

THE SENATE DEBATES

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION 1976 – 81

THE SENATE

Wednesday, 25th March, 1981.

The Senate met in the Senate Chamber, Public Buildings, on Wednesday the 25th March, 1981, at 11.20 a.m. today.

PRESENT

His Honour Senator the Honourable Sir ARNOTT CATO, M.B., Ch.B., LL.D., (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 H. F. G. ROCHEFORD, B.A.; Senator R. L. FIELD; Senator AARON TRUSS; Senator H. R. LINTON, LL.B.; Senator K. E. HINDS; Senator Miss O. A. LYNCH, B.A., Dip. Ed.; Senator C. I. E. DEANE; Senator K. R. HEWITT, B.Sc., C.A.; Senator Mrs. E. M. LYNCH, B.A.; Senator J. D. S. MacKENZIE; Senator Miss M. I. StC. BLACKMAN; Senator J. C. W. WICKHAM; Senator N. W. BOXILL; Senator W. O. FRANKLIN; Senator the Hon. D. G. BLACKMAN, (Minister of Labour and Community Services) and Senator R. E. BRATHWAITE.

Prayers were read.

ABSENT

His Honour Senator the Rev. G. Andrew Hatch, M.A., (Deputy President).

PRESENTATION OF PAPERS

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Barrow.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. President, I have the honour to lay the following documents:

The Civil Establishment General (Amendment) Order, 1981.

Statement showing money order transactions through the Crown Agents for overseas Governments and Administrations for the months of August to December, 1980.

Statement showing sums advanced to the Postmaster General for the payment of money orders for the months of August to December, 1980.

The Defence Force Civil Jurisdiction Regulations 1981.

The Defence Force Miscellaneous Regulations, 1981.

The Barbados Defence Force Reserve Regulations, 1981.

Statement showing net Customs regulations and excise for 11 months ended 28th February, 1981.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Barrow.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. President Item Number One on the Order Paper – a Bill to provide for the grant of sums of money out of the Consolidated Fund and for the appropriation of that sum for the service of Barbados for the year ended 31st March, 1982. It is the only item which has not yet been given a First Reading in this Honourable Chamber. Therefore, although it has been given notice of, before we proceed, Sir, it has to be formally introduced in a First Reading.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Let it be recorded that this Bill has been read a first time. Call the first Order.

APPROPRIATION ACT, 1981

Order Number One was called — To move the First Reading of a Bill to provide for the grant of a sum of money out of the Consolidated Fund and for the appropriation of that sum for the service of Barbados for the year ending 31st March, 1982.

Mr. PRESIDENT: It has just had a first reading. The Honourable Minister has asked to request the suspension of the Standing Orders to deal with the Second Reading. Senator Barrow.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Sir, as is customary, we have allocated enough time to ensure that we get through consideration of the Appropriation Bill before 31st March and I am sure that Honourable Members will not be unduly perturbed, or unduly surprised that I am moving on this Side that Standing Order 45(2) be suspended to facilitate the proceedings of Order Number One in all its stages.

The question was put to the Senate and agreed to.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Barrow.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. President, I do not intend to make a long speech in moving the second reading of this Bill.

As is customary, what we have done is to divide the work between us, so as to be better able to inform this Honourable Chamber in respect of any questions, or issues that may arise in the course of the debate. Both Senator the Hon. Don Blackman and myself will of course look after the areas of our constitutional responsibilities. In addition to that, Sir, Senator the Hon. Don Blackman will respond to points raised in relation to the Ministries of the Attorney General, of Health and of Agriculture. Senator Trotman will respond in relation to the Ministries of Communications and Works, and Housing, Lands and the Environment and also the Department of Immigration. I will have, Sir, to do my best with the rest of it.

The Bill which is before us, I want to make it very clear, the Bill which is before us, Sir is accurate. I am aware that Honourable Members would have seen another Bill and therefore, might wish to question what figures are accurate. The one that was circulated this morning represents the Bill with all the changes resulting in debate in the Other Place. I have not done the mathematical calculation to see whether the figure at the bottom of page 3 \$49 575 721 is accurate, or is inaccurate as I have been advised because that is merely a carry forward column and the figures that will be important will be the figures relating to Heads in the Estimates, on the total figures.

For example, Total Capital Expenditure, \$200 955 465 that is accurate. Overall Total \$481 585 651 that is

accurate, Total Current Expenditure \$280 630 186, that is accurate. So, the important figures, Sir are accurate. I thought I would deal with that first because I am aware that there are times when these figures are questioned because a Honourable Member might pick up a Bill which is circulated before and which is not the correct version or the up-to-date version and therefore, might misinterpret the information before him.

As promised Sir, I am not going to be making any lengthy introduction to the Appropriation Bill. As you know, the purpose is to ensure that before the end of the Financial Year funds adequate for the running of the business of the country in the coming Financial Year must be voted by way of the Appropriation Bill.

Unlike the Other Place where much of the debate takes place not on the Second Reading but really in the Committee stage where the Estimates are considered in detail, this Chamber, since it is not the Chamber with the money power, if you look at the sections of the Constitution dealing with money Bills you are immediately aware of this fact, we debate the Estimates by way of Second Reading speeches on the Appropriation Bill.

The Current Expenditure as approved by the Other Place for the year 1981-82 was \$469,239,861, the Statutory Expenditure set at \$188,609,675 and the voted expenditure at \$280,630,186. Of the total amount 42%, or \$197,059,077, has been provided to pay wages and salaries of Public Service employees of \$272,180,784 for the purchase of other goods and services of a Current nature.

As usual, Sir, we can tell from the Estimates how Government is spending the public funds, where the emphases are, and as usual these Estimates will reflect that a great deal of the public funds will be spent on social services. The efforts to manage the economy, successful though they may be, would indeed be to no avail unless funds generated by these efforts were then channelled to the general good of the community, and for this reason therefore it is an established pattern for public expenditure that the fruits of this management, the fruits of good management, are passed on by way of social benefits to the population at large.

For example, if you look at the Current Expenditure, \$101,261,257 is being spent on Education alone. That is something approaching 25% of the total Current Expenditure. Health will spend some \$67 million, so that if you take Education and Health together you find more than one-third of the expenditure, at a quick glance it looks like something in the vicinity of 35 going 40%. If you take Education and Health together, you will find that over one-third of the Current Expenditure will be in these areas.

Pensions, Welfare Grants and Grants to Institutions will use up another \$54,394,674. That means that in

between those three areas we are pushing pretty close to half of the public expenditure as compared with the economic services where some \$41,638,654 is being spent. Public Order, Safety, Finance, External Affairs, indeed all the general services, \$116,797,360. Taken, Sir, as a matter of breakdown, if broken down as the most recent figures will reflect, the overall expenditure on Education, taking both the Current and the Capital Estimated Expenditure, is 20.61%. Its total expenditure of approximately \$138,129,511, 20.61% represents 18.04% of the Capital Expenditure and 21.71% of the Current. Health takes a total of 13.97%, approximately 14% I suppose, and then we will have to put the pensions and so on in order to see exactly what the social services benefit is, but as I have pointed out, using the figures rather than percentage terms and adding them up, if you add 101 odd million and 51,912, 52 million approximately, and another 54 million on social services, you are coming pretty close to half of your overall expenditure.

The Estimates have increased by a bit over \$97 million, or 26%, over the 1980-81 figure. 50% of that increase or some \$48 million is accounted for by the increase in personal emoluments. Indeed, Sir, I think reflected throughout the Estimates we will find that the salary increases of the last year are shown to have quite an effect.

Of course it makes all of us I am sure particularly happy that salary increases of that size could have been not only contemplated but paid by the Government because of the fact that the country had continued to prosper under this administration. In times of prosperity obviously, Sir, we have to ensure that there is a distribution so that all may be said as far as possible to share in it.

You will find, Sir, that the Capital Estimates will reflect a number of sizable projects. You will find \$18 million provided for the commencement of the Heywoods project, \$16 million for building and repairing primary and secondary schools, \$13.8 million for building new roads, \$10.7 million for the Bridgetown Sewage Project, \$14 million for the construction of polyclinics among other things.

As the debate proceeds later today and over the next day and possibly two, I am sure that members having gone through the Estimates with their accustomed diligence will find areas on which they wish to concentrate some attention, and I am sure that points will be raised to which at that stage we on this side, at least the three of us sitting here, will have to reply. Now for that reason, Sir, I do not at this stage intend to proceed much further.

