
THE SENATE DEBATES

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION 1976 – 81

THE SENATE

Wednesday 24th September, 1980.

The Senate met in the Senate Chamber, Public Buildings, on Wednesday the 24th September, 1980, at 2.50 p.m.

PRESENT

His Honour Senator the Honourable Sir ARNOTT CATO, M.B., Ch.B., LL.D., (President); His Honour Senator the Rev. G. ANDREW HATCH, M.A., (Deputy President); Senator the Hon. N. A. BARROW, B.A., LL.B., (Minister of Information) (Leader of the Senate); Senator O'BRIEN TROTMAN, (Parliamentary Secretary, Prime Minister's Office); Senator Sir MENCEA COX; Senator R. L. FIELD; Senator H. R. LINTON, LL.B.; Senator K. E. HINDS; Senator C. I. E. DEANE; Senator Mrs. E. M. LYNCH, B.A.; Senator J. D. S. MACKENZIE; Senator Miss M. I. St.C. BLACKMAN; Senator J. C. W. WICKHAM; Senator D. H. G. HUNTE; LL.B.; Senator the Hon. D. G. BLACKMAN, (Minister of Labour and Community Services) and Senator R. E. BRATHWAITE.

ABSENT

Senators H. F. G. ROCHEFORD, AARON TRUSS, Miss O. A. LYNCH, K. R. HEWITT and J. A. CONNELL.

EXCUSE FOR ABSENCE

Senator H. F. G. ROCHEFORD, Senator AARON TRUSS, Senator Miss ADEL LYNCH and Senator J. A. CONNELL.

Prayers were led by His Honour Senator the Rev. G. ANDREW HATCH.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. President, today is, I believe the twenty-fourth day of September and I know that it is in the year of our Lord one thousand, nine hundred and eighty.

I am not sure what is the significance of the year.

I am informed, if I am to believe the newspapers, that it is a day of great importance in your life. I am sure that other hon. members would wish to join me to extend greetings on your birthday, wish you many more and wish that this one is a happy one for you.

We find ourselves in this Honourable Chamber getting up and saying good things which we want to say about you and I know that you would not want me to repeat once again, how great you are, I think Sir, that we are fortunate today, that we happen to have a meeting, so that we could all get together at some point and wish you in, perhaps, a more liquid way, many happy returns. (APPLAUSE).

SENATOR SIR MENCEA COX: Mr. President, Sir, I would like to associate myself with the remarks made by the Hon. Leader of the Senate and wish you the best and many more. (APPLAUSE).

Mr. PRESIDENT: Hon. Senators, I thank the hon. Minister and Senator Sir Mencea Cox for the good wishes and kind remarks and other hon. Senators for associating themselves with them.

I have got chronologically speaking, to the stage where you cease to remember birthdays, or you prefer not to remember them. But, it is still very nice to be given friendly greetings when the occasion arises. I hope, with Senator Barrow, that we will be able to put it in a more usual form, little later on this evening.

Thank you very much. (APPLAUSE).

The CLERK: Mr. President, I have been asked to offer you excuses for absence on behalf of Senator Rocheford, Senator Aaron Truss, Senator Miss Adel Lynch and Senator Connell who is on official business abroad.

PRESENTATION OF PAPERS

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. President, I have the honour to lay the following documents before this Honourable Senate:—

The Annual Report of the Barbados Industrial Development Corporation for the year 1978–79.

Statement showing Net Customs and Excise Receipts for 4 months ended 31st July, 1980.

The Ministers and Parliamentary Secretaries (Remuneration and Allowances) Order 1980.

The Civil Establishments (Teachers) (Amendment) Order 1980.

The Civil Establishment (Part-time Officers) Order, 1980.

The Civil Establishment (Teachers) Order 1980.

The Judges (Salaries) Order 1980.

The Civil Establishment (General) Order 1980.

The National Housing Corporation (Pensionable Offices) (Amendment) Order 1980.

The Senate and House of Assembly (Remuneration and Allowances of Members) Order 1980.

NOTICES OF BILLS

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. President, I beg to give notice of the following:—

A Bill to provide for the establishment of a Drug Service for Barbados.

A Bill to provide for the care and treatment of persons of unsound mind and for related matters.

A Bill to provide for the improvement of administrative justice in Barbados and for related matters.

A Bill to make provision for the avoidance of conflicts of interest by persons engaged in governing, guiding or administering the public affairs of Barbados and to establish a body to monitor the assets of persons in public life.

I also take this opportunity, Sir, to refer to the fact that with the Order Paper which members generally would have received on Friday last, there were circulated a number of Resolutions dealing with salaries and there are a number of Resolutions therefore, which fall to be dealt with. Yesterday I spoke to the Clerk and gave notice of intention to deal with these Resolutions and that notice, Sir, is in accordance with Standing Orders 14 or 15 and therefore they have been properly circulated and given notice of.

At the time when I gave notice I was not aware of their circulation even though, Sir, I must admit that they were already circulated to me. But having seen them otherwise I did not look at my package. Had they not been properly noticed I was going to ask the Senate's permission but in fact that does not arise now because they have been properly noticed and circulated. I wish to announce that it is our intention to proceed with them this afternoon.

I just wish to refer to three other Bills of which we gave notice last week, two of them concerning tenancies and one of them concerning the making of membership of the Commonwealth to be more easily ascertained which are down for debate on Wednesday next.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Let it be recorded in the Minutes that these Bills have been read a first time.

PUBLIC BUSINESS

APPROPRIATION ACT, 1979

The First Order of the Day was called — To move the Second Reading of a Bill to grant an additional sum of money from the Consolidated Fund and appropriate the same for the service of the Island for the Financial Year which ended on the 31st March, 1980.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. President, Sir, the items standing in my name, Orders 1, 3 and 5 will be dealt with by me and the other three on the Order Paper will be dealt with by Senator Trotman; then I will deal with the Orders, Sir. Unfortunately we were unable to revive Senator Blackman in time but he has at least honoured us with his presence and I hope he does not fall ill on account of it.

Sir, this Item No. 1 — and I would like to take 1, 3 and 5 in succession and then 2, 4 and 6 before we move to the Resolutions. This is the Final Appropriation Bill, Sir.

As we are all aware, the Estimates of Revenue and Expenditure are debated under the Appropriation Bill by this Chamber after they come from the Other Place and then in order to ensure that Government's work is carried

out a number of Resolutions of a Supplementary nature have to be passed from time to time in the Other Place. They do not fall to be dealt with by us but the Constitution at Section 109 Subsection 5 makes provision for a tidying up exercise in the following provision:—

“In respect of all supplementary expenditure voted on by the House of Assembly in pursuance of subsection (4) the Minister responsible for finance may, at any time before the end of the financial year, introduce into the House of Assembly a Supplementary Appropriation Bill containing, under appropriate heads, the aggregate sums so voted, and shall, as soon as possible after the end of each financial year, introduce into the House of Assembly a final Appropriation Bill containing any such sums which have not yet been included in any Appropriation Bill.”

So, Sir, what we have is the first Appropriation Bill and then to tidy it all up to take account of all those amounts which might by Resolution have been produced by the Treasury for public expenditure, we have a Final Appropriation Bill.

This, Sir, is the nature of the legislation before us and as you will see in the Schedule everything is set out clearly as to what amounts are involved in this Supplementary exercise.

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

SENATOR J. D. S. MACKENZIE: Mr. President, in rising to say a few words on this particular Bill, as the Hon. Leader explained to us when he introduced the Bill, this Senate has the opportunity to debate Estimates at the beginning of each financial year, and at the end of the year a Final Appropriation Bill for those sums of money that have been spent in excess of what has been estimated for in particular years comes before us, and really it is not anything to debate, it is just to be passed.

In doing the Estimates which we discussed in here, they show what the estimated revenue is expected to be and also what the estimated expenditure is expected to be for that year, and we can see at that time when we are debating the various Heads whether there will be an excess of revenue or expenditure over one or the other, in other words, an excess of revenue over expenditure or an excess of expenditure over revenue. Now in this last year, in the 1979–80 Estimates in respect of which this would be the Final Appropriation Bill the estimated expenditure was \$333,338,905, and it was seen from this Appropriation Bill that an additional sum of \$24,477,000 is now required, but in that year it had shown that there was going to be an excess of revenue over expenditure of about \$20.9 million. This here wipes it out, and it

would appear on a cursory glance that in fact we had not had any excess of revenue over expenditure, but it all depends again on what money has been spent for capital development.

I was wondering if, since it is not a debatable item as far as we are concerned in this Chamber, in future it could be so that hon. members would be aware of the performance of the Government in any one financial year in the same way as we are notified at the beginning of the year in the Estimates of what Government expect to spend and to raise, and whether we are going to have a surplus or not, and that when an Appropriation Bill comes down to us some information from the Auditor General's Office could come whereby it could show what actually the revenue was and actually the expenditure was in relation and also how much was spent on capital construction, so that at least we would have the final outcome on the performance for that year since we are given it initially to debate in the first instance before the year started. I think it would be beneficial perhaps that this information be given at the same time so that we know where we stand and whether or not it was a year in which there was an excess of revenue or an excess of expenditure. Thank you.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. President, I well understand Senator MacKenzie's point, but indeed the reason for the provision — in fact let me put it this way because I might sound as though I am suggesting that he thinks this is the reason for the provision — what I did was to describe it as a tidying up arrangement. There has to be legislation in order to authorise money coming out of the Consolidated Fund, and the point is that these Resolutions are brought together in a final Bill because it is foreseeable that your estimate cannot always come out pat, and secondly that even if they could there would be matters arising from time to time which would require expenditure which might not be voted.

The time at which the accounts are drawn together and actual expenditure and actual revenue figures become available may not be the time at which the Appropriation Bill is ready, and therefore I could not give an understanding that at this time I would be able to produce those figures. I well understand, but this is why in the Estimates when they come down in the month of March the actual figures are then reproduced; the revised figures being as far as possible to ascertain the actual figures, these they are. So that as far as actual figures can be produced they are then produced in that volume because by then all the transactions are finished and, as Senator MacKenzie is aware, transactions to which one may be committed may not come to be closed for some time after, and by the time one clears up the whole picture one then sees more clearly how much money was brought into the Treasury and how much was actually

spent. So it is not necessarily going to be a case that in the month of September, or whenever, the Final Appropriation Bill comes, because it may be possible for us to bring it in the month of June, and I believe if we had not had the recess in August it would have been here before, because notice was given of it in the Other Place to my belief before they went on recess. I know it was ready and at that time it certainly would have been possible for the actual figures to be out.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Before I put the question for the second reading, I wish to repeat what I have said many times before in this Senate in relation to Final Appropriation Bills. It is my firm conviction that this Chamber as an integral part of the Legislature of this country is entitled to discuss these Resolutions when they are passed in the Other Place, and not merely to rubber stamp the Final Appropriation Bill for money that is long ago spent.

I have raised this point before. It used to be the case in the Legislative Council and for some time after the Legislative Council was changed into the Senate that measures of that nature came up to the Upper House until some very clever person discovered that the wording of the Constitution did not necessitate Supplementary Resolutions coming to this House. I will never cease agitating that this practice should be changed and I am very happy that the Constitution Committee agreed with my representations to that effect on behalf of this body. This is an equal partner in the Government of this country in so far as the Legislature is concerned, and in my view it is contemptuous to this House that it has no say in matters of this sort and that any amount of money can be spent from the people's purse and Senators have nothing to do with it. I hope that Honourable Senators will support this stand firmly and that we will get to the point where we take our rightful place in this Chamber in the discussion and passage of legislation in this country.

The question that the Bill be read a second time was put to the Senate and agreed to.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. President, I move that, in accordance with section 59, this Bill be not committed.

The question was put to the Senate and agreed to.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Sir, I now move that the Bill be read a third time forthwith.

The question was put to the Senate and agreed to.

Mr. PRESIDENT: This Bill has now been passed.

THE REVENUE EQUALIZATION FUND (REPEAL) ACT, 1980

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. President, fairly recently I remember moving a motion similar to this one, in that it concerns removing from the Statute Book an Act which no longer serves the purpose for which it was passed. The purpose and the circumstances were no longer extant and the legislation continued, and this is one more instance.

Indeed, the history of this legislation would reflect that some time ago this very legislation was thought to have been repealed in that the necessary legislation was passed to repeal it, and then lo and behold, Sir, it appeared again in the laws of Barbados and the repealing legislation did not, and so we are back to square one. This is an Act enacted in 1952 to enable the establishment of a Revenue Equalisation Fund which would be used to augment Current Revenue in the event of a temporary recession of public revenues.

Section 5 of the Act also permitted that part or all of the fund could be withdrawn from time to time for the credit of the general revenue of the island. In addition, Sir, the Revenue Equalisation Fund (Temporary Use) Act, 1961-62 allowed the temporary use of monies from the fund to be used to finance the initial expenditure of the 1960-65 Development Plan. The sum of \$7,475,556.52 was used for that purpose. The Temporary Use Act was repealed by Act 1975-3 which provided: "Any amount borrowed from the Revenue Equalisation Fund under the Act of 1961 and which at the commencement of this Act has not been repaid in accordance with that Act, shall upon such commencement be treated as having been withdrawn under section 5 of the Revenue Equalisation Fund Act, 1952." This sum was repaid at the commencement of Act 1975-3 and was therefore treated as a withdrawal in accordance with section 5 of the Revenue Equalisation Act.

The laws continue to show the existence of this Act, the Temporary Use Act, although it has been repealed by 1975-3. (I made a mistake when I said that it was the Revenue Equalisation Fund Act which was repealed, Sir, it is the Revenue Equalisation (Temporary Use) Act that was repealed). The fund itself, Sir, has a balance of \$7,595,949 to its credit. This is in fact the value of the amount of Barbados' original gold tranche contribution to the IMF, and it would therefore seem that there is little point in having a fund where the balance of monies in it have already been applied to the subscription to the IMF and will really continue to be applied in that way.

Indeed, Sir, there is a legal obligation under the International Monetary Fund Act for the Government to

maintain the IMF Reserve Tranche Account. For this reason, Sir, the funds standing to the credit of the fund immediately prior to the repeal of this Act will be transferred to a new account to be known as the IMF Reserve Tranche Account. It is, therefore, then decided at this stage that the Revenue Equalisation Fund Act should be repealed, since it really does serve no further purpose.

I move, Sir, that this Bill be read a second time.

(ASIDES)

Mr. PRESIDENT: Order, please.

The question that the Bill be read a second time was put to the Senate and agreed to.

On the motion of Senator the Hon. N. A. Barrow, the Senate resolved itself into a Committee on the Bill, Senator the Rev. A. Hatch in the Chair.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Senator Hinds.

