a profit of just under \$400 000.

The permanent jobs created in 1981–82 as a result of lending were 601 jobs; in 1982–83, 578 jobs. In the nine months, April to December, 1983, 521 jobs were created on a permanent basis by the bank. A certain number of jobs in construction have also been created, but since the small business portfolio has absorbed the greatest single number of loans, 88, and in such loans the number of jobs created is not great – many of those

loans are mainly to self-employed persons — perhaps the number of jobs has risen, but the number of jobs is not quite so large as is usual.

There is very little that I can add to these facts and figures, Mr. Deputy Speaker. The National Development Bank Bonds are well known. The National Development Bank was turned around in the aftermath of the unfortunate contamination of the portfolio notably by the commitment to Bath Plantation. It has since gone from strength to strength. It is the principle source of capital for small businesses. Its industrial portfolio is massive, \$11 million in 1982–83 and almost \$7 million at the end of December 1983, in that nine months of the financial year. It continues to lend to tourism, \$3 million so far, although we hear more about the difficulties in tourism than about the expansion. It is a well run institution. I am very satisfied indeed with the work of the Chairman and of the staff, and I very cordially recommend this guarantee to honourable Members.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Dr. R. C. HAYNES (St. Michael South Central): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would just like to make a few comments without detaining the House too long this evening because I believe that the time will be ripe in the not too distant future, when the McConney Report is available, to have a major debate on the Government's financial institutions.

I think, generally speaking, one can accept that the Barbados Development Bank, thanks to the honourable Member for St. Andrew (Hon. L. B. Brathwaite) and myself on the floor of this House, has been spared the agonies of absorption into another institution and generally speaking, has performed much better *inter alia* than those institutions that have been the victims of chronic mismanagement. I thank the honourable Member for St. Andrew for lending support to the position that I took. It certainly helped to save the Development Bank from being absorbed into the orbit of the Barbados National Bank, as it was envisaged that that would be one of the scheduled institutions for take over by that bank under the appropriate Act.

I am not going to deal particularly at the moment with the question of incurring a debt *per se*, but I have repeatedly warned of the extent of exposure of the Barbados Development Bank to the tourist industry, particularly the apartment industry and the ancillary industries, which have an international basis. I took the position in reply to the Budget, which I recently heard echoed by the Government's chief spokesman on economic matters, Senator Owen Arthur, that there was need for an across-the-board rescheduling of the debts of the

tourist industry. I hope that this loan would be used to consolidate our current position and not leave the hotel industries strung out there for lack of cash.

The development process may from time to time involve new development, but I believe that the principle of rescheduling of debts has already been accepted by the Barbados Development Bank, and this is one of the main purposes to which any new borrowings should be put at this present point in time. I believe that a lot of those debts owed by the hotel industry to the Barbados Development Bank can be spread over a period of twenty-five to thirty years, relieving the cash flow problems in the hotel industry. I believe that if the Barbados Development Bank took that load at this time, the commercial banks could be persuaded to take the pressure off the hotel industry.

I also believe that it would be useful if the Government would cease to get involved in actions such as foreclosure sales, which are likely to precipitate nervousness and bankruptcies within the hotel sector. It is my humble opinion that this money can be best used now in the context of Barbados to stabilise what you have, to maintain and create job security within the tourist industry, to assist as well with the manufacturing industry, particularly in the furniture area, which at this time of the year depends heavily on meeting the refurbishing needs of the hotel industry in order to keep going between now and October. Having been a manufacturer myself, I know what I am talking about; although I did not make any money out of it, I know how the cycle goes.

8.50 p.m.

I think that if this money is used wisely the cash flow position of the hotel sector would improve, that you may get some stability in the job situation in at least one area of the manufacturing sector and in the tourist sector, and a lot of pressure could be taken off the hotels. It should also give them an opportunity to get prepared for a future at more reasonable rates, because one of the problems which has generated high rates within the hotel industry is not a matter just of greed, it is a matter of low equity, short term borrowings from the Barbados Development Bank and shorter term borrowings from the commercial banks with higher interest rates at the commercial banks. Nevertheless the short term borrowings from the Barbados Development Bank have all combined to push the rates up, and you just cannot drop rates without creating serious cash flow problems.