Just let me make one point and it is this, Sir: the policies which have been followed by this Government are policies which require very careful management of economic affairs, because I believe it is true to say that

never before has a single administration attempted so much over such a short period of time, and if Sir, we wish to look at the achievement record, I think it will be found to be staggered, the fact that we could embark on legislation of as extensive and revolutionary a nature as the Tenancies legislation, at the same time completely overhaul the system of Land Law, the Law of Real Property in the country, embark significantly upon extensive reform of the criminal law. I think there are among the items on the Order Paper at least two items dealing with the reform of the criminal law. At the same time we have been embarking on that kind of programme, the activities of the Housing Corporation have been such that we have to go a long way back to the time when there was real productivity in the field of house building. In fact let me put it this way: when this Government came in I am sure that Barbadians had forgotten that 300 houses could be built in a year far less to see a programme such as the one currently embarked on in which by using both the Public Housing Corporation and also the instruments of economic policy, private and public house building has been proceeding at a pace unparalleled in the history of this country.

I could go on Sir, and speak for a long time of the level of achievement of this administration, and perhaps I would be expected to do this because this is clearly going to be the last consideration of Estimates by this Senate, whether elections come now or later, they will have to come before January next year, so you will not have another Appropriation Bill with Estimates to consider, and it might therefore be wise to document the record. I am sure that this Senate does not need to have any extensive comments in that respect, and I am also sure that if I were to go too far I might then get into the area of skills training and my colleague... (Asides) I was about to say I am sure I would not be as unfortunate as the last person in this Chamber who ventured into that area, but Senator Boxill more or less said it for me. The point is that on the overall performance of Government we have been able to deliver as we had promised in the manifesto of 1976, and in so delivering we have been able to do the kind of credit to the country that the country deserves. It is a good country, it deserves a good Government and in 1976 it got one.

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

SENATOR N. W. BOXILL: Mr. President, I assume that since this Bill comes in this form we can deal with it as a kind of omnibus Resolution and therefore I can speak on any Head.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Yes, you can roam far and wide. This is one occasion on which you can speak on almost anything.

SENATOR N. W. BOXILL: Thank you, Sir, I did not hear much of what the introducer of the Bill said, but what

I am going to say is this: I am going to make some observations, I am going to make some criticism and I am going to make some suggestions. I will start off first, with the Law Courts.

I noticed I think it was yesterday or the day before but some time recently somebody mentioned that there was a backlog in the Law Courts here in Barbados. I am throwing out this suggestion to the Minister responsible. Why can't we have the Law Courts open here in Barbados at night? This would relieve a lot of the backlog and at least would help a lot of people too, because many times people get reported or have to go to court and it means that that person has to give up a day's work or leave something off, whereas if the courts were opened from 6 p.m. until 10 o'clock or 11 o'clock at night it would facilitate quite a lot of people. (Asides) Somebody wants to know how the lawyers would get time to do something. Then the lawyers would really have to work. But I am just throwing out this as a suggestion. I do not see any reason why it cannot operate here. It has been operating in Canada, I believe it operates in England and in the United States and there is no reason why it cannot operate here, because I think it would facilitate a lot of people.

I notice in the Estimates that in a short space of time this Government is spending something like \$14 million on the Defence Force. Now I do not want anybody to put it in their heads that I am trying or that we of the Democratic Labour Party are trying to put people out of work. Far from it. We always try to get people in work, not at the expense of some people as some other people have done.

Here it is this is a Force that came into operation recently. I was trying to get some information as to how long the Barbados Police Force was up, but I know it was up for a very long time and the Barbados Police Force Estimates are only somewhere in the same region as the Defence Force. Why did we not concentrate more on upgrading our Police Force instead of spending all of this money on the Defence Force. What is the purpose of a Defence Force in Barbados?

I have said already and I will say it again. Costa Rica is a Latin American country that is sandwiched between another Latin American country and as you, know Sir, the Latin American countries change Government more often than some people change their underwear, yet still for over 35 years Costa Rica has no standing Army and Costa Rica has never been invaded and I have never heard of a coup in Costa Rica but what you find, Sir?

In 1976 as soon as the Democratic Labour Party went out of power there was an alleged plot about somebody coming to overthrow the legally constituted Government and I say the word "legally" advisably, Sir, by the people of Barbados. (ASIDES) What DLP member what? There was

no such thing as any plot or overthrow and in any case you ever heard of a one man overthrow. Have you ever heard of a one man coup.

The reason for that, Mr. President, Sir, was to soften the people in Barbados to get them scared into believing that there was an imminent danger of an invasion and let me make it quite clear here now. I will tell Sydney Burnett Alleyne, any Alleyne, whether he be Burnett or otherwise, that if he or anybody else has it in their heads that they can come here and invade Barbados to cause an upset among any legally Constituted Government, whether it is the Barbados Labour Party, the Burnham Government or any other Government, once it is a legally Constituted Government, he will have more to contend with than he can hope for because I would be one of the first persons to be out there looking to shoot down the person.

This is our country and I want anybody to understand that I will be willing to put my life on the line to defend Barbados but the whole hoax of the thing was that in order to get the Barbadian people so scared about an invasion that you had to have this thing about a Defence Force and the Defence Force that we have, Sir, in the short space of time they have more equipment than the Barbados Police Force.

I will even go further. There is not a member of the Royal Barbados Police Force who can tell me that he went and did any range practice in the last four years unless he is a member of the Rifle Association. The Policemen of Barbados are not allowed to use their guns now. Years ago I remember, although it was wrong, they used to go down on Grave's End Beach and discommode us certain times in the day practising and learning how to shoot.

If we had a proper organised Police Force we could even have what you would call a Swap Team in the Police Force but any given 12th Commandoes if they decided to invade Barbados could come and take over. All this Defence Force that we have and this \$14 million that we are spending, that \$14 million could have at least built a Children's Hospital and that is something that Barbados needs very badly. That \$14 million could be utilised to upgrade the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. When people go to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital nowadays they have to carry along their breakfast, lunch and dinner as if they are going to an excursion because it means that they are not coming out of there under 24 hours.

If you had taken that \$14 million and brought in more Doctors at the Hospital, paid more Nurses this would have alleviated a situation that is drifting into a worse and worse state day-after-day but no, what have you. You want a Defence Force and I defy anyone of the Ministers around this side or in the Lower House to tell me the amount of ammunition and the amount of equipment that the Barbados Defence Force has. Do not worry about the

ammunition because you might say that that is secret, but tell me how many vehicles do they have. They have too many vehicles.

The Police are the people who really need these vehicles. You mean that if somebody came to interfere with my property or your property, Sir, you are going to call somebody from the Defence Force? You have to call the Police and if the Police had this amount of vehicles that the Defence Force has the Police would be able to get on the scene as soon as possible. People call the Police and they turn up four hours and five hours after the crime has been perpetrated.

This is money that I feel could be better utilised for the infrastructure of Barbados but no, you have a Defence Force and you can see what has happened in Dominica with the Defence Force. You saw what happened in Guyana with the Defence Force. You saw what happened in Surinam with the Defence Force. For some reason or another these Commanders of these Defence Forces and you are looking at the African Colonies, Sir, and you would notice that most of them are trained men. They get some bright ideas in their heads that they are to take over Governments without the Ballot Box.

I am not saying that it is going to happen here but I am hoping that we realise and limit the scope of this Defence Force before we create a monster because that is going to happen. We go experimenting seeing that there are big countries doing certain things and we are experimenting and we are going to create something worst than Frankenstein if we are not very careful.

I said in my opening remarks I do not want people in the Defence Force to think that I have a grudge against them. I do not wish to put people out of work but I feel that these people could have been better utilised in the Police Services. I am not happy. Fourteen million dollars out of a total of \$481 million, I think it is, for just a small segment of the community is a lot of money. I am sure we could have built a Children's Hospital for maybe somewhere in the region of that \$14 million. We need a Children's Hospital in Barbados very badly. Take the children from among the grown ups.

Here we see motor cycles, jeeps, all sorts of equipment being used by the Defence Force and further, when you have finished spending this amount of money, the Americans have spent millions of dollars on the B52 Bomber. They have spent millions of dollars on the Jupiter, the IBA, you name it and what have you.