On the motion of Senator K. Hinds, the Bill was taken as read.

Clauses 1 to 3 inclusive were called and passed.

On the motion of Senator the Hon. N. A. Barrow, the passing of the Bill in Committee was reported to the Senate and Mr. President resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On the separate motions of Senator the Hon. N. A. Barrow, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

BILL TO AMEND THE HOUSING ACT

Order No. 5 was called — To move the Second Reading of a Bill to amend the Housing Act.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Barrow.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. President, I have not, on the occasion of moving a Second Reading of this Bill brought any copy of the Housing Report, as this matter is not Legislation really relating to that Report. What it relates to more than anything else, is our commitment on this Side, Sir, to do whatever we can to reduce the incidence of cost to those persons in this community who can least afford to bear it.

The Bill Sir, has two specific aspects to it. The first one dealing with conflict of interest and which is clear enough. It enshrines in the Law certain principles which must guide everyone who agrees to serve in a public

capacity. Expressed simply, Sir, it is a principle that you must keep your private duty separate. So that, you must not use your office in any way for either enriching yourself, or enriching your friends, or family. So, where a person has an interest, he is to declare it and he is to take no part in the deliberations in the matter in which he has an interest. That is the first part and that Sir, is the part which would obviously make Hon. Members begin to think of the administration of the Housing Corporation in previous days, where it is so clearly evidenced there were conflicts of interest and whatever. That, Sir, is something which a community as intelligent and as mature, as ours, takes in its stride.

What we are doing, Sir, is ensuring that insofar as Legislation can prevent these things, they will not happen again. But to me, Sir, the emphasis belongs to the Section of the Legislation relating to contracts for sale of land by the Corporation. It is a known fact that the fees which one often has to pay for transfer of property are such that small persons, unless they are the vendors, cannot really afford them and even if you are the vendor, it may represent something very significant in relation to what you are getting in your hand because as you know, Sir, it is no point talking about five percent, or ten percent, or two and a half percent, when the reason a man might have to sell a property may well be his indebtedness and if five percent might have to represent \$1,000.00, or \$5,000.00, or what have you, the sum, though looking to others as insignificant, can have a serious effect on his ability to discharge that indebtedness. Sir, that is not something which we can easily provide for because we have to take the position that a society should not be too tightly regulated, but you forget that it is not only the vendor who has to pay fees, who has to pay stamp duty and who has to pay other expenses, it is also the purchaser.

It makes a mockery of the whole thing, if the Government is going to ensure that a piece of land reaches the purchasers at say, the price of \$45,000.00 whereas, had the development been carried out by a private person, it might well have reached the purchaser at a price of \$55,000.00, or \$60,000.00 having already sought to lower the price because the purchaser has legal expenses. He is then faced with a couple of thousand dollars, in order to close his transaction.

What I am getting at, Sir, is the fact that legal fees are a scale relating to price of property and not to difficulty involved in the particular undertaking and it is an important thing where people are purchasing from a Government Corporation or from the Government, purchasing land from the National Housing Corporation because the lands are first of all owned by the Government.

If they are purchased under compulsory acquisition there can be no difficulty with title and if they are purchased by treaty then Government is prepared to guarantee that title. It therefore means, Sir, that the work involved for a lawyer in closing one of these transactions is not any substantial amount of work because he cannot in any way be involved in difficult and time consuming purchases which are the things which one would normally expect a professional man to be charged with and so the poor purchaser gets caught up in the web of spiralling legal fees even though he is involved in a transaction of the utmost simplicity and minimum risk.

Again, Sir, if the Government is prepared to guarantee the title, then his lawyer is not likely in the end to be sued for negligence because he did not properly investigate the title.

This Resolution, therefore, Sir, has these aspects to it that it prescribes a form of conveyance so that no lawyer has to use his ingenuity to devise the form of conveyance or as someone might argue, to copy the standard form of conveyance used mostly in the profession.

Secondly, Sir, the Government guarantees the title, therefore the fact that it might arise at some later date, that there is someone with a claim to the land which they would wish to enforce will not disturb the possession because, as the law clearly states, that would mean that if the person has not been negligent, his rights under the law to be compensated will be honoured because the law of the land is that there must be adequate compensation.

Thirdly, there is this Section in the Bill which is of the greatest importance, Section 17(b): "Notwithstanding Section 35 of the Legal Profession Act or anything contained in any other enactment, the Attorney General may, after consultation with the Minister and a Judicial Advisory Council, by Order prescribe the fees payable in respect of services rendered by the Corporation or an Attorney-at-Law in connection with any sale or mortgage referred to in Section 17(a)."

In other words, that Section says that the crippling scale of fees which is applied on open market transactions will not apply because the nature of the exercise here is different. There is no work involved and there is no risk involved, therefore there is no reason for the purchaser to pay fees at the level which he has to pay for an open market transaction.

That, Sir, is what this Resolution represents. I believe that this Resolution should have been on the Statute Books a long, long time ago. I believe, Sir, that it would be a mistake for any of us to seek to see this legislation as a means of preventing professional people

from earning. I believe, Sir, it is only equitable that if the transaction does not involve the same difficulties or the same risks as open market transactions that the rules of the open market should not be applied and that the cost ought to be lowered.

I move, Sir, that this Bill be read a second time.

SENATOR THE HON. REV. G. A. HATCH: I was not able to follow the Leader of Government Business in the Senate when he made a distinction between conveyances from the National Housing Corporation and open market transactions. Presumably the National Housing Corporation purchases land which was previously on the open market, because I do not believe there is much State land in the country. Therefore one presumes that the question of title obtains both in conveyances from the National Housing Corporation and also on the open market. So, the point I am getting at is that land conveyancing needs to be simplified for the reasons which the Leader so ably described.

It is not only the lands of the National Housing Corporation being conveyed that need to be simplified. It is not only those conveyances that need to be simplified but all conveyances that need to be simplified and therefore I wonder if the Minister in winding up might explain why similar legislation cannot also be implemented for open market conveyances.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Sir, the reply to that point really is to be found in legislation which we passed in the Hon. Senate at the beginning of the year because it is the Property Act of 1979 which was part of the Property Legislation involving legislation of Charities and so on on which there was a Select Committee of both Houses examining and which was designed to modernize the whole business of the Law of Real Property which had been in an archaic situation.

I believe, Sir, at the time of dealing with that measure I referred to the fact that a lot of it was old Common Law predating even 1881 and that about the most modern Sections of our Real Property Law up to that time related to the British Conveyancing Act of 1881 and I talked of the general confusion then.

The whole point about that is that, Sir, once the new legislation comes to be understood generally by people at large, they will recognise that in that legislation itself one does not have to go back as far as previously in doing searches so that there has been some simplification. There has been a great deal of simplification in the Law of Real Property, Sir, and a great deal of improvement indeed, Sir.

In addition to that, the rest of the property legislation which will in time produce the Land Register with all the records up to date which will make it easier to identify the land you are talking about and to do your transactions unfortunately will take some time, but as you know, Sir, we are setting up a Land Registry and we are getting ahead on that. So these steps are being taken to ensure that ultimately open market transactions should not be as expensive as they now are. Whether it will take more than gentle persuasion to persuade the profession when everything is laid out for them that they need not charge fees as high as they charge is a matter of conjecture, but I can say without fear of contradiction that the fees are very high and there are in fact some practitioners in Bridgetown who do not let their clients face the full fee, and when they have made up their bills charged along the scale of fees turn around and take something off because they understand how high the charges are, and therefore what the incidence would be on a number of their clients. So I am not accusing the lawyers of being heartless about it. I know it would be invidious to call names and it would be invidious to point to law firms, but I know law firms, I can tell you of one law firm, in fact two, where it is the practice among the members of the partners to reduce the bills rather than let the full incidence of it hit the client, so it is not a point that is not recognised. But the essence of this one, Sir, is that since the Housing Authority has already purchased and the Government is guaranteeing the title by section 17A (2) "a conveyance made under the authority of and in the Form prescribed under subsection (1) shall vest a good and marketable title in the purchaser notwithstanding that he has not investigated the title of the Corporation for the period of years required by section 50 of the Property Act, 1979."

The point is, Sir, that once Government is standing between the purchaser and the predecessor in title, then the risk is eliminated. If when you bought the land on the open market the vendor guaranteed the title and the guarantee was really something, there would be no need to search back to see how good the predecessor in title was. That would eliminate the risk, so in this way with Government standing between the purchaser and predecessor in title, the risk is eliminated and the job becomes very simple, and in case you wanted to become even more simple, we are saying to the profession here in a form of conveyance, all you have to do is to fill in the blanks.

The question that the Bill be now read a second time was put to the Senate and agreed to.

On the motion of Senator the Hon. N. A. Barrow, the Senate resolved itself into Committee on the Bill, Senator Rev. A. Hatch in the Chair.

On motion of Senator K. Hinds, the Bill was taken as read.

Clauses 1 to 5 inclusive were called and passed.

The Schedule was called and passed.

On motion of Senator the Hon. N. A. Barrow, the Bill was reported as having passed the Committee without amendment, Mr. President in the Chair.

On motion of Senator the Hon. N. A. Barrow, the Bill was read a third time forthwith and passed.

THE CUSTOMS (AMENDMENT) (NO. 2) ACT, 1980

The Second Order of the Day was called — To move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Customs Act, Cap.66.

SENATOR O'BRIEN TROTMAN: Mr. President, the Customs Act, Cap. 66 in the First Schedule Part III provides for several items to be imported into Barbados free of duty, and these items are listed, and there is a list of over 200 I believe in the Schedule. There are other items which are imported duty free as provided by the very Customs Act and the section which provides for the duty-free entry of goods makes it clear that other enactments can also provide for duty free entry of goods.

The Diplomatic (Immunities and Privileges) Act, Cap. 18 provides in Sections 9 and 12, I think it is, for members of the Diplomatic Corps to import items free of duty. That Act further provides that where those goods are disposed of within a specific time the duty becomes payable by the person who imported the item, so that if for example a diplomat imported a car he would pay no duty on the car, but if within the specified time he sold the car, then the Comptroller of Customs would collect the duty from the diplomat on the sale of the car.

What has been happening now, Sir, is that several diplomats have been buying items on the local market, and it is considered that had they imported these items they would have got the items duty free.

The Minister of Finance has traditionally waived the duty in accordance with the powers vested in him under section 129 of the Customs Act, which empowers the Minister of Finance to waive or remit duty where he considers it equitable so to do, but there is a snag, Sir, because if one diplomat imported an item and sold it within the specified time, the Comptroller of Customs is entitled by law to collect the duty which should have been payable. However, if another diplomat buys the same item on the local market and the Minister of

Finance uses his discretion to remit the duty, the diplomat is then free to sell the item on the open market without having to pay the Comptroller of Customs the duty, because there is no provision under section 129 of the Customs Act which makes it mandatory for persons to whom that facility is given to pay the duty if they dispose of the goods, and what the Act now seeks to do is to tighten up that loophole.

We have been fortunate in that there is no evidence that advantage has been taken of that, because arrangements have always been made, and people always believed that in fact they had to pay the duty if they sold the items, and therefore there was a matter of good faith. What we are seeking to do now is to make it an obligation on the officer to pay the duty when he disposes of the goods.

It is therefore proposed, Sir, to amend section 129, the section which gives the Minister of Finance the discretionary power to remit or refund the duty, to give the Minister power to impose conditions relating to the remission or the refund of duties. It is also considered necessary to add in section 3 of the amending Act which validates the acts previously carried out where in fact we had been collecting the duties from those persons, otherwise the diplomats who paid in the past in good faith could now be in a position to come back and say we want our duty back because you collected it in error, so section 3 is necessary in order to utilise the previous collection of duties which were really made in good faith.

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

SENATOR D. H. G. HUNTE: Mr. President, any legislation which is introduced aimed at closing any loopholes as far as Customs is concerned must have the support of everyone in this country. It is very often that we find that we are very critical of certain Public Officers, but there are times when I think that we need to praise some of our public officials, and I would like to take this opportunity, now we are discussing this Customs Act, to pay tribute to the Customs Officers who have been very vigilant at our airport in recent times and who have been able to come across large amounts of marijuana and things of that sort that people are trying to get into this country.

As I said, we find from time to time that we are critical of them but I think that where praise is due it should be given, and in the case which we read of in the newspaper recently where because of some loophole somebody was able to get scotch free, I wonder if the Government would not consider looking at the legislation again to see if we could not try to stop those loopholes, because there is no point having a suitcase of marijuana

at the airport and somebody trying to get it through, and because the name on the suitcase does not agree with the person's name you cannot guarantee that the person is bringing it through, and things of this sort, and therefore you could not get any conviction.

I think that we must all be concerned about the large number of persons who have been convicted before the courts recently on charges of drugs entering this country, and I notice that it is intended that greater efforts are made by the Government and the Customs Department to track down the offenders, and I would like to indicate that any proposal which the Government might wish to come up with aimed at trying to curtail this development as far as the drug trafficking trade in this country is concerned, would receive the whole-hearted support of us all in this Chamber.

I have made mention already in here of the question of the construction industry and the importation of duty free articles, and I did ask on that occasion what guarantees there were that when a hotel, for instance, is to be constructed that the correct quantity of articles required for the construction of that hotel are allowed in duty free. I believe you could have some snags in that respect, because it is difficult for persons in the Customs to really determine whether 20 tons of steel is going to be used in a particular building, and there could be loopholes where 20 tons of steel may be imported under that particular hotel and then you could find that only 10 tons of steel is really required to be used in that particular hotel. What monitoring arrangements are made to make sure that the duty is collected on the remaining ten tons? I know that it will be difficult to bring it down to every bar of steel or to every W.C. that you want for that particular project, I think that some consideration must be given because there are business men and business men and it is not always that you will find everybody who will make the necessary declarations except there is some kind of legislation requiring that this declaration should be made, and I would think that the Government should give some kind of consideration to this, because when a warrant is presented at the Customs the poor officer is only aware that a hotel is going to be constructed, he is not aware that it is a 100 room hotel and that you only need 100 wash basins for that, but that warrant could be presented showing that there are 200 wash basins to be imported for that hotel and the other 100 could reach anywhere in this country and could be sold to the public of this country with the appropriate duty added on, although it was not paid, and I know that this is done in some instances. It is quite easy to do it, to work out what the duty would be on that particular item, and this is where I fear that we can well be losing large sums of money because we have not yet got the expertise in the Customs Department that could track down these particular practices.

I throw it out as a suggestion, Mr. President, I do not expect the introducer of the measure would be in a position to say that they are doing this or they are doing that, but I throw it out because I think it is something that needs looking at and I know that there are loopholes in that particular respect and I think if we are blocking one we should try and block all.