I would certainly support this Resolution on the condition that the bank would not necessarily feel that it is under any obligation to go out there trying to support new ventures, but to recognise that it is equally important at this stage in the history of Barbados to

stabilise existing capital investment. If it needs to put capital or capital participation in some of these ventures to save them, that would also be supported by this side; even if it is on a short term basis to help tide them over this difficult period; even if it means that the bank has to increase its management resources to the extent that it can get into the field and monitor what is going on in the sectors in which they have loaned money, because I believe that an important aspect of the bank's functions may not only be to take decisions at board meetings and so on, but also to extend its management capacities into the areas where they probably have developed some expertise over the years.

My general support for the Resolution, although you know I do not like borrowing, is in the light of the present circumstances, and my feeling is, and I have a strong suspicion, that if this money is used for consolidation purposes, for job stabilisation in at least two major sectors, the kind of haemorrhage of job losses that have occurred in Barbados over the past six months or so could be substantially stemmed.

I do not know the purpose for which it is being borrowed, but I would suggest that the bank concentrates on rescheduling and stabilising the existing capital development, rather than launching out into new areas. In other words, there is no point creating another 200 new jobs in a new venture whilst at the same time a financial situation exists in two or three different establishments where you are going to lose 400 jobs. Then, all you have is a net loss of 200 jobs when in fact you could have saved 200 jobs, and at the same time help protect those people who have put up risk capital over the years.

It is a fact of life, as I said recently when I spoke to the Chamber of Commerce, that the people who have ventured into these areas in Barbados of tourism and manufacturing are by and large poor people. There are very few rich people in those areas. In fact, I only know of one rich Barbadian hotelier; all the others are poor as far as I am aware; so I think this would be a great help. The bank should also give consideration to some capital participation in the purchase of equity, maybe on a three-year five-year basis, from those hotels that are on the borderline in order to help generate some cash flow situation.

I believe that with goodwill, with the recent steps taken by the Central Bank; and with the Barbados National Bank adopting the particular role that I have suggested, this is the best use to which this money can be put for the time being. There comes a time when you have to hold strain in capital development, there comes a time when you have to consolidate, and there comes a time when you have to reschedule in the interest of the nation, and I believe that this time has come, because I

can see no other way out to create a situation of comfort and a situation of growth in the hotel industry at reasonable rates.

Mr. A. TRUSS (St. Michael Central): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise in support of this Resolution, the Barbados Development Bank's fifth issue of National Development Bonds to finance certain of its functions. The bonds will be of ten years maturity redeemable in whole or in part after the expiration of seven years from the date of issue. The issue price would be at par and the rate of interest eight per cent per annum.

I think it is important to reflect on the performance of the Barbados Development Bank. Between 1980 and 1984 the number of loans approved totalled 1 048. The value of loans approved totalled \$73 915 000, and the job opportunities created totalled 2 362 – 536 jobs in 1981, in 1981–82 they created 601 jobs, in 1982–83 they created 578 jobs and in 1983–84 they created 647.

In terms of its loan disbursements

MOMENT OF INTERRUPTION

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is now 9.00 p.m., the moment of interruption. We can only continue if there is unopposed business on the Order Paper.

There seems to be no opposition. The honourable Member may continue.

Mr. A. TRUSS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, between 1980–81 and 1983–84 loan disbursements totalled \$62 114 000, with an outstanding portfolio of \$73 518 000. The net profit to the Barbados Development Bank in 1980–81 totalled \$62 000; in 1981–82, \$455 000; in 1982–83, \$375 000 and the projected profit for 1983–84 is some \$200 000. Between 1980 and 1984 a net profit of \$1 092 million has been realised from the Barbados Development Bank.

The break down of bond subscriptions by category of subscriber is interesting. In terms of the number of subscriptions, the value of subscriptions and the percentage of these subscriptions, the commercial banks contributed \$2 341 000 or 10.2 per cent, the Central Bank contributed \$3 385 000 or 14.7 per cent, the Insurance Companies contributed \$5 858 000 or 25.5 per cent, and, most importantly, private individuals contributed \$11 418 000 or 49.6 per cent.