All these missiles now have become obsolete, but what are you going to do when you get this obsolescence? Just now, these new machine guns and so forth are going to become obsolete. Somebody is going to come up with a new, modern weapon so you have to discard the old weapon. What are you going to do with this old iron? If

you build a hospital for children, if you employ more doctors at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, if you pay the nurses a better wage, that is a part of your infrastructure that you are getting back something for. If that lasts for 50 years, you are not going to say that it is obsolete because it is still serving the purpose. A modern weapon is not going to be any use after well, I should not say it is not going to be any use because you can still shoot, it is going to be no use to the Defence Force. This is money that a small community like Barbados cannot afford. I think I have dealt enough with the Defence Force, unless somebody gets the wrong idea.

I was told that the security guards come under the Defence Force and there is a question which I really want to ask. What is the purpose of the security guards? Going right back at the hospital, I was there a few nights ago and there was a man who was a perfect nuisance in the hospital. What made it even worse is that the man was not even a Barbadian. This is no reflection on anybody, but I do not see why he should come here to disturb Barbadians that way. The security guards who were at the hospital not one of them said one word to the man. Then another man came who tried to outdo the first. The security guards who were walking up and down not one of them said anything. I do not understand what is the reason for security guards at these places.

You go at the Ministerial building and unless you are somebody looking like Senator Fields, Senator Truss, Senator MacKenzie, or Senator Hatch, you are being stopped to know where you are going, who you want and all the rest of it, but if you look like those people, you walk in. So, what is the purpose of having these people, these people need training. I am serious about what I am saying here. If you are looking like me, or you Mr. President, and if they do not recognise you, they stop you and you have to tell them what you want, but if you look like these people, you can walk in. There are not a lot of black arsonists, or black commanders that I know about here. The reason why I am raising these points is because I was incensed at the behaviour at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital on the night on which I am speaking about. When you question these people, they say that is not what they are there for. I thought that these people were there to make sure that Law and Order was obtained and maintained at the hospital, or the places where they work, but it does not seem so, it seems that their main object is to be at the department and from there to receiving their money.

This is not a matter of running down the security guards, but this is a matter of speaking to who is in charge of the security guards, something must be done about this because if you go to the hospital and molest people in this kind of way, it got to the point Sir where I had to speak to the man, I could not bear it any longer. Then, next thing you would have heard is that I got myself involved and you will hear how much vagabond I am because being small,

you know that somebody is going to try to hit me and I am not going to take it, if Mohammed Ali hits me he will get hit back. I am not going to hit anybody first, but this is the sort of thing that we should be trying to avoid. These people are being paid, I thought they were being paid to do that job, but apparently they are not. I am saying and throwing out this to the Honourable Minister who will be responsible for the reply that something should be done to protect people at places like the hospital and this building, we do not have any security. If you have security guards, people should not be allowed to walk in willy nilly because they are of a certain hue and other people getting stopped because they are of a different hue.

Now Sir back on the security of the country. As you know Sir, the talk of the town today and yesterday and the day before is Ronald Biggs. Here it is we are spending an enormous amount of money on this so-called Defence. We are even going so far of getting a mini battle ship. I have not noticed anything in the Estimates for the provision of this battle ship, but I want to know if the people who are responsible for this are aware that keeping a ship is not like keeping a land ship, where people can go home and eat. When you have a ship you have to start providing the facilities, you have to have a captain so this means now that you are going to bring down an Englishman because nobody in the West Indies at least in Barbados is qualified to be a sea-going captain. So then, you have to get a first mate, then you have to have a second mate, then you have to have a third mate, then, you have to have a mid shipman, then you have to have three petty officers, then, you have to get deck crew, then you have to have stewards, you have not gone down below the deck yet, you know, then you have to get a Chief Engineer, second engineer, third engineer, fourth engineer, then you have to have the crews, the stokers and fireman. How are you going to manage this? When a ship is out to sea, there is no canteen out there that you can stop and buy a bread and fish and a coke, so you have to be providing for these people. Where there is no vision the people must suffer and perish.

My view is this, I have said it before and I will say it again the BLP came in in 1976 and in order to discredit the DLP, they sold out the North Point. Now, if we had kept the North Point, we would have been able to have it now, to send the North Point to places like Venezuela, Columbia, Costa Rica, Cuba and bring cement into this country at a subsidised cost. Today, a bag of cement costs over \$11. You will also be finding employment for people because you will have to have the ship manned, that will be worthwhile to the economy of the country. They are so accustomed to the landship thing, that they have gone now for a battle ship but, when you have a battle ship you have to have ammunition on it.

They went outside yesterday, or day before and towed a ship inside here, which in my view is piracy on the high seas. Now you are going in for piracy. Here is it, there

was a big rumour that Ronald Biggs was kidnapped not that Ronald Biggs voluntarily left Brazil he was kidnapped. What is strikingly strange Mr. President is that he had been taken aboard the ship, but at the precise moment that that ship is going to flounder outside of Barbados' waters, this ship is being towed inside here....

But, what is strikingly strange is this on the 6th October, 1976, a CUBANA airline went down outside of Barbados and the Government said that they could not do anything about it because it is out of their territorial waters. But, here it is a ship about 18 miles outside and you are going to tow it inside here. You mean you have gone in for piracy now. Somebody is saying about jurisdictions should be increased, you are not poaching a ship that is passing, can pass, you are not fishing, you are not poaching. You are a pirate.

Mr. PRESIDENT: I think that you better address the Chair.

SENATOR N. W. BOXILL: Mr. President, I beg to withdraw that remark. No way could I refer to you as a pirate, I was using the word "you" in the plural sense. No right did we have to bring that ship in here, but do you know why we are going to get away with it? Because they claim that Biggs is an escaped fugitive, but I am saying this. My view is this, if the Barbados Government has the temerity to extradite Ronald Biggs, they have the same right to bring back Hyacinth Goring. I am going to say it again. If the Barbados Government has the right to extradite Ronald Biggs to England, they have the same right to have Hyacinth Goring extradited to Barbados.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Just a minute. I am a little doubtful in my mind as to whether these *sub judice* matters like this one ought to get so much discussion at this stage. As far as I understand it, this matter is still *sub judice* and I think I would prefer hon. members to give it a wide berth.

SENATOR N. W. BOXILL: All right, Sir, I will accept that, but we are not sure it is Ronald Biggs we have. Everybody is talking about Ronald Biggs but nobody is sure that the man we have is Ronald Biggs, so it cannot be *sub judice*.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Just a minute. The Leader tells me that if it is not before the court, perhaps it is not and it cannot be deemed to be *sub judice*. I still think that I would like members to be a bit cautious.

SENATOR N. W. BOXILL: All right, Sir. I am willing to abide by your ruling, but this is what I would say.

Mr. PRESIDENT: I am not ruling that it is *sub judice*. I am advised that it is not before the court as far as is known.

SENATOR N. W. BOXILL: I know. We are not even sure it is he, Sir.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Yes, but let us be a little bit temperate in our discussion.

SENATOR N. W. BOXILL: All right, Sir. I was really dealing not with the man in particular, but I was dealing with the jurisdiction. Here it is you were saying that just less than five miles outside of St. James you had no territorial jurisdiction, but 18 miles east of you you have territorial jurisdiction. I will not call the gentleman's name any more, Sir.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Just remember I am not stopping you.

SENATOR N. W. BOXILL: No, Sir, I did not think you were. I appreciate all you are saying.

On the matter of Education, we know, Sir, that in July you are planning to have — when I say you, Sir, I am not dealing with you as a person, when I say you I am dealing with the whole community as you, or we, then — we are planning to have CARIFESTA here which in my view is really going to turn out to be CARIFIASCO, but here it is again we are spending an enormous amount of money for this sort of entertainment, which is good if we can afford it, but we really cannot afford it, yet still there are schools which are going today without chalk, ink, pens and all sorts of paraphernalia.

Do not let us, as a friend of mine used to say, be working for mauby money and trying to drink champagne, it is not going to work. We are a poor country. It is true that we might be living a little better than some of the other poor countries, but we are still poor. It is just like me telling somebody that I am taller than they, but I am still short. We are a poor country and we cannot afford it. Here it is you are spending this amount of money in something that was never properly planned for. This would need years of planning, you cannot just decide something in two year and expect to come and foist this on the people. It is going to be a fiasco in more ways than one.