SENATOR O'BRIEN TROTMAN: Mr. President, I wish to thank the Senator for his suggestions and I will promise him that I will convey them to the appropriate Minister.

The question that the Bill be read a second time was put to the Senate and agreed to.

On the motion of SENATOR O'BRIEN TROTMAN the Senate resolved itself into a Committee on the Bill, SENATOR THE REV. A. HATCH in the Chair.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Senator Hinds.

On the motion of SENATOR K. HINDS, the Bill was taken as read.

Clauses One to Three inclusive, were called and passed.

On the motion of SENATOR O'B. TROTMAN, the passing of the Bill in Committee was reported to the Senate and Mr. PRESIDENT resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On the separate motions of SENATOR O'B. TROTMAN, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

BILL TO AMEND THE HOTELS AND RESTAURANTS (SALES TAX) ACT

Order Number Four was called — To move the Second Reading of the Bill to amend the Hotels and Restaurants Sales Tax Act.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Trotman.

SENATOR O'B. TROTMAN: Mr. President, Sir, the Hotels and Restaurants Sales Tax Act provides for the payment of Government tax on food and beverages sold in hotels and restaurants.

It has been noticed however, Sir, that almost side and side with the sale of beverages at hotels and restaurants, that we are selling large quantities of beverages at what are commonly known as discotheques, night clubs, *et cetera*. The position therefore, is that, if one buys a drink at a hotel, he pays the tax, if he goes next door and buys the same drink for, the same price, at a discotheque run by the hotel, he does not pay the

tax. It is considered that the tax should be applied to all persons in the business of hotels, restaurants, discotheques, night clubs and entertainment, to ensure that there is no discrimination between the one and the other and that is what the Act this afternoon seeks to do.

Immediately after the definition, as set out in Section Two of the Hotels and Restaurants Sales Tax Act, a new insertion is being made as to the application of that Act and it makes it clear that the Act should now apply to places commonly known as night-clubs, discotheques, or similar places and whereas some persons have been questioning Sir, whether these places should be caught up in the Act because they do not sell food and beverages, they only sell beverages, the Act will now make it clear, that if you sell food and beverage, you pay the tax and if you sell food, or beverages, you pay the tax. So, there will be no escape to those operators of discotheques who are selling the identical beverages as hotels and restaurants.

I beg to move Sir, that the Bill be now read a second time.

Mr. PRESIDENT: It is proposed that this Bill be now read a second time.....Senator Hunte.

SENATOR HUNTE: Yes, Sir. One brief point. I wonder if the Hon. Senator could give some idea when they say night-clubs, there are many places in this country where people hold dances and things of that sort and they are commonly referred to as the night-club. I refer to things like you know, your own Party Headquarters, if somebody went there and held a dance, what happens? You get places like Harry's which is regarded as a night-club, is that going to be included in this Act?

I think that there should be some exemptions and I do not know if he has any intentions in this respect. When the first Act was introduced, there were certain buildings and things on Baxters Road which you did not include and all I am trying to find out Sir, is if there are any of these places which we consider the night-clubs where people go and have a dance and things like that, that the Act is going to exclude. I think that, for the benefit of the general public, you should state if there are any known exceptions.

I mean, there are auditoriums, there is something in the papers which the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister referred to in the Lower House and I did not see it myself, but this is why I am asking, Sir. The Labour Party has a dancing area somewhere attached to their Headquarters and I want to know if that is going to be included. The Democratic Labour Party has an auditorium which is almost finished there on George Street. Is that going to be included in this? I believe that the Hon. Minister would

tell me that Harry's is going to be included in it because Harry's is a night-club and is known to be a night-club. That is alright, but there are other places like Casinova, Club 80 in Silver Sands. This is what I want to know, if you are going to include those little places where you get the small man going into? That is all I would like to know.

SENATOR O'B. TROTMAN: Mr. President Sir, I do not know if to give a legal opinion because the practitioners present might take objection, but it seems to me Sir, that the Act specifically says that the Act now applies to night clubs and the Act provides for exemptions of small shops, so Mr. John Jones' rum shop accommodates that and would pay the Restaurant Tax. It seems to me that if Shiela Jones' night club next door is also affected by the Act, that the same provision must apply for an exemption.

The Act says very clearly, that the Act applies to night-clubs, so anything which applies to other people would apply to the night-clubs.

The question that the Bill be read a second time was put to the Senate and agreed to.

On the motion of SENATOR O'B. TROTMAN, the Senate resolved itself into a Committee on the Bill, SENATOR THE REV. A. HATCH in the Chair.

SENATOR K. E. HINDS: Mr. Deputy President, I beg to move that the Bill be taken as read.

The question was put to the Senate and agreed to.

Clause 1 was called and passed.

Clause 2 was called.

SENATOR K. E. HINDS: Mr. Deputy President, a question was raised by Senator Hunte which was treated a bit humorously by Senator Trotman, and I say I would like a little further explanation.

SENATOR O'BRIEN TROTMAN: We have darkness on both sides, apparently. The point I am making is, in my opinion, quite simple. The Hotels and Restaurant (Sales Tax) Act says that if you sell food and beverages then you are called upon to pay the tax. The main Act also makes provision for exemptions so that the small operators are not caught up in the Act.

The man who sells fishcakes in the Bus Stand is not caught up in this Act even though he is selling food in the form of fishcakes and beverages in the form of soft drinks because he applies to the Ministry of Finance for an exemption. (*Asides*) There are general rules apparently

laid down by the Committee that looks at these things and they decide whether you are a big or a small operator. The margin must be very thin somewhere along the line. Some people get it and others do not get it depending on how big you are.

What I am saying then, Sir, is if the Act now applies to night clubs, the same law as it applies to exemptions must apply to exempting night clubs as well, so the small operator in my opinion is also entitled to apply for an exemption because the law as it applies to exemptions has not been altered. I do not know if that helps him, Sir.

Clause 2 was passed.

Clause 3 was called and passed.

On the motion of Senator O'Brien Trotman, the Senate was resumed and the passing of the Bill was reported.

Mr. PRESIDENT resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On the separate motions of Senator O'Brien Trotman the Bill was read a third time and passed.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LANDS AT TUDOR STREET AND SOBERS LANE FOR THE PROVISION OF A YOUTH CENTRE

The Sixth Order was called — To move the passing of a Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of lands at Tudor Street and Sobers Lane for the provision of a Youth Centre.

SENATOR O'BRIEN TROTMAN: Mr. President, Sir, most of us, I believe know of Youth Town and of the work it used to do, and the work it is not now doing and even now the little work that it is still doing.

The whole purpose of the Resolution as it relates to the acquisition, Sir, has to do with the Government's proposal for a new place in Bridgetown where the youth can assemble, play games and in some way learn skills, etc. The present building, as I understand it, Sir, is owned by the Methodist Church.

There was a time when Youth Town was a hub of activity. I believe, Sir, that most of our table tennis players around Bridgetown came through the ranks of Youth Town, but now, Sir, the building is in poor shape and as a result most people are not attracted to the building as it used to be in years past and we are hoping, Sir, to give them a new building, not just to rebuild a build-

ing, but to give them a better building and indeed to give them some sort of a courtyard.

In order to do that, it is necessary to acquire the three neighbouring lots of land which are indicated on the map which I have circulated and it is hoped that Youth Town will once more be a Centre of activity for the young people of Bridgetown, so that when they say that we are doing nothing for the young people, we will ask them to pass by Youth Town.

I beg to move that the Senate do now concur in this Resolution.

SENATOR Mrs. E. M. LYNCH: Mr. President, I am very happy indeed to see this Resolution for two main reasons. First, this is the site, I think I can say the historic site, of the Wesley Hall School where the imaginative and resourceful Mr. Rawle Parkinson did such remarkable work.

It is very common in our Caribbean communities not to ensure continuity in our social development and I feel that, by retaining this site which was used first of all as a school and then later as a Boys' Town Recreational Club, we encourage a certain continuity of effort in pursuing certain social goals.

In this very limited area it was possible to see a Lunch Room catering for and giving free lunch or lunch at a low cost for boys. There was vocational training. There was music and art. There must have been cricket though I wonder where it was played, so limited was the site, so I feel that in retaining this sort of site, we are reminded and perhaps encouraged by seeing how much was achieved in circumstances which would seem an almost adverse but certainly not favourable environment in a street such as Tudor Street with very few physical amenities. And yet work of first-class quality was done there.

I think just retaining this site for children's work will do something to remind us and encourage us to continue our efforts for young people even where the circumstances do not seem very favourable. Secondly, at a time when we seem to be heading for increasing difficulties especially with the young adults, the young people from 15 years to 25 years who are giving the greatest amount of trouble where crime is concerned, I want once again, as I have done it on other occasions, to stress the importance of preventive work. We have very, very few people trained for corrective work.

I think I am told there are only three people trained for corrective work with young people and obviously we need not merely to wring our hands but to examine carefully what is happening to children just before this age. If they are giving trouble between

15 and 25 years, then we ought to be looking at the stage just before this to see what it was we failed to do, and this brings us of course to schools, the senior forms in schools and to the recreational facilities for young people. So I think that it is most timely that we should have embarked on building here, setting up here at the Youth Centre which we hope will be successful.

All our Youth Organisations are short of youth leaders, and I think that money spent here is very well spent, because we know from experience that preventive work is less expensive and more effective than corrective work. We would rather have good schools and good recreational facilities and spend less money on corrective institutions. Thank you, Mr. President.

SENATOR MISS M. BLACKMAN: Mr. President, we sit here when we do meet and so often we have Resolutions before us for the acquisition of property. This particular acquisition gives me more pleasure than all of the others put together. I am very pleased that after perhaps 20 to 25 years of consideration, the Government has seen it possible to move to acquire the site on which the first Youth Town was founded. Youth Town we know did excellent work; it has a record in that area where people in the Bridgetown area have spoken very highly of the work that it did. It was established at a time when the rate of crime in Bridgetown, and when I say crime I am talking about pilferage and theft particularly from the commercial community, was growing, and, in an effort to cope with the situation, Youth Town was established. The community accepts that, in fact, it was effective and that the crime rate dropped very considerably.

Youth Town as was mentioned earlier was also the cradle in which so many of our national table tennis champions have been nursed until they reached the standard of excellence, and so, Sir, at this site of which we can be proud of the record of an institution I am very pleased that we are going back to re-establish an institution which has now been closed for seven years. I would like to point out that the facilities offered at Youth Town were not better than the facilities offered in centres all over the island. Indeed the facilities there were very much more restricted than in some of our community centres, and the community centres or many of them in the country have brought little or no benefit. As one who has been very closely associated with the work in these community centres we can say that the results have been disappointing, and so I harp back to what was stated by the last speaker when she referred to the work of Rawle Parkinson at a particular site, and I would like to state my own views that what has made the difference was the person on the spot. The facilities, yes; but the direction which has been given is most important in dealing with our

young people and encouraging the proper use of facilities.

In this community, Sir, we have so often failed to reap the benefit of our investment because we have put such a heavy accent on real estate and on material things, and we have failed to gear the people to make the best use of the skills and the opportunities which are presented to them. Sir, in these centres or in many of these centres we have people who have been recruited sometimes as watchmen, people who were really brought on to watch on the roadside and then recruited as staff or even transferred as staff to all centres. It is not surprising, therefore, that these people are not doing the sort of jobs that Rawle Parkinson did and that Youth Town did under a former director who was very committed to the job and the youth of Barbados. I refer to Lomer Alleyne. The work which Lomer did at Youth Town is something of which we Barbadians can be truly proud, and I sincerely hope that as we move into re-establishing Youth Town that we will pay very careful attention to the staffing of not only this institution but institutions like it all around Barbados. If the others have not been able to produce the results that Youth Town did produce, let us question whether we put the appropriate calibre of staff in the other centres. This has been a trouble point with us, and for those of us in social work it has been a very serious headache.

I make a special appeal to the Government as they move into this question of re-opening Youth Town that they look very seriously at this question of the staffing of the centre and of all other centres like it. Sir, it is years ago, it is more than six, it is probably about eight years ago that the Association of Social Workers which at that point was functioning. I do not think it is very active now — made recommendations about training staff for these centres. I know that some years ago there was actually a plan and that two professors had actually sent in their resignations from the particular universities where they were serving to come to Barbados and to establish the social work training here that would give us the number of trained people who were required to work in this community. As long as we depend on sending people abroad for training, Sir, we will continue to train one person or perhaps two people per year, but this is totally inadequate for the needs of this community at this stage, and I make a very special appeal to Government at this stage to reconsider the possibility of doing adequate training for people to man these centres if we are to get the benefit of the money we have already put into the real estate.

We have given people real estate. The other failing that we have so often is expecting that we can take

somebody and give them a specialist skill in education and think that that necessarily makes them the kind of person that can use this specialist skill most effectively. Anybody only has to look around the civil service — I was in it for close on 30 years — to see the people who have all sorts of qualifications in administration who cannot see themselves as responsible people to get programmes going, but rather find it essential to throw a spanner in the works and hold up the work of people who are trying to get something done. Those people have not reached that stage of development, that personality growth which enables them to make the best use of the tools which we have put in their hand, and it is through institutions of this sort, properly handled, properly manned by people who have a concern and an interest and who know what they are doing in helping our youth, that we will be able to help the youth of Barbados to reach the stage where they can make the best use of the opportunities provided and help this country reap the benefits of the money it has already invested in real estate.

Sir, I am more than happy to see the Resolution before us today and I only appeal to Government to see how fast we can get established the sort of training institution which will allow us adequately to staff all the other institutions, not only Youth Town now coming up, but the others that have been with us for 30 years and more. Thank you Sir.

SENATOR H. R. LINTON: Mr. President, I will not detain you very long. Although I am not as young as I used to be I still feel young enough to have some kind of affinity with the youth of this country and therefore I feel compelled whenever a matter which touches and concerns the youth of this country is being discussed to get up and speak upon it in the interest of the young people for whom I am what you can call a self-appointed representative.

I was intrigued to hear Senator Marjorie Blackman state that after 20 to 25 years Government has now found it fit to acquire Youth Town. That tells me that either Senator Marjorie Blackman or someone that she knows has been agitating for some time to have the previous intransigent Government acquire Youth Town. In other words, Mr. President, we have reached a situation where not only trade unions are intransigent but previous Governments too were intransigent. You could probably call them copy cats, but that is just by the way, Mr. President. Suffice it to say, it is very good and it makes me extremely happy that it is a Government of which I form part which has seen it fit at long last to purchase Youth Town.