The bank, as I understand it, will promote the practice of payroll deductions with this issue. That definitely is a step in the right direction towards further promotion of these National Development Bonds, which certainly will go a long way towards financing the functions of the Bank. The Barbados Development Bank is the Government's major arm for long term financing of

projects in the productive sectors, such as tourism and industry. It is also involved in long term financing of small business, small manufacturing projects and co-operatives.

This is very important, because from time to time we hear charges levelled at the Members on this side that this Government is not a small man's Government. The statistics have proven that this is not so. We have been involved, through the Barbados Development Bank, in small enterprises: much more so than when the Democratic Labour Party was in power. I am not making this into a political issue, but I think the point has to be made to clarify our position in relation to what our priorities are.

The bank obtained funds from six major sources. We got money from the World Bank, the Inter-American Development Bank and the European Investment Bank, and loans from these institutions over the years totalled \$43.3 million. We also got funds from the Industrial Credit Fund, which is administered by the Central Bank of Barbados, a small contribution of \$268,000. We got funds from the National Development Bonds, and this is why we are here this evening to pass this Resolution, and so far there is a total of \$23 million that has been collected from the four previous National Development Bonds that has been issued. The sixth and last major source of equity is capital subscriptions, and these now total \$18.7 million, of which the Central Bank has contributed \$7 million and the Government of Barbados the balance. These funds which are invested in the bank are reinvested in the productive sectors, as I have mentioned, mainly in tourism and manufacturing and, to a large extent, in small manufacturing businesses and co-operatives.

9.00 p.m.

In the first issue of the Development Bonds, the amount we came for was \$1 million. The issue date was June 1972, and the maturity date was 1982. All of that money has been redeemed. The second issue came in January, 1976, for \$5 million with a maturity date of 1986. The bulk of that money is still outstanding; only \$42 000 has been redeemed. This comes about because people die and the Barbados Development Bank has to make payments to their estate. So of the \$5 million, \$4.958 million still remains outstanding.

In the third issue, the Government offered for \$10 million, but was successful only in selling \$7 million of that \$10 million, because at the time the interest rate of 7 per cent that was offered did not appear to be attractive to the investors. That was in August 1979, and the bonds have maturity date of August 1994 — 15 years. The fourth issue for \$10 million, in March 1982, are redeemable in 1989 which is seven years at 10 per cent. The full \$10 million was taken out.

I think that the General Manager and the Board of Directors, headed by the Chairman, have done an extremely good job at the Barbados Development Bank. I think that tribute should be paid to those persons in public office who do a good job for the country. From time to time we have to take civil servants to task for falling down on the job, and I think it is only right that when we have civil servants who do a good job, we should praise them for a job well done. I wish the General Manager of the Barbados Development Bank, the Chairman and the Board of Directors luck.

I am sorry to say that as far as I am concerned from a personal point, I do not think that \$1 million over four years is any great deal of money for the BDB to make when one considers that I made that in profit at the National Petroleum Corporation last year alone. But the \$1 million which was raised as a net profit is still good for the BDB. In spite of the fact that the Barbados Development Bank is a non-profit organization, I still think that it is consoling to the people of Barbados, the taxpayers, to know that organizations such as the Barbados Development Bank do indeed help the productivity of the island, help create employment and help earn foreign reserves.

Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I will reply briefly to the questions raised by the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central. The bank does lend quite voluntarily. Normally, you can get three years grace and fifteen years to repay on a first loan. That is eighteen years in all, a long time.

Normally, the monies you get from overseas cannot be used for refinancing and rescheduling. One of the purposes of this loan is to allow the bank to do some of the rescheduling that is needed now. The honourable Member said that he did not know what its purposes were. I think this is what he wanted to hear.

We are doing many reschedulings. We only like to add three years at a time on a straight reschedule. There are over twenty reschedulings being done now in tourism and industry; so it is not something that is rare or unusual, it is a regular business.