It was all right for Cuba to do this kind of thing, Cuba is spending Russia's money. It was all right for Guyana to do it, Guyana just got \$100 million loan from the World Bank and all the rest of it. We cannot afford to take up this sort of money and spend at this stage. I am not saying that later on if we were in a better position that it would not be a good idea, but here it is you are neglecting the schools with the necessary implements that the children should have, but you are going about now with a big, big fiasco.

The next thing about the schools, the Minister of Finance last year, or the year before, came up with what he thought was this big, bright idea about abolishing the

10 cents that the children were paying, and I heard last week somebody was saying that we said it was free school meals but we are still charging the children 10 cents. This was said down in the other House, but let me tell you this. You said you were going to give the children free uniforms, which I thought was vote catching like all the other things, and now it turns out that you are not giving the children free uniforms like you said, you are only giving those children who are going to the secondary schools. You never said that in your Manifesto. You also said in your Manifesto that you were going to pay the light and water rates for poor people.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Try and address the Chair, Senator Boxill. This "you" business is talking across to members on the other side.

SENATOR N. W. BOXILL: I said, Sir, I was using "you" in the plural sense. "You" is not really singular.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Address the Chair.

SENATOR N. W. BOXILL: They. They said that they would have paid the water rates and electricity bills for pensioners, but I know of a case where a man who has two houses rented out and two big sons working who was sent to have his water rates paid too, and I am sure that at one of the sittings we had here when Senator Franklin mentioned this he was castigated, and words to the effect were used that only a village idiot would have thought that somebody was going to pay light and water bills for people who have young strong people working, but I know this happened. (ASIDE). For what? The Minister knows the name better than me, the Minister is the person who sent them, I hear. I did not say he did, I said I heard so, and some is true.

The next thing I would like to ask now I am on Education, Sir, I have asked this question before and I will ask it again. I am no educationist, but I live in this community. I have noticed that we for some reason or other have this magic touch about the 11 plus. What is so magical about when you reach 11 years? I am wondering, since the Minister of Education had said they would bring back in school leavers and so on up to age 14 or 16 or something like this, I am wondering why this cannot be removed from 11 plus to a later age when children become more mature. When children are at 11, the strain is not really on the child as much as it is on the parent, because all of us want to know how well the child has done because we want to get the child into one of the better schools.

What I would also like to say is this, now that we are on Education, that the time has come where all the so called comprehensive schools need to be upgraded, and if we can manage this, I think then there would be no need for people to be fighting and clamouring to get into Harrison College or Lodge School, or those schools. If we could get these schools upgraded, then we would be doing

something. You see, why Harrison College would always win all the scholarships, and you notice the girls at Queen's College get scholarships as well, and occasionally Lodge, the reason is simple. They must get the scholarships because they get the cream of the students. They get the better teachers and they get the better children.

The children who get 98%, 99% and 100% in their passes plan to go there; but if we could upgrade all the comprehensive schools where people would not look down their noses because they have to go to Ellerslie or to St. George School or one of the other comprehensive schools, if these schools can come up to the standard by getting the proper teachers, then you would not have this problem. I know that it will take money and it will take time, but here is where I feel we need to concentrate more rather than on kidnapping people and arresting them. You must get proper teachers and have them trained.

I remember some years ago when we started to talk about establishing the Community College we were fought tooth and nail against having it because it suited certain other people's purposes, but now we have lived to see what a useful purpose it is serving. These are things we need to concentrate on because they are going to affect our children. If you only have certain school places where people do not want to send their children because they feel that if they go there they cannot win a Barbados scholarship, you are going to create a situation where you are going to widen the gap again as it was in the twenties, thirties and forties. I am therefore appealing to the Minister responsible for Education to have a serious look at trying to get more graduate teachers into these comprehensive schools which would mean most likely that you would have to upgrade the salaries. If a graduate teacher is even getting more than the head of the school or as much as the head of the school, I do not see anything wrong with that if he is a graduate teacher and he is contributing something to the school.

We need to have these people and we need to have science forms at these schools now so that this sort of stigma would be removed completely from these comprehensive schools. I am sorry to have to keep using the word "comprehensive", but I think the time has come when we have to start upgrading them. Do not tell me that when we were in power we did not do it. You are there now, do it. When we get back in we will do it. (SENATOR O'B. TROTMAN: When is that?) Very shortly.

Sir, another thing is this: still on the schools, the school meals programme has really gone down. There is nobody who can deny that. It has reached a stage now where it is a waste of time and money and unless you are prepared to upgrade it the children are not using it because it is not good, and if we continue to feed our young generation on this sort of food, we are going to

have a whole army of people with ulcerated stomachs, and an ulcerated stomach is not anything nice for anybody to have. Therefore I am saying that for the sake of saving a few paltry dollars there when you are throwing it away somewhere else, upgrade the school meals service once more to what it was or make it better, if it is possible. Right now it is deplorable. I do not let my children eat it, people whom I know are working in the school meals service tell me they do not let their children eat it, and they work with it. We cannot afford to waste food and money because our economy is a small one. I notice that notes are being taken, so do not get up and give me any fancy talk about what didn't happen. I am speaking positively and I want some positive results. I want to know that the school meals are upgraded back to what it was before or made even better.

Now, Sir, I noticed in the Lower Chamber things were filibustered until they had to skip two Heads, and two very important Heads. These are two Heads that deal with the infrastructure of the country, Communications and Works, and Agriculture. It is true that the Minister of Communications and Works has proven beyond any shadow of doubt that he is one of the most perfect persons in this society. He is a perfect failure. When he first got into the House of Assembly and you heard this man talking on agriculture, you would say here is a Solomon who really can help this country push forward agriculture. So what happened? The Government won, he was made Minister of Agriculture. He made a complete failure of that and had to be shifted. He was sent to Communications and Works. He is making a better failure of that or worse if it is possible. Only a few days ago, those of you who will remember, and I thought it was rather unfortunate, one of his own colleagues lambasted him on his inefficiency in running the Ministry of Transport; but not only has he fallen down on transport, he has fallen down on roads. There have never been so many potholes in the island of Barbados, even in the days before we started to have tar roads, when they used to roll them out and marl them, and sometimes the rain would fall and wash out the marl, but they never went so bad as they are today, and I can say that I doubt for the time he was Minister of Communications and Works he has built five miles of new road. Do not tell me about the road he is building down by Holborn because we started that, so don't come up with that. There is not a good road and what is shocking is that you can go into St. Thomas, my constituency, and although the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, the man that has the purse strings represents that constituency — I do not know if you can say he is representing it, he is supposed to be a representative of that parish — the roads are in a deplorable state. But not only there. Go anywhere in Barbados, go into St. Lucy, go into St. John, and right here in Bridgetown. Well I will not deal with Bridgetown because you can always say that the sewage project is digging up the roads; but let us go on the periphery of

Bridgetown, say Beckles Road. The other day my car dropped into a hole and I thought I was going down to Japan, it went so far down. The roads are in a deplorable state. The other day all they were doing was coming up in Brittons Hill, going into Fordes Road and dropping some marl in a hole, and in two twos, the wheels of the vehicles pulled the marl out and the hole was back there.

There is a hole in the road just after you pass Hazlewood on Collymore Rock that is a perpetual hole. They would come and drop marl in it today, the wheels of the vehicles would pull it out and they would go back in the evening and drop some more marl.

It is a perpetual hole so sealing this hole will cause somebody not to get into serious accident. Well, recently now they have managed to put a little tar in it so it is still a depression but it is not as bad as it was. Nothing has been done and when he got castigated on the Floor of the House of Assembly, he turned to his colleague and he said, "You have the bright ideas, why do you not come and run the Ministry?" He has got it so far down that I do not know if anybody will be able to get it back where it was.

Transport in Barbados is shocking. Had not for the mini-buses I do not know how people would get to and from work and anybody who doubts me, go into the Bus Stand this evening. It is pathetic to see how people have to fight to get on board these mini-buses and the other buses. There is no system whatsoever. Maybe, I do not know, maybe they might have other reasons for having the Transport system in the bad state that it is in. I say no more on that but the members of the Chamber will understand what I am talking about.