Youth Town, Mr. President, has a history of its own. It has been there for a long time, it arose to fill

a special need out of a special set of circumstances, it was allowed to run down and things of this sort but now it is being rescued. The act of acquiring the premises represents a microscopic portion of all that the Government has done for the youth of this country, and in saying this I speak with the Editorial of this morning's Advocate at the back of my mind which says, if I remember correctly without looking at it, that the BLP had done a lot for the nation. When one reads that Editorial, Mr. President, one does not see reflected therein the tremendous and magnificent achievements that have been brought to the youth of this country during the last four years. One does not see it in the Editorial and it is therefore incumbent upon me, lest my colleague and friend, Senator Trotman, misses it, to bring home most forcefully to the nation of Barbados the fact that the youth who it is said supported this Party in 1976 have benefited tremendously from this Government.

Witness the skills training programme which is working very successfully, witness the vast number of young people who can now find employment in places like the Parks and Beaches Commission, the Transport Board and places of this sort. I remember when I first went to the Transport Board the average age of the workers hovered around 45 to 50. The practice of the previous Government was to take established and skilled tradesmen — tailors, painters, carpenters and the like — take them out of their skills and trades and put them to work as rangers and wardens at Parks and Beaches and the young people without a skill or trade went without employment. That is what used to happen, but we have changed all of that. We have now dropped the average age of the workers at Parks and Beaches Commission to more like between 21 and 25, which means that people as young as 18 years can now find employment there. All of this added up shows that the programme pursued by this Government on behalf of the youth is exemplary, Mr. President, and consequently it gives me extremely great pleasure to be able to stand here and salute the Government on this purchase of what Senator Marjorie Blackman referred to as a piece of real estate, particularly so because it is going to redound to the benefit of the people around my age or slightly younger.

Having said that, Mr. President, I want to say that for the past 15 to 20 years the youth of St. Philip have gone without any kind of provision or benefit at all, no kind of amenities in St. Philip. As I traverse the boundaries of St. Philip, and I am speaking here today of both St. Philip North and St. Philip South, I find not one community centre, not one youth centre at all, all we have now got is a little pavilion at Chapel in St. Philip North. I restored King's Park of course, it is now a beauty to behold. In 1976 it was a dilapidated run-down place without toilets or anything at

all. It used to be shut up all day long with five wardens shut up in there guarding the inside, guarding some old wood inside there, that is what it was. The gardens were totally run-down, there was no playing area, nothing at all. It reduced the values of the properties around it, I did not have a property there then, but it certainly helped to reduce the value of my father's property, so bad a state it was in, that King's Park.

I am sure you would have seen it recently, Mr. President, and you would have been pleased of the fact that it has been restored. Even so, only one plausible community centre is now serving the whole of St. Philip, St. Philip North and South. I want all this widely reported, if CBC or the Advocate does not choose to report it I am going to write the letters in myself and let them carry it, because they pick out what they want to report when Senator Connell speaks but when other people here speak they do not see it fit to report it. I want the whole country to know that I am ringing the bell, I want some action in St. Philip South, particularly for the youth, I don't want the youth to be meeting at the snackette any more. In any event I understand that the snackette has been sold, taken over by Barclays Bank. They do not have a meeting place in Six Roads, St. Philip, they have to meet at the gas station and I do not want that. I am calling upon the Minister now, I am sorry he is not well enough to get up and speak, if Senator Blackman is the Minister concerned. He can give me the rhetoric, I can take it, but when that is finished I also want the action.

I also want the action. He can lick me, lambast me, Mr. President, as much as he wishes, but when he is finished, if he wants to take a drive with me, to St. Philip, I am willing to take him, petrol will be on me and I want him to show me where he proposes to put up the community centre and he is not going to stop at Six Cross Roads in St. Philip. A lot of houses up in Union and Ruby have a lot of young people who want some community centres as well, a playing field.

The developers in the previous Administration were allowed to put up 800 odd houses and give a playing field, as big as, the area in here, so that the young people have literally nowhere to play. O.K. there are very close to King George V Park, but in the same way that we are providing the youngsters around Tudor Street and places like that, I want to see provision made for the people at Ruby and Union.

I am going into the backyard of the incumbent representative for St. Philip South, a place called Gemswick where the only thing they have is a rubbish heap, Mr. President, I thought that when the pulverisation plant was opened, that they would have removed that rubbish dump from the backyard of the representative for St. Philip South in Gemswick. The only thing which the

young people have up there is that rubbish dump. You can smell it if you are down by Foursquare Factory Mr. President. I do not know how they live there, I want it removed.

Only today, I have written a letter to the Hon. Minister of Health asking her how soon she proposes to close down that rubbish dump in the backyard of the incumbent representative for St. Philip South. I want the people of St. Philip, in Gemswick, to breathe fresh air. I want it converted into a playing area and a community centre for the people of Gemswick, and I want them to do it like they did Lammings. We want an auditorium too, we just do not want a few houses, or a little pavilion, we do not want this little pavilion thing. We want the auditorium, we want it done like how you did Lammings in St. Joseph. I want the Hon. Minister to promise me this. I am willing to take him to St. Philip, this evening to show him these areas where he could set these things up. In due course, not right now, I am going to be asking him for a little playing field, this time, for the people at the Crane, St. Philip.

My friend and colleague who sits in the Other Place is going to ask for certain facilities for the people in the Northern part of St. Philip. I do not want to pre-empt him and it is for that reason and that reason only, that I am not going to mention places like Bayfield and Marleyvale, where I also want to see community centres. Were it not for that reason, I would have asked you, as strenuously as I do, for the people of St. Philip South, for provision for youth in St. Philip North and I hope Mr. President, when the Hon. Minister gets up and he cuts me down he tears me to bits and he tears me to pieces, that he will promise me to accompany me to St. Philip South where I can show him exactly where I want a youth town in St. Philip South and then, if my friend from the Other Place is back here, he can also show the Hon. Minister where he wants a youth town in St. Philip North.

I will take him, I will drive him. If he is too ill, he does not have to worry about that, Mr. President. When the rhetoric is finished, I want action.

Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Hatch.

SENATOR THE REV. A. HATCH: Sir, I am grateful that the last speaker who had agreed to hand the baton on to me in a short time, did not decide to make a long speech. But, the heavy politics has somewhat broken the trend of thought which I was hoping to pursue because I think that perhaps, no two ladies in the country have more right to speak on this issue, than those who grace us in the Honourable Senate and spoke this afternoon from the heart, about problems of young people. I am not implying that the

last speaker did not also speak from the heart, but not with the same experience.

I know, from some conversations with the Hon. Minister of Community Development, that he is absolutely clear, that the provision of physical facilities does not in itself, answer the problem facing youth in the island and the problem which youth presents to the society, so I do not think that the two ladies need persuade him on this. As they are both committed Christians, like myself, I do not think that we all three should not expect, that this matter can be laid at the door of Government because in the matter of the training of character, it is particularly that aspect which the two ladies dwelt upon, which I think perhaps, we might lose from the contribution of Senator Linton.

The Church ought to be pre-eminently concerned with the formation of character and therefore, with the training of young people in the Island and so, I would not like the Hon. Minister, who as I said, is well aware, to defend the Government's position, or attempt to do so. I feel that it would be better for him to make a new initiative to challenge the community and in particular, the Christian Church, so that some of our best energies in the island can be turned to what is clearly one of the most serious problems. The alienation of our young people and a response to this problem goes far beyond provision of physical facilities, even though, I hope Sir, that if St. Philip is, as neglected as, Senator Hutson Linton says that it is, that the needs of St. Philip will be taken care of, but, I believe the problems which the lady Senators identified calls for a serious and consistent tackling of that problem, until we find a solution, through some of the challenges, which undoubtedly face our society, at the moment.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Hunte.

SENATOR D. H. G. HUNTE: Mr. President, this debate started off and I was very pleased indeed, with the way that it was going. I am not going to say that Senator Linton should not have spoken, but I think that his speech in here, this evening, put the debate in entirely different perspective and I think that we should be careful where we make our political speeches. It is not every Resolution which comes before this Honourable Chamber, that is deserving of the kind of political speech which Senator Linton made this evening.

When the debate started, I myself thought that it was one of the best debates which we were having in this Honourable Chamber for some time. I would not, therefore, deal too much with Senator Linton, but I will leave him to the Hon. Minister. He anticipates that Senator Blackman is going to cut him down, I will leave him entirely to Senator Blackman to do that.

But, I would like to pick up from where Senator Marjorie Blackman left off.

There is a history behind Youth Town. A lot of people seem to believe that Youth Town was run by the Government, but Youth Town was run by a Committee which included persons like Reverend Lyder, Kathleen Gilmore, the late George Hammond, who was the headmaster of Harrison College, Clyde Gollop and people like Hilda Weekes served on the Committee at Youth Town, from time to time. Senator Marjorie Blackman made reference to Lomer Alleyne, who was the organiser of Youth Town and paid from the funds of the Committee at Youth Town. Voluntary contributions were collected from various persons and one of the persons who gave freely to Youth Town was a former American Ambassador and I refer to Ambassador Frederick Mann who gave very generously of his money to charities in this country.

Youth Town was set up in that area of Baxter's Road and Tudor Street. It was considered that you could get nothing good out of Baxter's Road, nothing good out of Tudor Street, nothing good out of the area known as Murphy's Pasture and from time to time the organizations of Youth Town were able to introduce various forms of activities.

You had woodwork classes and various other classes where you had people coming in and involving themselves in various activities voluntarily and in their spare time at Youth Town and the introducer of this Resolution is aware of what I am talking about because he served at one time when he was Secretary-Treasurer of the Barbados Youth Council and I was President and we all worked closely together in the running of Youth Town.

The history of the purchase of the property is a long one. I believe if you take the files you will find that this matter was going on for a very long time. The Methodist Church owns the property. The idea of having a necessary building in the area came for discussion and the previous Government set in motion the acquisition of an area of land adjacent to the Wesley Hall Boys' School, which had the best facilities and I believe this Senate has already approved it because we thought at one time it would be better to build the new Youth Centre on an area of the Wesley Hall Boys' School.

There is a young man who made a very valuable contribution to the development of Youth Town. I refer to Vernon Cadogan. He took over the running of Youth Town and he helped to inspire a lot of the youngsters from that area and when we recall that the Table Tennis Team, the National Table Tennis Team, at one stage was

represented almost by the members of Youth Town and whenever there was table tennis in this country it was Youth Town, Youth Town.

The idea of Youth Town, however, Mr. President, is one which I think we should try to encourage more organizations like that. As Senator Blackman said, it is the quality of the staff that is important and one of the problems which we face at the Community Centres in this country is that you had persons whom you called Welfare Assistants, some of the most difficult people to get along with and they were in charge. Now what were they in charge of? They were not in charge of organizing any problems. They were in charge of opening and closing the building. They were in charge of stopping people.

I went to Ellerton, St. George, one night and in the middle of a very important discussion we were having at Ellerton, St. George, the Welfare Assistant announced big and bold, "you have to stop talking. It is 10.00 o'clock and I have to close the building". These were some of the things you got happening.

When I say the quality of the staff, Mr. President, Youth Town had persons who organized programmes, who were able to inspire people but under the system, which we called Welfare Assistants, we tried vigorously to get other persons put into the field. We tried, Mr. President, but it is very difficult at times to be able to convince the authorities in this country that we need a different type of person to inspire persons.

Senator Blackman put forward proposals which were accepted but we are all aware of the way these things have to go. Except the Establishments Division agrees with you, that you can get the Minister of Establishments to agree with you that it is necessary to get another post created, except the Ministry of Finance agrees that they will put the money up or the money is available, you can knock your head against the wall, you cannot get anything done and I am glad that Senator Blackman has seemingly been able to motivate some of these persons in Government who have decisions to make with regards to the recruitment of staff and things of that sort in order that we could find persons in these Centres who could inspire the young people.

We do not want the kind of community centre concept that we have where you can only keep dances. We would have been glad to get away from this. Senator Marjorie Blackman can tell you and I believe that one of the reasons why she left the Service at the time was because of the disappointment which she got and I shared some of the disappointment with Senator Blackman at the time because when you tried to convince people that when people are working in the Service with youth in

this country, it is an entirely different field to the everyday Civil Service job because there are people who have to be prepared to come out at night and spend some time with the young people.

Senator Trotman can attest to this that the time that we spend with them after leaving our work places when the evenings come, travelling throughout the length and breadth of this country and trying to assist the Youth Groups in this country, trying to organize programmes. Canefield House in St. Thomas was one of the venues where we would have weekend Seminars and weekend Conferences, not only for the young people in this country, but we have the Caribbean spirit at heart and we would bring people from St. Lucia and St. Vincent to come and participate in these Seminars.

Youth Town served its purpose but the type of programming, the type of activity we had in that day, with the new concepts today, it is necessary that we move away from that type of programming and look to a more sophisticated type and this is where we must accept that changes must come in this country and I am very glad, Mr. President, as one who made a little contribution to the development as far as I could, I am very happy despite which party we have in power to see advancement made in the interest of the young people in this country.

We cannot stick a Community Centre or a Youth Centre here, there and yonder. If we want them to be successful, they have to be models established. We cannot multiply them too fast. We have to make sure that the concept is the right one and that it works first before you introduce another one, and I believe that Mr. Alleyne who is the Director of the Skills Programme and who once served as the Secretary of the Barbados Youth Council, we have one of the most dedicated young men in this country who has made a very outstanding contribution in the field. He may not have been flamboyant. He may not have caught the headlines in the Press but when it comes to devotion and dedication of duty, there is no one like Lomer Alleyne who can sit down and plan and implement and get out of young people what it was necessary to get out of them.

The work of Youth Town, Mr. President, was not easy. It was not an easy task. Because of the environment around it and because of the people we had to deal with, it was not an easy task but all of us who served at some time on the Youth Town Committee decided that we had to make a go of it.

There comes a time, Mr. President, when the people who serve are no longer able to serve for one reason or another and you cannot recruit persons overnight who are prepared and who have the necessary time to devote to this kind of activity, and so Youth Town went by the

side. If it is the desire of the Government to revive the concept of Youth Town they have my wholehearted support. The acquisition of the property is one thing but the content of the programme, the type of person that you put there to manage that Centre is what is going to make or break any new attempt you have.

In closing, I want to refer to the fact, too, that we should have some money for a Youth Centre and that we would not have to call upon the resources of this country. In 1976, after the Heads of Government Conference in Jamaica, General Gowan who was the Head of State of Nigeria donated, I think it was \$500,000 to the Government of this country. I believe it is in an account in the National Bank in the name of the young people of this country and it was in the Savings Bank, as far as I can remember and I think the present Prime Minister put it into an account in the Barbados National Bank and his expressed desire when he came out (ASIDES) I said it was put in the Savings Bank which is now the Barbados National Bank.