On freezing, as we have had to do with two loans, one being Husbands Wrought Iron — I mention that one because it is a well known one — and there is a hotel loan, of course maturity is open-ended, because if you put in a receiver, the original loaner will get back his money only when he is able to buy the shares back or pay off the debt, as the case may be. But the freezings that the bank has carried out have not been unsuccessful. It has not lost its money entirely.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: On a point of elucidation, if the honourable Member will give way. If the honourable Member will take the point that I was trying to make, it is that I was trying to suggest that as an instrument of policy it should be generally known at this point in time that in the hard-pressed hotel sector, a hotel can get its debts rescheduled before it gets into deep trouble. That is the important point that I am trying to get across. In other words, do not reschedule when it is almost too late, when it is a salvage operation. When you see the trouble coming, reschedule at an early stage.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I do not myself want to lay down any general policy that will encourage the hotels to believe that there is a cow there giving golden milk on just a whisper of trouble. Nor would I want the hoteliers to believe that the Government has any sympathy with the view that it must provide cash flow for them by not collecting the debts due to it. Too many of the hotels that appear to be in deep trouble should not be in trouble at all. There are hotels that owe a million dollars, and when you look at them they are under capitalised, they are foreign owned, and they seemed to have pursued that quite deliberate policy of not paying the Government so that they can have some cash money.
9.10 p.m.

I do not wish to make a general statement, nor do I wish to pledge that the Government will never foreclose any of these hotels, but foreclosing has proved extremely successful. The Land Tax foreclosures have elicited a great deal of Land Tax, and the measure designed to stop hotels getting a liquor licence has also produced a great deal of revenue, although they are not taking it seriously now and they need to be reminded by one or two closures of the bar that they have certain duties.

Many tourism businesses are receiving sympathetic consideration at an early stage of their operations. The number that I know of in tourism industries going through the mill now is 20. I think that is a large enough number to satisfy the honourable Member that we are not looking at it with an unsympathetic view.

The honourable Member may very well be drawing on his own experience of companies that owe the BNB that have actually fallen into insolvency without making arrangements for rescheduling or reconstruction or whatever. I know that the honourable Member put up \$152 000 in cash — I mean actual cash money — sent it down one afternoon in 1975 to buy into a manufacturing business — and contrary to an earlier report there were hundred dollar notes included in it — and I know that he chose a bad partner and has lost at least \$100 000 in the investment, and probably never got a penny on it. In those early days he should have had the advice of a sensible BDB rather than the BDB that existed then.

The honourable Member is shaking his hand and saying no. If he has got his money out of the business, I congratulate him; nobody else has. But he would understand that in that position he was like the BDB, holding the bag end of an insolvent business. That particular manufacturing business did fall into insolvency and has not been reconstructed. It happens in some cases.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I rise to set the record straight. I was one of the original shareholders. I brought that manufacturing business to Barbados and my investment was \$40 000. The delicate situation was that I had signed the bank's guarantee and I got off the hook early. It is a different ball game.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Well, I am glad that the honourable Member managed to get back the very large sum of cash he had to put up that afternoon in 1975, but it does happen that some businesses are run by people who do not really give the bank the impression that they want to get the businesses out of trouble. They take cash out of the businesses, invest them in other assets — they have other assets — and they are able to let the creditors, including the bank, carry the can for their extracted methods. In those circumstances we may have made mistakes at the bank, but we cannot help it, but the bank is certainly looking with a sympathetic eye at tourism reschedulings.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, earlier in the day I drew to the attention of the House that there was a Resolution for \$864 000 which we would be proceeding with today in all its stages. I propose therefore to deal with this Resolution now.

On the motion of Hon. L. S. CRAIG, seconded by Mr. J. G. ODLE, Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. J. G. ODLE in the Chair.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The House is in Committee of Supply.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1984-85
No. 2 — \$864 000

HEAD 78 — MINISTRY OF HEALTH

Hon. L. S. CRAIG (St. James North): Mr. Chairman, the Addendum to this Resolution is relatively clear.

The Government has to settle a debt with the firm of Lawler, Matusky and Skelly for work related to the sewerage plant for their professional services.

There was some form of disagreement somewhere along the road. However, without this going before the High Court it went into arbitration, and they have been able to settle this matter out of court.

I do not think there is any more I can say about this. It has to be paid and no provision was made in the Estimates for it.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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. L. R. TULL, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Resolution in Committee of Supply, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.
9.20 p.m.

On separate motions of Hon. L. S. CRAIG, seconded by Hon. L. R. TULL, the Resolution was read a first and second time and agreed to.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Deputy Speaker, there is a Supplementary Notice Paper – a Bill to amend the

Sanitation Service Authority Act – and I would like to deal with this matter under Orders of the Day, which I know I can do.