It is ridiculous to think that you took over the buses from the free enterprise concessionaires and you are not doing as good a job as these people have been doing although you are supposed to have a greater rolling stock than they had. The whole Transport system wants organising. Sometimes you stand up on the road to get a bus then when you manage to see a bus coming you see three or four buses one behind each other. The buses should be allowed to run in say five or ten minutes intervals so that if you missed one you know that in five or ten minutes another one is coming. Nothing of the sort happens. You wait a long time for one and then when you see one there are three or four coming. It is a waste of gasoline and it is a waste of taxpayers money. Well you see who is running it so you will understand.

Going back to Agriculture, Sir. I remember that in 1976 we were being criticised. When I say we, I am talking about the members of the Democratic Labour Party and the Government of the Democratic Labour Party, were being criticised claiming that people were being taken on on jobs in order to solicit votes. Right

now down at Haggatts, Bullens, Jerusalem and all of these — I have heard at the Stations have closed down — but down in St. Andrew I have noticed that an enormous amount of people, coming to the end of the Financial Year, have been taken on.

I said Bullens, Jerusalem and Sayes Court have been closed or about to be closed. I know you would not understand but I know. They have been closed or are about to be closed but I have noticed that down in St. Andrew the taxpayers money is being used to solicit votes. This is the same thing that they were criticising, and unjustly, they were criticising the Democratic Labour Party power. They said that the DLP had picked on and in the Parks and Beaches Commission we had picked on a lot of people. More than 248 people are now in St. Andrew and I am sure that the same 248 people that were laid off since you got back in are being picked back on now in the Parks and Beaches Commission too. (ASIDES)

The hon. member has the rudeness to tell me about no victimisation unless he does not understand what is meant by the word victimisation. You are employing people at the expense of other people's job. You do not understand what is meant by victimisation then. You are getting mixed up. I know where people were employed and dismissed willy-nilly and other people were taken because they were shouting for the present Government in power. Do you want to tell me that that was not victimisation? Even in top Civil Service jobs, men were shifted around because of their association with other people so it means that when one Government comes into power you drop all of your friends that you knew for years. You cannot say this of the Democratic Labour Party.

When we were in power we ran the country to employ people. When I was Minister of Housing and I can mention this here now. When I was Minister of Housing you will notice that they had a Commission of Enquiry on the running of Housing Authority and I am sure that a lot of people did not know that I was Minister of Housing longer than Mr. Edwards but if you read the Report the only thing on Page 4 of the Report where mention was made of my name was that I was Minister of Housing during that period that I took over from Mr. Edwards and Mr. Greaves took over from me because I have always tried to maintain a certain amount of honesty and dignity in running my Ministry.

I never got myself involved like I have seen certain people are prepared to do right now for the sake of a vote. I tried to help as many people as I possibly could but I never interfered with the running of the Ministry, at least with the running of the Housing Authority part of it. That was for the Board. They set up a Board. They had a Chairman and I let those people run it. If complaints came to me that things were not going as good, well then I came in but I never stood in my office

and dictated who should get houses from who should not get houses and I would say this.

It used to make me kind of sick to see people coming day-after-day to my Office asking me to try and help them with a house. You would send them down to the Officer in charge and tell him to try and see if he could do anything for that person. They had in an application such and such a time, see what you can do to help this person and up to this day I do not think some of those people got houses. Maybe it might have been my fault for not being more demanding but I thought that the civil servants were technocrats and they had a job to do. I did not want to interfere with them in the day-to-day operations of running the Department therefore, I left it up to them but thank God I can say boldly, and I have said it on the Floor of this Chamber already, I doubt there is anybody in this Chamber, outside or inside of it that is more honest than me. They may be honest but not more but there is no one who can say that when I was the Minister they got me involved in any of these things.

Now, Sir, my subject is going to be the Prisons, straight from Housing to Prisons.

I was following the debates and the Estimates and I do not remember if prisons were dealt with. They might have been, I am not too sure, but this is what I am going to say, there is a report that came out here recently on the penal reform of this country. I have my own views about penal reforms. I agree with some of the things which I saw when I glanced over the report that people under a certain age should not be sent to prison, but I go further. I have said before and I would say it again, Dodds has served no useful purpose in this Community and Dodds should completely be got rid of.

I will tell you the reason why I say this. The reason why I say that Dodds should be got rid of is that Dodds is a house for stigmatising those black offenders. Do not tell me that white people's children do not commit offences too. I am not prejudiced, I am not dealing with anything because of colour, but I am factual, I am pragmatic, I have never seen a white boy in Dodds and I am going to tell you something, apart from the judges that they got yesterday and day before, they do not have many white people about here either. But that being as it may Sir, do not tell me that white people's children do not commit offences. I remember years ago, a long time ago, a case where two youngsters, whose father was a doctor operated on a coachman, you know they were not even flogged.

But, the point I am making is this, when we have young offenders sometimes, well, not today, but years ago people used to be sent to Dodds for a mango. I remember that a fellow went to Dodds for a penny in fish hooks. But that youngster comes out of Dodds with

a stigma because no matter how hard that youngster tries to play fair somebody is going to remind him that he was a Dodds boy. Now, my view about young offenders is this. Most boys are bad when they are between the ages of say 10 to 17. They do a lot of stupid things, but after they pass a certain age, they start to level off. My view is this, you have the Defence Force, all young offenders should be sent to the Defence Force. No matter how much I talk about it, you are not going to get rid of it. All young offenders should be sent to the Defence Force. I said it would be creating a monster if you do not handle it correctly. The other day a man had a chicken which grew bigger than a turkey because he was experimenting. You can control it.

What I am saying is that the young offenders should be sent to the Army with a good Regimental Sergeant Major to teach them discipline. If after six months, in the Army these youngsters do not show improvement, then you are going to have to do something else because to me they do not intend to change. If you send them to Dodds, then they feel that they are ostracised, they feel that they are not wanted and they come out feeling that the society is against them, whilst if you send them to the Army, there is no stigma about being an army boy, there is no stigma to being an army girl, but if you send them up there, I do not care how good the attendant appears to be, there is still going to be a difference and we are not honest with ourselves.

You look at the majority of criminals today and I will bet you that the majority of them spent some of their life in Dodds, where if you had taken these youngsters and guided them into the volunteer Force, or into the Army for special training, these children will automatically change, and if they do not change, do not waste your time and the taxpayers' money because they are going to be criminals, but I would bet you that you would get a 99% improvement. But, here it is, what hurts me most is when I look around this Honourable Chamber and I look around the Honourable Chamber below, we are the Legislators and we are perpetrating something that should be outdated years ago. Do you know why, because we want to please a certain segment in the society and if a segment of the society says well, send them up there they will make better boys of them. If any one of these Dodd's boys comes tomorrow and starts going around their daughter, it is alright, they will say, "Frankie is a nice little boy." But somebody is going to come and say, "Frankie had a little thing up there you know." and he cannot come around her any more. You are trying to fool people that you want to rehabilitate these people back into the mainstream of the society; you want him to marry my daughter, but you do not want him to marry yours.

The time has come when we have to start being bold. We cannot continue to wait on Great Britain, or the

United States say, "Well, we are going to do something and then we do it." There is absolutely nothing wrong in the abolition of Dodds. What are you keeping it for, to put a stigma on poor, black children? We could find something else to do with that, we can save that money too. I am not asking anybody to agree with me, these are my views. But I am hoping that when we get back the Government that we start taking these bold steps. Well, it depends on how long is too long. I am not satisfied that I am getting my money's worth in the upkeep of Dodds and I think the time has come when it should be closed down.

There are certain people who are earmarked for these places and there are certain people who will get away with it and therefore we will have a society with the haves and the have nots. Take a bold step, put this to the Honourable Minister. Do not come up with this fancy thing. If a boy goes to Dodds he is going to be a Dodds' boy. If a boy goes to Dodds you are not going to say that he is a Harrisonian, you are going to say that he is a Dodds' boy and remind him of this stigma, but he is not going to get into an argument if you told him that he is an Army boy. I agree with Professor Jones I think it is on that score that if a man has committed an offence and it is not too serious an offence, make him go and do some work for the society. But, putting him away, when he has committed a minor offence in our society — when a criminal comes in your house at night, he is armed with a knife, or a gun and he is not coming in there to suck cane.

We should not create a society among ourselves because we want to please a few people out there who do not have the guts nor the conviction to tell the cook what to cook. I will die and say that I believe that Dodds should be abolished, send the young offenders to the Regiment, then, after six months, if that fellow does not make an improvement, you know that he is going to be a hardened criminal and we have to try to avoid creating more monsters in our society.