You can correct me if I am wrong, but I know that General Gowan made this contribution and it was outside the studios of CBC at the Pine. I think he went to a Press Conference there and there were the children from the Pine Primary School who were brought to the compound of CBC, and when he came out, in speaking to the children he turned and said he would like to make this contribution to the youth of the country.

The Wesley Hall School too got a piano, I do not think many people know this, as a result of General Gowan's visit here. As a matter of fact, he made an offer here of something like \$3,000, and I happened to have been going up to London to a conference at some time and I was told by the Headmaster of the School, Mr. Vaughn who was there at the time what kind of instrument he was looking for, and I went up to the agents for the particular type of piano in London and made the necessary arrangements, and I know the piano had come and is in service at the school. Now I say there should be some money. There seems to be an actual difference between the members on that side and myself as to where it is, but be that as it may, Mr. President, the concept of Youth Town, if we are to revive it, needs the support of everyone. I would like to see more of them over the country, but we have got to make a start at some point and then success will come; but there are many people who over the years have served that organisation well. I could not remember all the names of the people this evening, but they made their voluntary contributions, and we cannot expect any Government to do all that is necessary for this

organisation. I would appeal therefore to any other public-spirited person in this country to volunteer to come out and to render some assistance when the time comes in order that we can all make our contributions felt that the reactivation of this Youth Centre is most needed.

SENATOR THE HON. D. BLACKMAN: Mr. President, I had asked the Leader of the Senate to absolve me from the burden of speaking this afternoon, but in view of the fact that many statements and allusions were made with respect to my Ministry and myself, it is incumbent upon me to make certain responses. You will recall that in the debates of the Estimates 1979 and again this year I made two very comprehensive statements and analyses on questions relating to youth and community affairs. Judging from some of the comments that have been made here this afternoon, persons have either forgotten or never heard what was said on this occasion. I however do not intend to tire you with any rehash of such a comprehensive nature, but it is necessary for me to restate certain salient points.

Mr. President, as time goes on, the entire concept of what constitutes a youth become problematic. As Senator Linton insinuated, there are all kinds of individuals, some of them with grey hair, others with no hair who represent themselves to be youths, so that the term "youth" has achieved a certain elasticity in Barbados today and it can be stretched and twisted in accordance with the copies of the individual who uses the term. I choose to define "youths" then as persons who are young and young at heart. Even in this particular definition we will see that for categories of persons who are young and young at heart, Mr. President, there are certain unique problems. It is well known that it is an international phenomenon that unemployment rates and depression levels obtain among persons who are considered youths. It is known also that education is a matter of particular relevance to young people as well as recreational activities, and it is these areas which have been given some particular concern. However, youths are not creatures that simply appear like Martians, are reported by some persons to appear in unidentified flying objects. They are part of the human family and as such have problems in common with the rest of the human family, and because of that I categorically reject the thesis that has been propounded implicitly and explicitly here this afternoon that community centres are primarily the concern of youths. In fact this is the very antithesis of the philosophy of the policies relating to community service within the Ministry that I preside over.

When I came to the Ministry I found that community centres were in a state of decay in a real sense,

physically and morally. Some of them were blighted and had not been painted for years; others had been used as lovers' lanes, still others had been used as latrines and the purposes for which they were conceived in the 1950s had not been carried out, the purposes being that these centres would be instruments and vehicles for developing community cohesion and reinforcing the traditions of sturdy independence and self-reliance that characterise Barbadians, and it was particularly tragic that the decline and disintegration of community centres coincided with the advent of national independence. At the very moment when these centres were to be used as vehicles for promoting collective self-reliance and community cohesiveness, they could not be found, a problem exacerbated by the fact that local government had come to an end and authority institutions had been abolished and the vacuum into which properly functioning community centres might have entered had remained to the detriment of social stability led to the increase in crime, deviance and all other forms of socially and desirable conduct. So when we examined this lamentable situation in the Ministry of Community Services, we came firmly to the conclusion that it was necessary to revitalise and rehabilitate these centres to serve the ends that I have just indicated.

Much has been said about the quality of the staff in the community centres. A typical community centre has two persons who are called community aides but are in fact watchmen, a cleaner and I believe a part-time maid, and it has never been the intention so far as I can ascertain for such persons to do anything but to clean and to protect the Government property.

It was never envisaged that a community aide would be formulating programmes for people in a community in which a community centre was located. One may quarrel about having a community aide there who is no more than a watchman. I myself have had some problems with it, especially since the majority of the community aides perceive themselves as having been appointed to performing political functions in addition to being community aides.

The staffing of community centres was as a result of what is felicitously referred to in Barbados as yard fowlism Mr. President. It is a situation to be regretted, but it was never envisaged that these persons would be responsible for formulating programmes in the centres, this is the responsibility of the community development officers. Community Development Officers are assigned to a particular area in Barbados and it is their responsibility to make contact with the people of Barbados and to try as far as possible to ascertain the wishes of the people in the area on matters relating to recreation, etc. and to assist them in organising it, and it is the responsibility of a Community Development

Officer, once he has assisted a community in organising itself and carrying out its programme, to withdraw quietly from the scene and work in another community.

It has never been the concept of the Ministry of Community Development to have Community Officers flitting about the country playing God and lauding it over the people in communities and telling them what to do. You cannot get a programme of collective self-reliance that is viable if you have Community Officers who are expected to be omnipresent in these communities and to be playing nurse-maids to the residents there. Their job is to find out what the people want, to organise them within the context of national policy, and once there is a viable independent organisation, then to withdraw. A Community Development Officer's work is completed when once he has created the environment in which the people in the community can do the things themselves. Over the past two years training courses in a wide range of areas — needlecraft, cake mixing, handcraft — have taken place in the community centres. During the past two years, since I was associated with the Ministry, some 800 persons have been trained in the community centres of Barbados in this area. It is therefore totally inaccurate to suggest that no training whatsoever is taking place in these communities and there are no programmes taking place there. Mr. President, to suggest this is to refer perhaps to a situation in a bygone decade, but it is not to describe the reality of the work of community centres today.

We perceive community centres as not places where only people within a particular generation are welcome, they are not exclusively the preserve of young people, they are places where members of the entire community can meet, where generational interaction is encouraged, because we believe that a society is made up of many parts which must function harmoniously, and it is our business to ensure that there is this solid unbreakable nexus between the generations. That is what the community centres' work must be, it must be a community, and a community embraces all people of all ages and it is not an exclusive agency that caters only to the youth. That is a concept of a community centre which it was never envisaged would be implemented within the community centres in Barbados. Nearly all of them were built in the 1950s, and certainly when the community centres were constructed at that time they were not seen as places where the middle aged and the old could not come into contact with the young. So it is necessary, Mr. President, to lay to rest the separatist doctrine that community centres are only places for the young. To be sure, Mr. President, there are programmes in the community centres in which young people are exclusively concerned.

Our skills training programme is conducted now in eight community centres throughout Barbados, and it is a programme designed to give short term intensive modular training to persons between the ages of 16 and 25. This is a youth programme and the Ministry of Community Services was careful to locate these programmes in community centres because we felt that the response would be more satisfactory and that it was necessary to demonstrate that the community centres were not monuments to the folly of some short-sighted politicians but they were places which had a vital functional purpose in so far as enabling people to improve themselves is concerned.

Here, Mr. President, I must correct the statement made by Senator Hunte when he indicated that the half million dollars given to Barbados by the Nigerian Government some years ago is lying somewhere gathering dust in the Barbados National Bank. This money was a gift of the Nigerian Government to assist in youth development and it was used for precisely this purpose. The skills training programme to which I have just referred was financed by the money that was given by the Nigerian Government. It has served a very constructive purpose, it has been responsible for the training of 500 young people all of whom are in gainful employment earning an average of \$120 a week, and there are another 250 in training at the present time. It is not in the Barbados National Bank or any other Bank gathering dust, it has been used for the purpose for which it was given and that is to enhance the development of young people in this country.

An interesting point was made by Senator Enid Lynch when she stated, that in order to deal with the problems of youth and I presume she was referring to the problems of alienation among youth in Barbados, it is necessary to look at the causes and causes, by their nature, normally precede the effect in time. The only cause that I know of simultaneous with its effect, lightning, or noise of this kind, but normally — Senator Wickman tells me 'nuf' — but one would assume that there were conditions which preceded the chemical reaction and I believe that Senator Lynch is correct.

Our studies in the Ministry of Community Services have revealed serious problems within the family unit. The moralisation of Barbados has virtually destroyed the external family. This has wrought havoc with old people in this country, I do not propose to dilate upon that now, but it has led to the wholesale abandonment of old people in this country and with the abandonment of old people and the increasing phenomenon of both parents in the family working, a great deal of stress and responsibility is placed upon young children, at a very early age.

The incidents of emotional disorders in the last five years, in Barbados, among young children, children

under twelve have increased enormously, as a result of the changing family unit in Barbados. It has traumatised people at every level, it has traumatised the old, it has traumatised parents and it has traumatised the children, giving rise to qualitatively new problems within the area of Child Care with which we are now grappling. In another month or so, I hope to bring a new Child Care Bill before this Honourable Senate and a new Adoption Bill which would be pieces of Legislation which seek to deal with that particular problem, the causes of juvenile delinquency.

These pieces of Legislation, from the standpoint of adolescence are preventive, but from the standpoint of young children under the age of 15, they are corrective. This is what we are attempting to do, to eliminate the conditions which breed the kind of social pathology among young people which we are witnessing in this country.

In passing, Mr. President, Senator Linton had the temerity to suggest that none of these institutions existed in St. Philip. Indeed, he will find in St. Margaret's that there is a housing area there, in Six Cross Roads, if he would only go and look carefully, he will find a group home for children which represents a sophisticated attempt, on the part of the Child Care Department, to deal with the question of residential care for children who are abandoned, or have incompetent parents. If this is not an institution which deals with the problems of young people, I do not know what it is and since he had made, Mr. President, a very generous offer to drive me to St. Philip, I would be happy to accept the offer and to go into the housing areas at Six Cross Roads and show him where this group home for children, is located.

I do not pretend to know the boundaries of St. Philip that well because Mr. President, I cannot tell you whether the six acres of land which the Ministry of Community Services is in the process of acquiring at Bayley's is in St. Philip North, or South, I do not know whether the \$20,000.00 which is being spent to rehabilitate a building for the youth of East Point is in the North, or the South. I do not know whether the five acres of land which is being acquired at Supers, Blades Hill, is in the North, or the South, but since Senator Linton took it upon himself to talk about the whole of St. Philip, since he chose to be the surrogate of the Hon. Member for St. Philip North in the Other Place, I am at liberty to roam widely, throughout the parish of St. Philip, a parish which I do not know very well, except in relation to things which the Ministry of Community Services is doing there.

The Ministry of Community Services is staffed, Mr. President, by human beings. We do not know all, we do not hear all, nor do we see all, Mr. President, and in order

for us to deal expeditiously with problems of a regional nature, it is necessary for interested and public spirited people from these areas, to come forward and articulate the needs to the Ministry. Many of the developments which are now taking place in St. Philip are as a result of public spirited people from that area, including the representative in the Other Place coming to the Ministry of Community Services and demonstrating the need to us.

Mr. President, Senator Linton, I understand has had a long and burning interest in St. Philip South beyond the restoration of King George V Memorial Park and we would certainly have expected to hear from him, much earlier and in a much less demagogic manner, than we have heard this afternoon.

SENATOR H. R. LINTON: On a point of order, Mr. President. It is true that I have an interest and I have always been trying to look after, but I have only recently acquired a vested interest, Mr. President.

SENATOR THE HON. D. G. BLACKMAN: Mr. President, I believe that genuine concern is best to demonstrate, when we have nothing to gain, when interest is altruistic, this is the most convincing and most sincere of interests which we can think of.

That is not to say that I for a single moment doubt the sincerity of Senator Linton. Indeed, I am so convinced of his sincerity that I propose to give him all the help he needs that is within my capacity to give. Senator Linton talked about putting Community Centres in St. Philip. I believe, and I think it was Senator Hunte who made an excellent point that one does not rush blindly upon the behest of a person with a vested interest or a representative and then put some concrete and wood in a particular locality.

Community Centres are not white elephants. They are not monuments. There are there to serve certain social purposes. They are there to promote the cohesiveness of the community. They are there to promote collective self-reliance. There are there to serve as catalysts for imbuing the people within the area of their national consciousness. They are there to work on particularised problems, Mr. President, and therefore the process is one which admits to very careful study and discussion before we locate a Community Centre anywhere in Barbados and we would welcome a scientific presentation that follows the criteria that I have just enunciated from Senator Linton or anyone with vested or altruistic interest for St. Philip South and if the case is made, every effort will be made to put a Community Centre there, but he must be aware of the fact that we have a scale of priorities and that we must balance needs in one region of Barbados against needs in other regions of Barbados and the lesser needs must always give way to the greater needs, Mr. President.

Over and above this, Mr. President, I support this Resolution. I support this Resolution because it aims to establish another institution which could help our youth to look forward to improving themselves. I would, however, like to remove the mistaken notion that has crept out of the speeches made here this afternoon that this Centre represents in some way a resurrection of Youth Town. It is not contemplated that this Centre will be a replica of Youth Town, Mr. President. It is true that there are certain facets of the Parkinson model that have been referred to here this afternoon which I would like to see incorporated in this Centre's activity.

Mr. President, Parkinson, as you know, was an apostle of Booker T. Washington. Booker T. Washington in the late 19th Century and the early 20th Century was one of the great exponents of vocational education. His philosophy and arguments for the importance of vocational training is exemplified by his speech at the Atlanta Exposition in 1896. Booker T. Washington has been much maligned by historians as his speech was distorted into a claim that he was arguing that blacks should never attain to University Education.

I believe that historians within the last decade are correcting this impression about Booker T. Washington's work but the Booker T. Washington model through Parkinson served Barbados many, many years in a most beneficial manner. There used to be a time when at all of the Elementary Schools in this country there was a programme of productive and vocational training incorporated in the curriculum.

Those of us who attended Public Primary Schools in those days can no doubt recall being compelled to scrape desks, sandpaper them, to help build the desks, to plant vegetables, attended the garden and the like. I understand that in many of the Primary Schools in Barbados that this kind of training is unfortunately *passé*. We would hope that an exposure to young people of these kinds of skills as an integral part of the educational programme contemplated in this Centre would be carried out. Over and above this, the activities of the Centre are contemplated to be much more diversified. A part of the Centre will have activities that are based upon the Doors Project for youth in New York City.

We are well aware of the fact that in Barbados today many of the youth problems assume the same kind of profile as problems of youth in Metropolitan countries. There are some young people with a drug habit. There are others with crime habits and a wide spectrum of anti-social activities that 20 years ago would have been associated with Metropolitan Centres.