I beg to move that we revert to Orders of the Day.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable Member is entitled to give notice of any Resolutions or Bills at any time during the proceedings of the House.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, I beg to give notice of:

A Bill to amend the Sanitation Service Authority Act.

FIRST READINGS OF BILLS

On the motion of Hon. L. S. CRAIG, seconded by Hon. L. R. TULL, a Bill to amend the Sanitation Service Authority Act was read a first time.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, this is the end of Government's Business for today. I beg to move that this House do now stand adjourned *sine die*.

The question that the House stand adjourned sine die was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.
9.25 p.m.

CONTENTS

MINUTES

Confirmation of the Minutes of the meeting of
Tuesday, May 22 1167

PAPERS LAID

Hon. L. S. CRAIG 1167

The Financial Statement showing Net Customs
and Excise Receipts for 1 month ended 30th
April, 1984.

The Land Valuation (Fresh Valuations) Order,
1984.

The Income Tax (Amendment) Regulations,
1984.

Report of the National Insurance Board on the
National Insurance and Social Security Scheme
for the period 1st January to 31st December,
1981.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE 1167

The 9th Annual Report and Financial State-
ments of the National Housing Corporation for
the year 1981-1982.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. L. S. CRAIG 1167,1216

Resolution to grant the sum of \$864 000 from
the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the
disposal of the Government to supplement the
Estimates 1984-85, Part II - Capital, as shown
in the Supplementary Estimates 1984-85,
No.2 which form the Schedule to the Reso-
lution.

A Bill to revise and consolidate the law relating
to betting and gaming and provide for related
matters.

A Bill to amend the Criminal Procedure Act.

A Bill to amend the Magistrates Jurisdiction
and Procedure Act.

A Bill to amend the Evidence Act.

A Bill to amend the Customs Act.

A Bill to amend the Sanitation Service Authori-
ty Act.

FIRST READINGS

Hon. L. S. CRAIG 1168,1216

A Bill to revise and consolidate the law relating
to betting and gaming and provide for related
matters.

A Bill to amend the Criminal Procedure Act.

A Bill to amend the Magistrates Jurisdiction
and Procedure Act.

A Bill to amend the Evidence Act.

A Bill to amend the Customs Act.

A Bill to amend the Sanitation Service Authori-
ty Act.

OBITUARY SPEECHES

SPEECH RE LATE FATHER VAUGHAN, CHAP-
LAIN OF THE HOUSE 1168

Mr. Craig, 1168; Mr. L. B. Brathwaite, 1169;
Mr. Sandiford, 1170; Mr. Deputy Speaker,
1170.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

RESIGNATION OF SPEAKER 1170

ADDRESS FROM HOUSE TO GOVERNOR

GENERAL 1170,1171

Mr. Craig, 1170; Mr. Adams, 1174, 1181;
Mr. St. John, 1177; Mr. L. B. Brathwaite,
1178; Mr. L. E. Sandiford, 1180.

NATIONAL HEALTH SERVICE BOARD
ACT (RESUMED) 1182

Mr. Weekes, 1182; Mr. Adams, 1184, 1198,
1202, 1204, 1205, 1208, 1209; Mr. Sandiford,
1186, 1205; Dr. R. C. Haynes, 1189, 1201,
1206, 1207, 1209; Mr. St. John, 1193; Mr.
Johnson, 1196; Mr. King, 1203, 1208.

GUARANTEE OF \$10 MILLION BOND ISSUE
OF BARBADOS DEVELOPMENT
BANK 1211

Mr. Adams, 1211, 1214, 1215; Dr. Haynes,
1212, 1215; Mr. Truss, 1213.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1984-85

No. 2 - \$864 000 1215

HEAD 78 - MINISTRY OF HEALTH 1215

Mr. Craig, 1215.

SUSPENSION 1177, 1207**ADJOURNMENT** 1216**SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE****ADAMS, Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. (St. Thomas)****BOLDEN, His Honour C. L. (St. Joseph)****BRATHWAITE, Hon. L. B. (St. Andrew)****CRAIG, Hon. L. S. (St. James 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)****TRUSS, A. (St. Michael Central)****WEEKES, L. A. (St. Michael North West)**