Now, Sir, some people will stoop to the lowest ebb to achieve an end. Some people would eat a dead rat with knife and fork to impress on others that eating dead rats is something nice to do. Recently there was a report about an intended gaolbreak. I have been told only this morning that two Warders have been suspended. The plot was — and I would like the Minister to answer if this is true when he is replying — but the plot was that someone, a Warder, had placed guns, or a gun, knives and a cutlass in the reaches of two known criminals, bad ones too, "Buddy" Brathwaite and Mark Young. Someone informed the police of this plot, because these people were to break out of prison. Can you imagine what would happen in this society if people like these people got out on this society with a gun or a cutlass? A lot of heads would roll, and they would not be rolling on top any bodies, they would be rolling in the gutter.

Anyhow, this plot was foiled, as I am told, by the alertness of the police, but what is annoying about the whole thing, Sir, is that the whole plot was engineered around the plans that it was to be said that this was a DLP plot. Two members of the Democratic Labour Party's names were called saying that they were involved in it. Fortunately for us I heard that the Prime got up and denied that the Democratic Labour Party members had anything or knew anything at all about this plot. (SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: He would do that, he is an honest man). So was Pilate an honest man, but he did not say that the people should have let Christ go free. He washed his hands, because he knew what would have happened. We are all honest men. But this is the sort of society that we are creating here. For the sake of making yourself look good and the other fellow look bad, you are going to stoop to the lowest ebb, because you cannot get any lower than that, to turn loose people like these people on the community on the grounds that we of the Democratic Labour Party would have been involved in something like this. How low can some people get? (ASIDES) I say no more. You all belong to that party, check it out.

I will say that when this society has reached that stage....

SENATOR THE HON. D. G. BLACKMAN: On a point of elucidation, Mr. President. In order to give a satisfactory reply to the question posed, it is necessary for me to determine whether the Hon. Senator is saying that the Government, or members of the Government other than the Prime Minister are responsible for saying that DLP members are implicated in the alleged plot.

Mr. PRESIDENT: I think if the Hon. Senator has not quite followed what you have said, would you like to repeat what you said in your last few sentences?

SENATOR N. W. BOXILL: What part of it? If he wants me to repeat that a few days ago a gun.....

SENATOR THE HON. D. G. BLACKMAN: Excuse me. In order to obviate the necessity for any prolixity on the part of the hon. member, I shall simply repeat the question. Is the Hon. Senator saying that members of the Government other than the Prime Minister are responsible for imputing to members of the DLP responsibility for the alleged plot? (ASIDES).

SENATOR N. W. BOXILL: Yes or no? Is this a court? What is this yes or no talk?

Mr. PRESIDENT: Order. Please address the Chair.

SENATOR N. W. BOXILL: I am sorry, Sir.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Are you in a position to answer the question that was asked?

SENATOR N. W. BOXILL: Yes, Mr. President, I am in a position to answer it but I am not answering it, I do not have to answer him. In a legal court if you were a lawyer a Judge could tell me I have to answer, but he cannot ask me and tell me I have to answer. No. I refuse to answer, and he knows as well as I do what I am talking is true.

Mr. PRESIDENT: That may very well be so. Just a minute, Senator Boxill. We have certain Standing Orders against making imputations of a dishonest or bad nature against members, and I think it is relevant for you to make clear exactly what you are saying.

SENATOR N. W. BOXILL: I think I have made myself explicitly clear in what I have said. If I say yes, he will say, name the people. Then you will be telling me I have to name them. I am not going to do that, Sir, with all due respect to you and the Chair and the Senate, but there is no one in here who is going to make me say yes or no to anything I have no intention of saying yes or no to.

Mr. PRESIDENT: You are not saying then that members of the Government other than the Prime Minister were involved in any of the imputations you made.

SENATOR N. W. BOXILL: I am not saying that, Sir, I am not denying that either. It is as simple as that.

Mr. PRESIDENT: The way I understand that the matter has developed at the moment is that the Senator has said certain imputations or suggestions were made that the DLP would in some way have been connected with this alleged plot but that the Prime Minister had got up and said that this was certainly not the case. Can the matter be allowed to rest there? Or are you pursuing it and saying that despite what the Prime Minister has said other people of the Government are involved? That is what I think the Minister wants to get clear before the time comes for him to reply.

SENATOR N. W. BOXILL: Mr. President, with all due respect, that is not what the Minister, as far as I understand it, wants.

Mr. PRESIDENT: It was, as far as I understand it, and I am the person sitting here.

SENATOR N. W. BOXILL: If he means what the Prime Minister said is true, that the DLP had no involvement, yes. It is true that the DLP had no involvement in it.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Well, does the matter rest there, then? That the Prime Minister, who is Head of the Government, said that no such thing could be said against the DLP. Is that sufficient to leave it there?

SENATOR N. W. BOXILL: Oh yes, of course. No such thing could be said against the DLP, because I have made it quite plain, explicitly plain when I was speaking that we would have no intention whatsoever in associating ourselves with that sort of behaviour. I thought I had made that explicitly clear.

Mr. PRESIDENT: You are making it clear then that you are making no further implications against the Government or any member.

SENATOR N. W. BOXILL: Are you asking me to leave it there, Sir?

Mr. PRESIDENT: I interpret your remarks to mean just that, and I propose to leave it at that.

SENATOR N. W. BOXILL: Thank you, Sir. You see, Mr. President, some people went to one University and they think they know everything. I went to all the universities, so I know quite a lot too, and nobody, even in a law court, is going to be able to tie me down to anything that I do not mean. What I say is what I mean. I am sorry that the hon. member tried to take me off my stride.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Boxill, are you proposing to continue much longer?

SENATOR N. W. BOXILL: Yes, Sir.

Mr. PRESIDENT: The time is 1 o'clock and if you could possibly give me some indication as to how much longer your speech will be, it will determine when I suspend the sitting.

SENATOR N. W. BOXILL: With all due respect, I would prefer if you were to take the break now and let them get something to eat and let me come back and lick some more wind out of their sails.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. PRESIDENT: It seems as though the Senator has some more things to say and this is probably the best time to suspend.

The sitting will be suspended for 45 minutes.

On resumption:

Mr. PRESIDENT: This sitting is resumed.

SENATOR N. W. BOXILL: Mr. President, I am going to touch briefly on foreign policy before I sit down, which is the Ministry of External Affairs. I would like to know what is the Government's intention. Now for some reason or another the bugbear of the emerging countries is communism. Every time an emerging country starts to demand what is rightfully its own, the leaders of that country are abused and accused of becoming communists, but with the way the situation is going, one has to keep asking oneself which is the greater of the two evils, communism or democracy. A lot of people have been making the mistake of comparing communism with democracy, but communism is not now, has never been nor ever will it be a threat to democracy. Communism is a threat to capitalism, but for purposes best known to other people, they try to make you believe that communism is a threat to democracy. I want it made explicitly clear that I am not now, have never been and I have no intention of ever becoming a communist. I am not going to leave my aunt's doorstep to go and sit down on my cousin's. I am a black man and no matter which ism you have, black people are always at the bottom of the rung.

I mentioned this to go on to say that the foreign policy of the present Government is somewhat baffling, and as someone else would have said, it boggles the mind. Here it is you are espousing a theory against communism, yet you are sending down to Cuba to get Cuban cement. Now as I said just now in the Chamber, if the Americans were as serious as they would like us to believe to get rid of communism, it is an easy matter for them. If you have ants affecting your house you do not go and look for an individual ant to kill; you look for the source from which the ants are coming, which is the nest and you throw your poison or whatever you are going to destroy the ants with right there. If the Americans wanted to get rid of communism as they want us to believe, they would stop feeding the communists. Every year, Sir, with the exception of last year, America used to send something like five billion bushels of wheat to Russia. I do not know if they got paid for it, but I doubt they got paid. America also lends Russia money at 6% whereas Americans have to pay 19% and 20%. America as far as I know has never sent a pint of corn to Barbados. If they were serious about getting rid of communism as they should be, how come they are taking up something like \$3 billion to send to Poland.