The Doors Project aspect of the Centre, therefore, will be designed to ensure that young people have

adequate counselling in a wide range of areas on drugs, birth control, venereal disease and the many other ills that afflict many of our young people because of their inexperience and ignorance in certain areas and I think that this is an important step especially for those young people who are characterized as urban youngsters and I therefore, Mr. President, give this Resolution my fullest support.

The question that the Senate concur in the Resolution was put to the Senate and agreed to.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (TEACHERS) (AMENDMENT) ORDER, 1980

The Seventh Order of the Day was called — to move the passing of a Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (Teachers) (Amendment) Order, 1980.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. President, to facilitate debates and indeed to channel dissentient views into such form as I may therefore find it reasonably easy to deal with, I propose to crave your indulgence on the ground that these Resolutions, numbering I believe eleven, may be dealt with in one speech by way of introduction, and then if members care to make speeches to each as it comes before us, it would be easy for me to isolate the points and to deal with them by way of reply as the points are made. In other words, since all of the Resolutions arise out of negotiations relating either to regrading or to an increase in salaries, it would seem to me better to make my points in one presentation than to fragment them.

The first two Resolutions, Sir, as you are aware, relate to regrading within the teaching service, where the point really is that for a long time Teachers' Unions have been trying to get their situation vis-a-vis other persons paid from the public purse adjusted in a way that would reflect more the responsibilities which were carried out by members of the teaching service, and as I understand it in principle, to reflect some adequate reward for a teacher who had undergone training, and therefore was at least *prima facie* qualified to enter the professional service. It has not been hard for this Government to accept that where anything can be done to encourage professionalism it should be done, and what we found therefore is that the negotiations with the teachers proceeded, they took a long time, there was hard bargaining, but in the end a result was arrived at which was satisfactory both to the Unions, and when I say both to the Unions, I should say to both the Unions because there are two Unions and to the Government.

The other aspect of the Resolutions before us relates to negotiations generally for increases to persons

paid from the public purse. This constitutes basically two types of persons, career public service officers and those who do public service as a result of political office. I can deal with the latter category first because it is easy — dispose of that category. The decision in relation to that category which, Sir, is not unionised, there is no union of Ministers, not even of Parliamentary Secretaries and least of all is there a union of members of Parliament, that category is subject to a decision by the Cabinet that since relativities were restored in 1978, these relativities should continue to apply in any future salaries legislation. I say salaries legislation because after the negotiations whether there is a settlement or not for salaries to be increased, there has to be legislation and that is what we are here about this afternoon.

I think, Sir, those of us who are aware of the views held and publicly expressed indeed by some members on the other side — I was going to say that Senator Hunte is one of the people associated with the view, and even although it is true that he is, I do not want to associate it with him now because he wants to give me trouble, but people like the hon. member for St. Michael South in the Other Place and people like myself whatever the situation, whether in public or in private, whether in Government or in Opposition, and people like Senator Hunte hold the view that there are certain clear irrefutable points relating to the fixing of parliamentary and ministerial salaries.

In the first place a decision was taken a long time ago that politics was not to be a matter of privilege and that people holding political office would need to be paid, otherwise only those who could afford to serve for free would be in public life, and that is the direct antithesis of democratic and popular politics.

In the second place, where a man is doing a job in which his function relates in some way or other to that of another, then he should be paid a sum of money relating in some way or other or in like manner to what that other person is being paid. There is no Managing Director of a company in Bridgetown who will be found to receive pay inferior to that which his divisional head for whom he is responsible will receive, and therefore it is distressing, Sir, when we know that on both sides of the fence there are persons, and indeed in the majority, by far the majority, who have long since come to the conclusion that it is unfortunate that the business of parliamentary salaries was ever allowed to become a political football. It is unfortunate, therefore, that now we are beginning to hear the kinds of noises which we have heard in the last couple of days.

I say that, Sir, because it is not my business to stand up and say that a Permanent Secretary works for \$X when you take his salary and add his housing allowance and it comes out to \$X, and therefore that a Minister ought to be paid \$X plus at least a little thumbnail

or something of the sort, because everybody already understands that point.

Today we are faced with a situation in which the Caribbean News Agency, whether through ignorance as the General Manager has explained to me or through mischief as some persons who are quite neutral in political life as far as I know have expressed the view, has produced for consumption by all and sundry a specious calculation designed to show that when the Government claims that Parliamentarians are getting an increase of the same order as other persons paid from the public purse that that is not true. Indeed, Sir, if one listened to the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation's news items this morning, or if one read page 1 of the Advocate in the last column, one would have read of the Leader of the Opposition getting an increase of 111%. That is not true, so it is not even as though the release makes sense if you examine it in partisan political terms. It just makes no sense in any terms at all, because as I understand it, what some person has done is to go back to the 1976 position, look at the report submitted by the Nicholls Commission in 1978, arrive at a set of figures which he used as a basis for a calculation, and having done so wonderfully to arrive at what persons were being paid, when of course all you had to do was to call the Cabinet Office to find out what people are paid or call the Clerk of Parliament and find out what people are paid, and having done this, he then uses a fictitious base, uses the new figures and comes up with an increase like 111% for the Leader of the Opposition, 34% for the Prime Minister and all sort of foolishness.

The Nation apparently also has some interesting calculations. The point is that I do not really know if I can accept the assurance which I was given by the General Manager of CANA that this was an exercise of ignorance, damnable though that may be, because if that is the case and it is an article in which you are talking about salaries and allowances from the public Treasury, how come when they get down to the bottom looking at the Judiciary — not that I wish to debate the salaries paid to the Judiciary — how come the writer of the article does not also go on to state that the Judiciary gets allowances too? So you understand what I am getting at, Sir. The factual base for the calculation does not exist and the facts that he seeks to put as fact and not as opinions or results of his calculations, these are untrue because he has left out material particulars.

If we were to take the point purely and simply, Sir, and I am sorry I have to say this in the presence of Senator Hunte knowing as I do that Senator Hunte understands that you have to pay Permanent Secretaries, you have to pay Assistant Secretaries, you have to pay Senior Assistant Secretaries who at present are caught in a bind and need to be regraded, and indeed the Permanent Secretaries also have a good case for that, other-

wise at the middle and upper management levels of your public service you will not be able to continue to regrade persons of calibre into your ranks, nor will you be able to provide a sufficient promotional opportunity for persons who enter down at the bottom or half way up the scale and hope to make a career out of the public service. There is absolutely no doubt about it, and if you have these people to pay and if you want a Government any way related to the capacity and talents and merit of the present Government you will have to be able to offer enough to attract men of calibre into public life.

It is no secret that the persons who constitute the present Cabinet have among them people who will be earning two and three times more outside even on increased salaries, but they are not looking to earn what they can earn outside, they are looking to earn what by any reasonable standard is a satisfactory salary level for senior management. That is all they are looking for, nothing else, but we have this nonsense produced in this morning's Press as a result of the mischief or the ignorance, or both, of CANA. I believe it is a mixture of both ignorance and mischief, the General Manager believes it is only ignorance, but that is his institution and he should know it better than I. All I must say is that it is a sorry reflection on the state of staffing of what is supposed to be the principal, indeed the only news agency within the Caribbean. I have had cause in the past to raise a few points relating to the quality of their output, but never really have I seen anything of such crass ignorance as this.

What are the facts, Sir, in relation to the level of increases in that category? I think it is only fair that when this nonsense is published that we make a statement that although the intention was that at the top there would be a 22½% just like for public servants, that when figures are rounded off instead of getting a 22½% increase the Prime Minister got 21.24% and the Governor General got 21.76% increase, far from having the 34 and the other fanciful percentages which were relayed to the public by way of CANA. The Deputy Prime Minister got 22.94%, 23.17% was what other Ministers got, Parliamentary Secretaries 23.57%. Senator whose wage level relates to what people in Z.30 got, and people in Z.30 got 38.3%, Senators must feel very badly done by because they only got 25%. The Speaker of the House got 23.18%, and these figures have been generally released today but there have been regardings in one or two instances like the Leader of the Opposition who got 25.12% whereas he might have normally been expected to get 22.5%, so that what I am getting at, Sir, is that none of the increases has been out of line with what was stated. The actual increase on a ministerial salary is 22.5%, the increase on his allowances might turn out to be a little over 22.5% and therefore in a total package you might get 23.17%.

If you examine what the Permanent Secretaries got, you will get 22.5% on the salary and I believe, Sir, that on the Housing Allowance, you would get a 50% and so on. So that, where the allowances have had to be related to specific things, there has had to be a variation, but in fact, we are careful, if we say that our increase was only going to be of a certain order, that it must be that. So that, it really distresses me Sir, to look around and see, in the newspapers this morning, that CANA has put out this story which not only is a falsehood Sir, but a gross falsehood. The only thing Sir, which I can say about it, is that I am very glad that they picked the Rt. Hon. Leader of the Opposition to stick on the 111 on Sir. I am glad it was not the hon. ministers. Serious incompetence, they just got stuck with the figure one and they just could not stop. Lucky they did not put 1111% increase on him.

But, I just wanted to deal with that aspect, Sir because that aspect, in my view, is one which I presume, as long as, you have a certain kind of person in politics, we will always get some kind of flack on, but which really is a non-point. Indeed Sir, the only other good thing about comment on Parliamentary salaries was the fact, that it enabled the Democratic Labour Party to make their one positive, political statement in about four years because everybody who has been asking what are the Democratic Labour Party promising the country to do if, by any mistake, they should make it back, they never have an answer. They are promising to slash salaries. A Government elected on the promise to slash salaries and a Government which has, in its ranks, men of integrity who tell you that I am not making Election talk, I am telling you very straight that this is a matter which belongs out of the political arena and that you should have a formula that automatically, when other people from the public purse get emoluments then, those who are politically appointed should automatically have theirs increased. That is why Sir, you would find, that in the debate yesterday, in the Other Place, the hon. member for St. Michael South voted with some consistency, with the Government Side and not with the Opposition because he is a strong advocate of that view and he is right.

Are we going to continue to have the ridiculous nonsense, where, when for example, I became an Hon. Minister, I had seriously to find out what was going to happen because I had commitments on the salary of a University Lecturer, which was not a princely salary, by any means, but I was taking home more money than I was taking home as an Hon. Minister and I had far less commitments, none of the expenses of an Hon. Minister.

The other thing which has to be looked at Sir, is this, where people have to spend 10 years to qualify for Pension, which is the same period of time, I believe, that a Public Officer spends to qualify for a Pension and he is contributing to his Pension. I would believe that you would agree with me, Sir, that unless something drastic happens, the average person who enters the Public Service, even if he does not shine, can expect to be employed in the Public Service for 10 years and can therefore, expect to qualify for a Pension after. But, in political life, even if you shine, only God knows how long you have in there and you can come out with your affairs in a total mess, have a complete relocation exercise and no money and no income to do it with.

You would find too, Sir, that it has been the experience of some persons, that it is only when you have lost office, that the creditors really want to get paid. So, in order to keep sailing, you have to make sure, that what looks like a big salary, gets the employee to ensure that you do not get into their grants. They will look at you and say that you are in the Public Service and therefore, if you extended it, over a period of time, it does not matter because there is no fear, that you are going to lose your job. These are certain facts of life Sir, which people have to look at.

But, let me look really to the main thing because frankly, I believe that time which has to be spent making that kind of point, is not time well spent. It is not a point which a modern, civilised educated, sophisticated society ought to have to be arguing. The point which I want to make Sir, relates to the actual negotiations which produced the basis on which all of this has been predicated. The Government was negotiating with a number of Unions, Sir. The teachers are represented by two Unions, the Barbados Union of Teachers and the Barbados Secondary Teachers' Union. Both of these Unions negotiated with the Government, on their regrading exercise. On that being settled, there was no doubt, as to the general acceptance of the terms, in which settlement in the wage negotiation was coming on. Therefore, while neither the Government, claimed to formal agreement, nor the teachers have raised any noise, one can understand that there was and is, consensus.

The Government also negotiated with the Police. The Police submitted their position very late. When the settlement with the N.U.P.W. was arrived at, from the last correspondence coming from the Police and which I have seen, if there were a matter of dispute at all, it was not a matter of any substance. So that, in relation to the Police, it was as close to an agreement, as really makes no difference. In addition to which Sir, since 1976, the Police have had a number of regradings and a number of beneficial things

done for the Force because we recognised that the Force needed to have a number of things done.

Now, Government also negotiated then Sir, with the National Union of Public Workers and the Barbados Workers Union. It is perhaps not generally appreciated, that there has been a certain amount of back and forth in Union membership relating to certain categories within the Public Service. It is not one of these clear cut issues where you can say that the N.U.P.W. has, among its membership, and represents therefore, A Scales to Z30, or what have you and the B.W.U., the Key Scale workers. There are Key Scale workers among the ranks of the N.U.P.W. and a lot of them. My understanding is that, in some categories, definitely and clearly, the majority.

It is not as if the BWU is irrelevant to the negotiations of the Public Service. You never say that of a Union which controls the Port but you do not negotiate with the Government over the Port. You negotiate with the Port Authority over the Port. There are certain categories that have left NUPW; gone to BWU and come back to NUPW and we do not know if they will go back again because people tend to play one Union off against the other and I am not being critical either of the Unions or the members who do that but I wish to deal with the facts of life.

The Barbados Workers' Union you will find in its final letter dated September 19, submitted proposals from A - Z and the key scale. They submitted proposals related to categories of workers that it most definitely and avowedly does not represent and at points that had already been settled by the Unions representing them. If I am challenged on the point, Sir, I would be happy to produce the evidence.

Sir, in the Union's own language, that submission relating to categories not represented by the Barbados Workers' Union was the "final proposal" coming from the Barbados Workers' Union. This is why the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance had to say in the Other Place that he had reluctantly to come to the conclusion that that Union was not seriously negotiating.

My name has been called in connection with negotiations, therefore, it is not surprising if I know a little about it. I do not know as much as I would like to but if I knew as much as I would like about it, I would be able to explain for the benefit of hon. members how it is that you can submit proposals for people you do not represent, and I am sure that that must be the most intriguing question in industrial relations today, if you are really talking about serious negotiations.

We have to remember, Sir, that when we are dealing with the Barbados Workers' Union that we are dealing with an old and established institution with a terrific and a first-class fundamental and infrastructural reputation in this country and a Union which undoubtedly has done a great deal for the stability of industrial relations in this country but no Government can take the position that because a Union has made an outstanding contribution that it is going to allow that Union to back it up against a wall and this is something, Sir, to which we must all dedicate ourselves.

In 1976, the Government, of which my friend Senator Hunte was a member, legislated a settlement and Mr. Trotman, not Senator Trotman, but Mr. Trotman, an Assistant General Secretary of the Union made a statement on a political platform "I want you to understand that what took place after very many meetings were held and the legislation was legislation for money that could not have hurt anybody."