You might be wondering why I brought in Russia in this and I will tell you why. Our Minister of External Affairs, and what I would like to say I cannot really say in this Chamber, as far as we can see, was using whatever the then Ambassador was inviting him to use, so they were attacking little Grenada. Now I have nothing to defend for Grenada. That is a matter for the Grenadians. They will come around to that when it suits them, but the point which I am making, Sir, is that we here in this

country are running down the Communists and maybe rightly so, and yet our foreign policy is not to give the Grenadians who are our neighbours any ministerial facilities at the airport, but we have just finished wining and dining the Chinese. China has over one billion people. The world is comprised of four billion, so China has one-quarter of the world's population, yet we are wining and dining the Chinese who are arch communists, but our little neighbour Grenada we want to tell what to do. You cannot blow hot and cold at the same time. If you are telling Grenada that they should have elections, and I believe they should, but I guess Mr. Bishop is not going to risk that now because he has gone too far on a limb and will get thrown out, Poland should have elections too. But what do you find, Sir? Millions of dollars are being thrown into Poland who have openly declared that they are communists and they are not changing their communist ideas for anything, but down here we are not getting one yen, and yet we are getting ourselves involved in international politics that are eventually going to hurt us. That is why this morning when I mentioned what I was mentioning, I was mentioning that to warn those in power that when you play with fire you will get burn, and if we get ourselves on the map as some people would like us to believe that Barbados is now on the map, because I do not know if you only started printing maps since 1976, we will eventually find out that we are going to have a lot of saboteurs in this country who are going to come in here trying to destroy the equilibrium of this society.

We are supposed to be a neutral country, satellites of none and all this fancy talk, but as the world stands today it is impossible for a country to be neutral, therefore we are throwing our lot in with the democratic societies. But the father of democracy, the United States of America, is the biggest supporter of communism. You look around and you will see that Poland, Czechoslovakia, Russia, all these Eastern European countries have done better than we who are toting the flag of democracy. They lend these people more money than they give us, they send food to feed these people more than they send to feed us. As a matter of fact they do not send anything down here at all, and when they send things down here they are usually second class and we have to pay for it down to our teeth, therefore the time has come when we have to have a new look at our foreign policy. I know that we are not only a small country, but we are a poor country and we cannot go and expect to fight these big countries, but at the same time we have to be more than careful in getting ourselves involved in certain things and joining with other people who can afford to be big. If we go on attacking Cuba the way we are doing, do you know what is going to happen? Our whole infrastructure is going to tumble down because Cuba will decide one day that if that is your attitude they will send no more cement, and the moment you do not get any more cement, work will cease. There is no reason for us to

wine and dine the Cubans, but there is also no need for us to be completely belligerent towards these people.

I am not pushing any door for the Cubans either. These people can handle their affairs, but the door I am pushing is a door for Barbadians. I am a Barbadian and I want to see the best for the country whether we are in power, they are in power or somebody else is in power. I am prepared to live here, I do not have anywhere to go and therefore I would like to warn the Minister of External Affairs to stop being the mouthpiece for these big powers, because they are only using us. Do not let us get involved in their affairs. I do not agree with the nonsense Grenada is getting on with because a small country like Grenada cannot afford to get on with that kind of nonsense, but that is their foreign policy, and there is no reason why our foreign policy should be completely in the reverse of somebody else. We should have our own foreign policy and it does not necessarily mean that we have to do what the United States say. It is better at times to keep your mouth shut than to go playing you are talking big because you know this and you know that.

Now I have been noticing recently not only that we have been having the communist here wining and dining but we have ever gone further. We have Russian cars inside of our country. Now, what do the Russians buy from us? When the War comes down, as it surely would come, what is going to happen with the Ladas. I am not trying to scare away people from buying the Ladas, that is their business.

I remember back in 1939 we had a lot of German cars in here and during the War, the Opels were here and we were at War with Germany. A lot of people had to put down the Opel cars because they could not get parts. I do not feel that we should be doing all of this trade with the Russians because when it comes down to the nitty-gritty I do not see that we are getting anything. It is a one way street. I do not know what Russia buys from us. I do not know what help Russia gives us. They do not help us anyhow.

As frequent as last year I think it was last year or the year before that the Minister of External Affairs made a big Statement on the Floor of the House about trading with Japan. Here is another good reason but my view is and I am saying this that when we are back in power — of course I cannot tell the Minister of Trade who to trade with but my view is that we should be trading with the United States, Canada, Great Britain and Germany. These are the people who helped us. These are the people who we can help.

We are doing a lot of trade with Japan. Japan does not even buy a pint of molasses from us as far as I know.

As a matter of fact, when you go to Japan, Sir, and you do not speak Japanese they do not listen to you because they feel that everybody should speak Japanese, that is the country of the World. All of this comes under Trade and Foreign Policy. My view is that we should take another look at our Foreign Policy. There is no reason why and another thing I can say. It is true that a lot of Americans are buying the Japanese cars too but my view is that we can get a better deal with the United States if we really press the point of getting materials and so on down here than we can get from Japan. There are coming from around the other side of the World. America is just next door and when the show-down comes as it is going to come sooner than later we have to align ourselves with the Western powers but how are we going to do this when we are supposed to be doing trade with China.

We are supposed to be doing trade with Russia. We are supposed to be doing trade with China. Two of the biggest communist countries in the World. Yet, you are telling people about here that this body is a communists and the next body is a communist but you are not telling them about the Fascist Government that you have in South Africa or the one that you had in Zimbabwe or the one that you have in Great Britain right now.

We have to take a different look at our Foreign Policy. We have to put people to run our affairs and we have to be very serious about running our affairs. My view is this. We have no right sticking our necks out defending one big country against the other big country because despite what we might say or do I have said it before and I will say it again now. If tomorrow the Russians started to invade the United States and they were right into Washington D.C. and the Army of the United States had formulated and decided to push them back but somebody came and said you know that a nigger just raped a white woman down the road. Do you know that the Army would stop pushing back the Russians and go and look for the nigger that just raped the white woman. They are not worried about the Russians taking over.

We in this society whether we be white, black, blue, pink or red, we are considered in the West Indies as coloured. You can take it however you like and therefore people in the United States, the people in Russia, the people in China, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Austria and those other countries they see us from our colour first and anything else after.

We as West Indians have to start seeing for West Indians first and the others after. We are a nation now. We cannot run up to the Colonial Office complaining that somebody did not do this or somebody did not do that or somebody did this or somebody did that. We are running our own affairs and I therefore would hope that the time is now, not coming, now where our Foreign

Policy can take a completely different line from the one in which it is taking because we were supposed to be satellites of none but there is nobody that can deny the fact that we are satellites of the United States.

A man can be strong and independent without being a bully and as I have said before it is better to be poor and independent than to be poor and dependant. We are poor and we are independent and there is absolutely no reason why we should be a mouth-piece for the great powers because when the show-down comes, nobody is going to remember us and before I sit down, let me tell you this, Mr. Chairman.

In the 1914 to 1918 War the Germans beat their allies at every Infantry combat that they had until the Americans came into the War and the Americans sent a Regiment to France called The Fighting 369, a Black Regiment and in this Regiment was a man by the name of August Johnson. He was the first American, I need not tell you that he was black because it was a Black Regiment, but he was the first American to get the highest Military Award from the French. The Fighting 369 stood up under fire for 191 days without yielding one inch of ground or giving up one prisoner.

The first time the Germans were going to lose a foot battle was then and do you know what happened? The people in England and the United States started crying and saying that they would prefer the Germans to win the War than to know that the black soldiers were out there killing the white soldiers. Do you know what was said in the United States too? They might be heroes out there but when they come back here they are only niggers and that is how the Klu Klux Klan started again in 1919.

I want to make it quite clear that I am not a racist. That is History. I did not write it. I am not preaching against one race or the other. I did not write this History and this is History but I wish to show you that when the showdown comes, we in the West Indies would be only used to suit the other fellow's purpose and you watch what I am going to say before I sit down.

There has not been a War in Russia for the longest time. There has not been one in the United States. It is all right to have Wars on somebody else's ground and let somebody else get killed but they are not mashing up their buildings there or the buildings in Russia. I am therefore appealing to the Minister of External Affairs, although I know he will not be there too long, that the time has come when we have to start thinking more positively than we have been thinking. We have to stop allowing people from thinking that because we are a poor country that we need hand outs and we have to borrow

the money that they can dictate to us in every sphere in life.