It seems as though if you belong to a political party and you are a Trade Unionist when the time is right you jettison the interest of the workers and you come out and identify quite clearly the interest of the political party. If, therefore, we regard the Workers' Union leadership as playing politics with the 1980 negotiations, we are not doing that without cause.

Mr. President, the fact is that in the negotiations of 1980 no settlement with the Barbados Workers' Union and any employer in this country was higher than 33% until the quarry workers were able to get 35% on a very cynical argument indeed, if I may mention, because our information is that settlement at 33% was at hand when it suddenly became apparent that there were some people among the employers taking the line that if we settle for 35% we can always pass on the cost and that, if anybody has had to build a house lately, is one of the big problems, this business of inflationary costs within the construction industry.

One of the big problems right now is this, but they could have had a settlement of 33% apparently and they decided that they could pass it on so they put it to 35% and at Z-22 in the scales was the point at which the Government had indeed committed itself to the Barbados Workers' Union that they would not be paying less than 35%. That is the point in the scale where people begin to earn in excess of \$700 a month as a result of the recent salary negotiations.

The level of increases that Government had committed to itself would not be less than 33% at that level and for people, of course, earning less. The result of Government's decision in that area was that Government found itself in relation to the NUPW's proposals a little higher and a little lower there, a little lower

here and a little higher there and so it came out that with the NUPW we were able to settle because it came to a level at which Government was either \$1.00 or not more than \$6.00 for a particular point in the scale below where NUPW were or Government was \$1.00 or not more than \$10.00 above where NUPW were and for most of the points going from A-Z30 Government and NUPW were agreed. At that level there was nothing more to fight about.

Everybody by now knows, Sir, that it was a hard fought negotiation. Everybody knows, Sir, that Government had to stand firm at some points and NUPW stood firm at other points. It was insistent on other things and there had to be a meeting of the minds but then that is what you expect negotiations to be all about but what went on coming from the other Union which represents a few hundred of the public workers as opposed to something like 7,000 represented by the NUPW. What went on was a matter of grandstanding. I can only call it grandstanding, Sir, because I know no other name for it and therefore we have to explain why it was not possible to reach a decision or rather an agreement with the BWU, we have to recognise that what passes for serious negotiation certainly did not take place with that Union.

At a purely political level let me say that I am fully aware of all the comments made about next year being election year, and it being necessary therefore that Government would have to legislate a settlement. I am also fully aware and fully conscious that when you are charged with the administration of public finances you have to take the position as to how much the country can afford to pay, and this is not dissimilar to any company negotiating and having to go to its shareholders at the end of the year and say what the dividend is. They have to decide how much they can pay out in salary increases, and as long as we take the line that when there is productivity the people must share in that productivity, in the same way that when there is hardship there is no choice but that they share, the Government cannot afford to be mean or ungenerous in dealing with its employees, and I believe, Sir, that a settlement which sees some people in the teaching service whose case for regrading, whose prayer for regrading has at last been answered, getting backpay to the tune of some \$6,000 before tax of course, Mr. Waithe says he must get his piece too, but a gross figure in excess of \$6,000, at a level where as a result of the concessions made in income tax that the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance in his April Budget gave, at a level where the incidence of income tax is not all that heavy, you must recognise that there is nothing ungenerous or mean-spirited about the way in which Government approached the bargaining. The bargaining was an exercise, Sir, carried out with a skill and a tolerance and a perseverance on the part of the Chief Establishments Officer and his staff which I believe, Sir,

you have to be a public servant in order to exhibit, because the impatience of a politician would probably have broken up those negotiations a long time, especially when people come to you with proposals affecting workers they do not present.

I see Senator MacKenzie smiling. I believe I know what he would have told them if they had come into McEneaney with proposals representing the Directors, and this is very much like that. The point I am making, Sir, is this: The NUPW represents by and large the public servants in this country. There are relativities between the payments made within the various categories in the public service, and whether this Government, the last Government, the next Government, the public service, the public service union, the Barbados Workers' Union, the Police union, the teachers, the members of Parliament, or whoever you may be, whether we like it or not, if the NUPW agrees, then any agreement with any other union must fall in line, otherwise you will have come to a conclusion which would disrupt the result of the entire negotiations. You may take a man from the Key scale and pay him \$700 or take a man at Z.22 and pay him \$700, the fact that they are both getting \$700 is not incidental; it is because of the position as to where the relativities lie, and any time the largest union settles with the Government, the real hard facts of the matter is that Government and the other unions then do not have any choice. You will have to come down the line in relation to that settlement. This is the point which I think people lose sight of.

People talk, Sir, about trying to divide the unions, trying to split the unions, trying to divide and rule. How can you divide what is already divided? How can you split a situation in which the unions are involved in outright thieving of membership from one another? My colleague on my right probably knows the details of this better than anybody else because he was a former General Secretary of the NUPW. I am told that what we are talking about would have to be sub-division and not division, but Senator Trotman would be an authority, not on the subject of stealing generally, but on the subject of stealing members from the union where because he had his union membership stolen from him or because he saw people steal back his union membership for him, we know that is the position. It is no business of pretending that there is unity between the unions. It is like the long cherished notion, I can put it no higher than a notion, that the teachers should come together in one union. Sir, I have believed that for years. When I was a practising teacher I used to believe that it was possible. It was possible 20 years before that, it was possible then and it is possible ten or so years after, but it has not happened yet. I do not understand why it has not happened. I believe that it would be better for the teachers both from an industrial relations point of view and from a professional point of view to have a single union, but there are human factors

which tend to get into everything and which perhaps explain why the teachers are not a single union.

You can look at the Police and say that they do not have a union, they have an association, what they receive is comparable to Government and you can say they could work out a common negotiating position perhaps with the NUPW or somebody else, but it does not happen that way. I know that consultations took place between them and the NUPW after the settlement, and that probably accounts to some extent for the mood with which they viewed the whole thing. The position then, Sir, is this: the two largest sectors, or let us say sections, among the employees paid by Government are the public service and the teachers; there is no dispute whatever except for what dispute there appears to be with the Barbados Workers' Union, and interestingly enough at 6 o'clock on Thursday afternoon or was it Wednesday, it is when the NUPW had the general meeting, Sir, Wednesday or Thursday, at 6 o'clock that evening I am driving home and I hear the first item on the CBC News "Information Hour" and it says that the Barbados Workers' Union has rejected the Government's latest offer, and at the end of "Information Hour" it says that the NUPW has accepted Government's offer, and every news cast after that and until the next morning said that the BWU was putting new proposals to Government. The whole notion of rejection had dropped out of the language altogether, indications as to who knows what wicket he is batting on.

I regard that as very significant because in fact no experienced trade unionist, nobody as experienced and as worthy a member of the fraternity as Frank Walcott could fail to know that once his negotiating ploy had failed there was no point pretending that within the public service he had the pull that the NUPW had. What is worse, Sir, when you get a good settlement the position of your Union is enhanced and therefore if there is rivalry between the Unions the fact that the NUPW could negotiate and come out with a good settlement means that in terms of people looking to move from one to the other, they for the moment at least hold the upper hand, it is no point pretending that somebody had to sow seeds of discord. The NUPW used to negotiate for the teachers BUT left. There is always this factional interest which can cause splitting off from the Union, so if from time to time they lose a category of worker and they get it back there is nothing new about that, and no politician in this world is going to be able to determine who will go into a Union and who will come out of it.

I lived in Jamaica where I saw people whom you would normally regard as PNP people, there was a PNP Government in power, and the work place with them as members being represented by the BITU, which is the JLP Union, because when push comes to shove a man

takes decisions that will separate his politics from his trade unionism, and it is perhaps unfortunate that one or two of the Secretariat of the Barbados Workers' Union have not learnt that lesson which is known so well in the rank and file, that your politics and your trade unionism do not always mix.

I will go one step further and say that the politics of the President of the NUPW are so well known that if he was not a man of sufficient stature to separate his politics from his trade unionism there could not have been a settlement either. I believe that we have to recognise when people are people of quality and when people are embarking on a particular course which is clearly the correct course. You must not for any cheap political gain jeopardise the long term interest of the members of your Trade Union. That is the lesson which every trade unionist ought to have learnt and I am sure that any book telling you exactly how you should operate would have that in the first chapter.

I believe, Sir, that I have covered most of the ground that is relevant to these Resolutions. However, Sir, if there are points which should arise in the course of discussion I will be happy to seek to clarify any such points. The order specifically on which I am speaking is Order No. 7.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

SENATOR C. I. DEANE: Mr. President, Sir, I agree with the Hon. Leader. I consider that a good agreement has been reached, but I bewail the fact that two Unions were involved in these negotiations. There will always be trouble, there will always be one Union trying to outdo the other one and I could not agree more than I do with the Leader on that particular point.

Now, Sir, I hope what I shall have to say will not embarrass you in any way, but the Hon. Leader spoke of consistency and it is exactly that that I intend to do now, I want to be consistent. He spoke about the relativity established in the Nicholls findings. I still object to what relativity was applied in the case of the President of the Hon. Senate. I hope I do not embarrass you, but if you establish the relativity on a wrong basis everything after that is bound to be more and more wrong. That is all I have to say, Mr. President.

I agree with everything else but on this particular point I cannot. I feel it incumbent on me to persevere in my consistency on this point and question the relativity that has been applied in the case of the President of our Senate. We all know, the Island knows the integrity you bear in this Island and I will also say that all of us present know the influence that you established for propriety in all the behaviour of this

Senate and I do not think you have been treated fairly, Sir. Thank you, Sir.

Mr. PRESIDENT: I think I ought to make it clear that although I have to put these Resolutions *seriatim*, the Leader of the House gave broad outlines that involved all the matters arising from the negotiations and the resulting salary increases in different directions, so that members must not feel circumscribed because I call a particular Resolution. It will save time and it is common sense in the way that we are doing them.

The question that the Senate concur in the Resolution was put and agreed to.

Order Number Eight was called — To move the passing of the Resolution to fix the emoluments and conditions of service of Headteachers, Deputy Headteachers and the various categories of Teachers in Secondary Schools with effect from 1st April, 1979.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. President, Sir, this is the other regrading Resolution.

I move that this Resolution be concurred in.

The question that the Resolution be concurred in, was put to the Senate and agreed to.

Order Number Nine was called — To move the passing of the Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (General) Order, 1980.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. President, this is the first of the new salaries' Resolutions.

I move that this Resolution be concurred in.

The question that the Resolution be concurred in, was put to the Senate and agreed to.

Order Number 10 was called — To move the passing of the Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (Teachers) Order 1980.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. President, I move that this Resolution be now concurred in.

The question that the Resolution be concurred in, was put to the Senate and agreed to.

Order Number 11 was called — To move the passing of the Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (Part-time Officers) Order 1980.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. President, I move that this Resolution be now concurred in.

The question that the Resolution be concurred in, was put to the Senate and agreed to.

Order Number 12 was called — To move the passing of the Resolution to fix the rates of pay and conditions of service of unestablished staff and casual employees with effect from 1st April, 1980.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. President, I move that this Resolution be now concurred in.

Mr. PRESIDENT: It is proposed that the Senate concur in the Resolution to fix the rates of pay and conditions of service of unestablished staff and casual employees with effect from 1st April, 1980.... Senator Hewitt.

SENATOR K. R. HEWITT: Mr. President, having heard Senator Barrow, the thought has occurred to me, that stemming from the various salary increases, including the back pay and so on, that a broad category of people will be soon highly liquid and I was wondering whether the timing of the various saving schemes, the various investment certificates and so, which we talked about previously, whether the timing of these would be such as to soak up, as it were, some of this liquidity. There are going to be a lot of lump sum payments.

The mortgages have been made slightly tighter in recent times and it would be in the interest of the Public Servants if, in fact, there were available the schemes enunciated earlier, through which the lump sum payments may be channelled.

The final point is that, I am still sort of waiting for Government to institute some particular encouragement, or encouragement which would be specific to the Public Sector, as distinct from, the Private Sector. In the last Budget, there are one, or two areas which were specifically aimed at encouraging members of the Private Sector to invest the things dealing with an element of bonus payments which would be, if taken up in shares, tax free and so on. Such a measure, obviously, is not available to the Civil Servants whose employer does not offer shares and I feel, that it is high time, that some thought be given, whereby there would be some specific attraction, whereby the Public Servants, teachers, *et cetera* would be able to channel, or have some preference, by way of investment, more or less, to put them on par with their counterparts in the Private Sector.

I do not know if the Hon. Leader of the Senate could react to that, but if he can, I would be pretty glad to hear what he has to say on that.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Hunte.

SENATOR D. H. G. HUNTE: Mr. President, during the introduction by the Hon. Leader of the Senate, he made certain remarks which were of interest and I wonder if he could enlighten us further, when he alluded to the fact that a Union submitting proposals on behalf of persons they do not represent.

I believe that this particular Resolution may be the crux of the whole matter, in that what we call the Key Scale workers are the ones which I believe that the Workers' Union sort of have a majority of them, rather than the National Union of Public Workers.

We heard a lot of talking this evening about the backwards and forwards, the stealing of members from one Union and the other and that this rivalry might have been the reason, Mr. President, why we might not have had a settlement.

What I would like to suggest is that if there are two Unions operating in the country and the Government recognises both Unions as the bargaining bodies for the public servants, then I really wonder if the argument which the Leader of the Senate put forward, that if the Union with the largest number of members accepts the proposals, that it is bound to be forced on the other Unions. I wonder if that is really accurate because if you accept both then it is my feeling that you negotiate with both and try to reach an agreement with both but not that you reach an agreement with the one which, say, had 7,000 and have reached an agreement with that one, you say to the one that has 1,000 members, well the one with 7,000 members has accepted our proposals therefore you will have to take it whether you like it or not.

The impression I got from the statement the Prime Minister made was that the Barbados Workers' Union seemed as though it did not want to reach an agreement. He did not give the impression that if (a) accepts and (b) does not accept that then you will have to force it down the throat of (a) or (b) for that matter.

The Barbados Workers' Union, as the Minister said, Mr. President, made a significant contribution to this country. There comes a time and in 1976 the previous administration had to do it, to go to Parliament and Legislate for salaries and we were all aware that because it was 1976 what the situation was. In 1976 there were no speeches made like the one you got made by the Leader of the Senate this evening in this Chamber. When the Democratic Labour Party Government went to Parliament, what were the words used by the present Government? "Go back to the table and sit down and try and reach an agreement." That is what was said on that occasion but now that the ball is on the other foot, you are hearing that one Union has reached agreement with the Government and therefore (ASIDES)...

Mr. PRESIDENT: Order, Order. Please proceed.

SENATOR D. H. G. HUNTE: I do not understand how anybody can say that there are three Unions that have reached agreement when the Leader of the Senate distinctly said that there were no negotiations with the Teachers. After the regrading exercise they were offered the same thing as the other. (ASIDES).

Mr. PRESIDENT: Order. Give him a chance.

SENATOR D. H. G. HUNTE: The time will come when we are dealing with Parliamentary Salaries when I will take on him to a greater extent than we are dealing now but these are the workers of the country and I am going to deal with them and leave him for later on.

The point is that in 1976 when they had this wrangling we were told that we should have gone back to the negotiating table and I never believed that I would have lived long enough to see a Barbados Labour Party Administration legislating for salaries for public workers in this country. It is only one point. When it pleases this administration to refer to actions made by the previous administration because they are copying them they refer to them, Mr. President, in the best terms that you can find but when you find that what the other administration did is contrary to what they are thinking, then you find them continuing the criticism.

I know the Leader of the Senate is going to pounce on me for saying that. I know that but as far as I am concerned, Mr. President, I feel this way about the whole matter. I believe there should be a spirit of compromise and there should be a spirit of give and take in any form of discussion when you come to talk about salaries or any matter for that reason. We know that sometimes it is not possible to do so and we had occasion, when you were not President, Mr. President, to refer to a particular matter but it seems to me that the whole question of negotiation of salaries in this country has reached a level which does no good whatsoever for this country.

For one, I think that the negotiations dragged on for too long. It does not seem to me as if the proposals are looked at in the correct light in which they are submitted and then you get the Government coming from a position where you will hear there will be no increases this year. I cannot promise you anything and then from that start you end up after a period of time offering 38.3% or 22.5%.

There is a difference between the two administrations and I think Senator Trotman knows this very well. The difference, Mr. President, is that the present Prime Minister starts from no increase and then he will progressively go up whereas you will find that the former

Prime Minister would tell you, "look, the position is this. I can give you 20%, we will start from there."

The difference is, and of course we know that nobody expected that in 1980 the Civil Servants would go without an increase. Oh, no, Sir, not at all, but you start from zero saying it did not look possible that you would get anything at all and then you end up with 22.5% or 38.5% or whatever it be, but my main concern is that if you accept the two unions to negotiate with the two unions how can you tell one that if the other one with the largest numbers accepts then you have to accept. It seems to me that something is wrong.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: On a point of order, Sir. I heard the Senator earlier make the suggestion which is leading him now where he is going but indeed I never said that agreement with one must be forced on the other which, in his earlier words, is where he is going.

What I said was, let us take the facts as they are, that if the NUPW represents the bulk of the workers and there are relativities involved right across the Public Service, it means that agreement with them is going to basically determine the situation affecting the others. I can, Sir, but this would be a rather long point of order, but if he would agree, I could explain why I am saying that.

One would notice that in the regrading exercise conducted as a negotiation between the Chief Establishments Officer and the two Teachers' unions, agreement with one would raise the issues relating to the agreement that one appears to be reaching with the other and then you have somehow to try and bring the two together, so one has a direct bearing on the other.

This is the whole point I am making and where that one union is in such an overwhelming position in terms of its strength within the Public Service, it means that when you come right down to it, if you cannot get the other Union to agree you can go ahead because you have an agreement.

SENATOR D. H. G. HUNTE: Now, I am going to ask the Minister one question, Sir. There are two Unions negotiating. Let us assume that the positions of the two Unions were entirely different and that you had one Union asking for an increase of say 30% across the board and you had the other Union asking for say, 25% across the board. What would be Government's position in relation that? Are you going to tell me then that if the Government accepted — in this case the smaller Union said 30%. We are asking for 30% across the board while the other one is asking for 20% across the board that if the Government accept that 30% was reasonable that it would offer this then to the other

Union or would it then, say the other Union is only asking for 20% and we are negotiating with you on the basis of that 20%.

(Asides) I do not go into those kinds of negotiations, but you see the point I am making is that there are two unions and I cannot see — he is saying he did not say that — but what he said in effect is that if the senior union, the union with the largest numbers agree, then five in a seat, you take it or you leave it; and it seems to me that this is what was done with the Barbados Workers' Union. I am saying there should be a spirit of compromise, and it appears to me, Mr. President, that having put forward the cases that the give and take could have been allowed, and it seems to me that on the 38.3% or the 22.5% that we sought that we could have had an agreement, but we do not want a situation to develop in the country where there is some kind of unrest because the strength of the Barbados Workers' Union must still be taken into consideration. The Minister alluded to the fact that the Workers' Union has control of the Port, but what I did not understand was when he said that they negotiate with the Port Authority, but we know full well and I hope it will not reach this point, that if any industrial action is taken that the Union can call out its members in support of other members. I am hoping that we do not get this kind of situation, and therefore you will still find that the seaport can be called out in defence of the rights of other workers; and it is situations like this that I would not like to see developing in this country overnight, and that is why I say, Mr. President, that in coming to an agreement it is still my belief that a final meeting should have been held, and perhaps this is where the Leader of the Senate referred to the patience of the civil servant as against the attitude of the politician, because he did indicate that if it were not the civil service perhaps the negotiations would not have gone on as long as they had done. What I am saying is that I believe a final meeting could have been held with the Barbados Workers' Union in order that the situation could have been clarified.

Mr. President, I hate to think of what could happen if after the meeting which the Union is holding tonight, Mr. President, a decision is taken by that Union to vindicate the rights of its workers, and then the seaport is closed, and then you find that we get chaos and confusion in this country. The strength of the Barbados Workers' Union should not be underestimated. I am not suggesting for one moment that any Government should therefore look at the strength of the Union and decide to give in at all times, but we must realise that the weapons are there which could be used and that can be used effectively against any Government, against any employer in this country, and I was hoping, Mr. President, that in these discussions the Prime Minister, astute as he is would have had the final meeting with the Barbados Workers' Union. I regretted that he made the kind of statement

which he made in the House that it seemed to him that the Union was looking for something other than that which you can get over the negotiating table or something like that. It is statements like these that tend to create more problems in the country than the failure to reach an outright agreement.

I am hoping, however, that the Barbados Workers' Union Executive will tonight at its meeting allow commonsense and fair judgment to prevail, that the workers in the Union would have come to the conclusion that the percentage increases which have been offered to them, although they are not what they desired would appease them for the time being, and that we can have some kind of industrial peace in this country. I hope that in the interest of good judgment, the Trade Unionist Mr. Walcott is willing to accept the situation although we do not like the attitude in which it was done, but that it would be accepted and that the workers can continue to carry out their functions smoothly.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. President, I find this thing a bit distressing because I really thought my friend Senator Hunte was a stronger man. I really thought he would recognise that there comes a point when you have to take a decision. The distinction, Sir, is clear between this and the 1976 situation. In 1976 there was no Barbados Labour Party led Union wanting a confrontation with the Government on the eve of election. In 1976 there was not a situation where there was agreement with everybody except the union which represents the smallest amount of people within the public sector. This, Sir, is the point you have to look at. Everybody else is in agreement, but the one Union which represents a few hundred people is the one that is not in agreement. You have to call the tune at some time. You have to decide, are we going to allow a union because of its strength in other areas to hold a country up to ransom. This is what you have to ask yourself. Are we going to be held up to ransom merely because we are dealing with a union which has strength in other areas? If the Government were to give in to that kind of blackmail, we would be crawling on our knees forever and forever, and that is the point which we have to recognise.

Senator Hunte is talking about the BWU representing the Key scale workers. I do not know whether they represent the majority of the Key scale workers even. Information to me would suggest differently. But the point is that they do not represent anybody working in salary scale "A" in which the people who represent people working in that category accepted \$36,756 a year and on the 18th September the BWU was asking for \$37,500 a year for them. Or "B" where the agreement was on \$34,392 and on the 18th September after the agreement the BWU was asking for \$35,076; or "B1" where the agreement was on \$33,132 and they were asking for \$33,780; or "C" \$32,052 and they were asking for

\$32,676. In other words, what we are talking about is that after the people who represent those people had agreed, this could only be a nuisance proposal. You have to understand, Sir, that in practical politics we do not want to stand up and tell Frank Walcott and the Union that they are joking with workers' serious interests. We do not want to do that. We do not want to stand up on any political platform and ask for a confrontation with Frank Walcott, otherwise it can be put as strongly as I would really like to put it now. When the Government has agreed that the people at Z-30, the 154 of them in the public service in Z-30 would not only get the 38.3% they would go from \$363 a month to \$502 a month as opposed to the 40% which would be \$508 or the \$500 which represents 37.7% and which was really the point that the Union was making initially.

When a Government decides that nobody in the Public Service would be working for less than \$500 a month and you say all right, is \$502 reasonable, and you get an agreement with the N.U.P.W., and the Government then also gives an assurance that instead of maids remaining at the \$502 over the next two years — and this is the point which Government itself volunteered — these people would then be able to move two points up the scale so that for them the real increase next year would be 44%.

In spite of that it puts people in a better position, but what do we get after that is settled? The Union's proposal from the BWU is still 6096, which is 508. In other words, they are not even paying attention to the fact that you are getting even more really than the 38.3 which appears up front. That is what we are talking about when we say that the people do not want to settle.

When we are dealing with drivers of heavy duty equipment and supervisors within the key scale, and the government recognises that those people are being paid at a level which was not contemplated in relation to the kind of work and the kind of value of the equipment they now have to handle and so on, and the Government itself is saying that these people need to be regraded. Ask if the Barbados Workers' Union has made any representation for them as yet. It is only late down in the story you understand what happened, they do not represent them, NUPW represents most of them. We cannot waste people's time and the taxpayers' money allowing the BWU to get themselves into a position in which it can win what looks like inter-union rivalry. That is what I am talking about, Sir. When you come right down to it you have to take the view that the Union that represents the bulk of the Public Service has been negotiating seriously

and in good faith, the other one looks like it is doing something else, so the only agreement you can get out of this is the one with the NUPW. You take that and go home and tell the other people we cannot hold up all these public servants just because you are really basically refusing to negotiate.

I could quote the thing right through, Sir. It is not as though there were not negotiations, but the letter in relation to this last thing I am quoting with BWU proposals says that this is their final proposal to you, so they are also telling you there is no point sitting down talking about anything. If you cannot give us what we want it is finished. We admit it is finished, because we cannot give you what you want.

I believe I have indicated enough of the facts, I mean it would take me a whole night, and once Senator Hunte is satisfied that I have indicated enough of the facts, then I can move on, and this is why the situation is quite different from the one in which you can say go back to the bargaining table. In 1976 there was no agreement with any Union about anything, it is a totally different situation, and this is why it will not be accurate also to say that I am saying that an agreement with one therefore forces agreement with another.

Let us assume that the Barbados Workers' Union had agreed, because it was to them that the Prime Minister had given an undertaking, that people from Z.22 down would get not less than 35% increase. Let us assume they had agreed, the effect of that on the NUPW proposals would have been that the NUPW proposal would have been out of line on that point, because in grading the scales the NUPW had reached down to 33.8% at Z.22. That is what I am talking about where you are dealing with two unions for the same number of people. The result is that once you commit yourself to the 35% you have no problem because you can bring the NUPW up to 35% which at that level was more than they were asking, but you recognise that all the sailing cannot be that easy. Negotiating with more than one Union is not easy, and I know Senator Hunte knows this, and he only has to think about it, because he is an independent man, Sir, I know it, never mind the little argument and the little dally he is making now, he knows what I am talking about. Once you are negotiating with more than one Union you will have these things to try and iron out and you will have to compromise on some point or the other. The point, Sir, anyway is that I am glad that Senator Hunte is not running in this election, unless something goes wrong in the east, because he would find it difficult to run for a party that has only one plank, the slashing of salaries.

As to Senator Hewitt's point, Sir, I am not in a position to deal in any detail with the points he raised,

except to say that I understand quite clearly that if people become very liquid, and in fact the settlements represent in real terms more than the increase in the cost of living, one of the reasons for this is because the consumption tax has tended to reduce the incidence of taxation on a number of essential items, and also in real terms represents more money because of the improvement in the income tax scales. I believe that the savings bonds were being timed to pick up some of this liquidity, and if auditors were to know when certain other things were going to happen, perhaps Senator Hewitt could tell us when the Development Bank is coming on the market with another issue of bonds, because if they have it timed now I believe that this is a good time to come, because there is going to be a lot of liquidity, and the worst thing we can do to this country would be to allow all or most of it to be directed towards consumer spending, because we could easily have an import bill that is out of sight. So I quite understand his fears, and I know that the Minister of Finance is not unmindful of the problem, but I have not had the benefit of a discussion with him in which he has enunciated in any detail any proposals for absorbing some of this liquidity.

The question that the Senate concur in this Resolution was put to the Senate and agreed to.

RESOLUTION TO FIX THE EMOLUMENTS AND CONDITIONS OF SERVICE OF HEAD TEACHERS, DEPUTY HEAD TEACHERS AND THE VARIOUS CATEGORIES OF TEACHERS IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. President, I move that this Resolution be concurred in.

The question was put to the Senate and agreed to.

RESOLUTION TO FIX THE RATES OF SALARY AND ALLOWANCES APPLICABLE TO THE POST OF PERSONAL ASSISTANT TO THE PRIME MINISTER, PRESS SECRETARY AND EXECUTIVE PERSONAL SECRETARY

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. President, I move that this Resolution be concurred in.

The question was put to the Senate and agreed to.

RESOLUTION RE THE GOVERNOR-GENERAL (CONDITIONS OF SERVICE) ACT

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. President, I move that this Resolution be now concurred in.

The question that the Resolution be concurred in was put to the Senate and agreed to.

Order Number 16 was called — To move the passing of the Resolution to approve the Senate and House of Assembly (Remuneration and Allowances of Members) Order 1980.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. President, I move that this Resolution be now concurred in.

The question that the Resolution be concurred in, was put to the Senate and agreed to.

Order Number 17 was called — To move the passing of the Resolution to approve the Ministers and Parliamentary Secretaries (Remuneration and Allowances) Order 1980.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. President, I move that this Resolution be now concurred in.

The question that the Resolution be concurred in, was put to the Senate and agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. President, if you will recall, Sir, next Wednesday is when I had given some indication, that we wish to have a meeting starting at 10.00 in the morning because we have two matters on the Order Paper, which require passage by a majority of two thirds of the Honourable Members of the Senate, in order to give effect to them.

Accordingly, Sir, I move that the Senate stand adjourned until Wednesday, 1st October, 1980, at 10.00 o'clock in the morning.

The question was put and agreed to, and Mr. PRESIDENT adjourned the Senate accordingly at 7.35 p.m.