They gave Brazil \$40 million, they sent money up to Bangladesh, they send money all over the world without any strings attached, but as soon as they want to lend you \$2 000, or \$2 million, they want to dictate to you what you should do and what you should not do. I am therefore saying that we are a small country, we cannot fight the big powers but we should be powerful in the United Nations.

When it does not suit our powers to say what is right because it might not be politically expedient, I think that we should abstain. But going out on a limb and pushing ourselves pro one side, or con the other can create a situation for a small country like Barbados that we can start getting international terrorists coming in here and destroy the whole equilibrium of our society.

With that Sir, I think that I have hauled up enough for the time and I hope that the Beacon newspaper, the same way how they can take things out of context, they can take some of what I now said out of context. They can say that I am a communist if they like, but I categorically deny even supporting a communist. When we look around and we see people who are running the community they are not little people like you and I Sir so it therefore behoves us to steer a straight and narrow path, be friends of all and satellites of none.

Thank you.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Field.

SENATOR R. FIELD: Mr. President, I propose to deal with just one particular Head and that is Civil Aviation and Tourism. As a matter of fact, more confined to Tourism than to Civil Aviation.

For a long time now, a matter of concern to me was pension for hotel workers and I believe it gives me the opportunity today to probably vent some of my feelings towards the lack of provision for this measure. Mr. President, Tourism continues and for a long time now to exceed sugar as the Island's number one foreign exchange earner. It is estimated last year to have earned \$447 million for this country and one can only recognise that Tourism is making a vital contribution to the social and economic development and also the political stability of Barbados.

But the point that concerns me mainly is hotel workers and we must recognise that hotel workers are all playing a major role to the industry making such an

invaluable contribution to the economy. I would like to congratulate the Barbados Workers' Union who has done a tremendous job in not only demanding certain wage increases and certain conditions for the hotel workers recently, but also instilling in the workers of the industry their sense of responsibility to this country. Mr. President, this sense of responsibility among the workers, the Barbados Workers' Union and the hotel management has enabled it to enjoy a relationship as we have seen, a relationship which maintained industrial stability, which has been demonstrated by the whole manner in which the last negotiations were concluded.

The time now however is ripe and has come to make sure that something is done for the hotel workers not only in the Tourism industry, but for the employees in the industry. We know that Tourism now is an old, secure and established industry and provision should be made and we hope that this Government will see fit because you cannot leave it to the employers — I believe that this Government should see fit to ensure that some form of trust fund, provident fund, whatever you would like to call it be set up for these workers when they should have reached retiring age. I believe, Mr. President, it would be a sad commentary on Barbados' sense of social justice if it were to produce a generation of retired hotel workers, who have given the best years of their lives, toil and sweat to industry only to end up for the remainder of their lives, unable to provide without any provision for social compensation other than the meagre amount which is provided by the National Insurance.

Barbados now, Mr. President is experiencing a slight decline in visitors to this country and I would like to point out that this fall off is due I think mainly to the adverse economic conditions in the major cities like Europe, the United States of America and Canada and we must recognise that every effort should be made to maintain our position in the tourism market in order to continue to be the number one earner of foreign exchange in this country. We are facing increasing competition.

Barbados has been fortunate particularly in the Caribbean to have had a head start on a number of islands in the Caribbean because of our facilities, infrastructure the progress which we have made in the island in the past, I believe it has been fortunate to have had a head start on some of the small islands. But today, there is increasing competition and we have to ensure that our product remains competitive not only competitive but attractive to potential visitors to this country.

We have a reputation to be a high priced destination, Mr. President, and this is an area I believe that we have got to concentrate on and watch very heavily. Because of that, I would like to appeal to Barbados hoteliers to give serious consideration to

imposing a freeze on the existing hotel rates, particularly for the next winter season, and I appeal sincerely to them. It will be a strategy to make our destination more competitive, I believe, at this time.

Mr. President, I am calling for greater emphasis to be placed on the education of the children of our nation in our schools on the various pros and cons, the merits and demerits of the industry of tourism. I hope that the forthcoming new Education Act will make provisions for the general educational curriculum to deal comprehensively with tourism in its social and economic features, including the benefits which would be derived to the young people of this country as a result of tourism.

The Board of Tourism will shortly be launching a local awareness programme. This programme will not only be directed to our local people to make them further aware of the need for tourism, but general instructions to the visitors coming to our shores. Mr. President, I know that I have acquired a reputation in the past for being very hard on that certain segment of our community known as the Rastas. I believe that everyone in our society has a useful role to play in the community, and I am not yet convinced of the usefulness of that segment in Barbados, but, Mr. President, they are a fact of life and I believe that the Government should explore ways and means to rehabilitate these people and make them useful members of the society if they so desire.

Mr. President, crime is one of the social evils in Barbados today. Despite the general decrease in the last few months, and I believe that is as a result of the vigilance of the Royal Barbados Police Force, we know the police who have been subjected to severe criticisms in the past recently, I must say, must take some kind of credit, and I would like that credit to be known, that the Royal Barbados Police Force has done a fine job within the last few months to reduce the spate of crimes in this country.

Mr. President, as I said before, I am deeply concerned about the workers in the hotel industry. We know what we have seen in the past as far as the sugar workers are concerned. I believe if we were aware of what would have happened when the sugar industry was in its kelter, we would have had some provision for these workers. It is now, and it is the time that I believe a look should be made at the workers in the hotel industry.

I thank you, Mr. President, for giving me the opportunity here today to express my feeling as regards the situation. Thank you very much.

SENATOR J. C. W. WICKHAM: Mr. President, the Estimates with which we are dealing do not in fact reveal any dramatic departure from the past, and certainly no dramatic change in direction. There may be some

differences in the amount of money which is being spent, and our Leader's impressive recital of percentages, no doubt aided by the technology of the computer, does not in fact say a great deal more than has been said or could be said if one read the newspapers with attention.

There are three Heads which I want to talk about very briefly indeed. The first of them concerns the Department for which the Minister, our Leader, is himself responsible, and I speak about the Library. The amount of money provided for the Library shows that there is a provision for equipment under Library, Plant and Development, but there does not seem to be any provision for increased space.

Some months ago, as a member of a Committee which was looking into the — I think the Committee was appointed or certainly got together on the direction of the Minister — which was looking into the provision of new facilities for archives and information services, I saw a very impressive plan of a new Library. I believe this might have been prepared for a suitable application to be made for international funding, but I have heard no more about it, and certainly the Estimates do not reveal any concern for the cramped conditions which exist in the Library.

This sounds like harping, but no one who attempts to use the Reference Section of the Library can be pleased with the jumble of books which meet you as you enter that space. It is impossible to find anything. I thought that my own little area of my house was untidy until I went to the Reference Library. The titles are visible only if you crane your neck, and it is impossible to get work done, and I am really ashamed of the provision which is made for research and the retrieval of reference books, and the staff is ashamed too. They are very embarrassed when you ask for something.

I think that the Government owes it to the country to provide some lead as to what is going to be done with the provision of space for the Library. That Carnegie Library is very old. The advance which Barbados has made in other fields has not been matched by the increased provision of space, and it is not an area of our social life of which we ought to be proud.

The second point I want to raise concerns our contribution, Barbados' contribution to International, Regional and Commonwealth Organisations. Now, the Estimates show under various Heads — some under Agriculture, some under External Affairs, some under Meteorology — a lump sum and a footnote which say: "Provision for contributions" but there is no way of telling the individual contributions. Now, I realise that there is some difficulty in providing accurate figures for these, because in many cases the financial year of International organisations is the calendar year.

When these Estimates are being prepared, the exact figure which Barbados is to be called on to provide is not known, but it would do no harm to include the figure of the previous year with a suitable note to indicate that this figure is provisional, but we are given no indication at all and in one of the cases this figure is important because in the case of CARDI and in the case of the World Meteorological Organisation, I am beginning to have serious doubts in common with a number of other people as to whether the Barbados contribution is really getting its money's worth.

So far as CARDI is concerned they have a responsibility for development and research on the regional basis, but in many cases I suspect this is duplicated in each of the individual territories by the Ministries of Agriculture who themselves run their own research departments and who certainly have a more intimate knowledge of the needs of the country than CARDI has. Barbados has been extremely hospitable to regional organisations and it really is time that we look to see whether we are getting our money's worth in more ways than one. The personnel of these organisations are welcome to come here and provide their variable services, but they do exert weight on our social services, our schools, our hospitals, and it is no more than fair that we should see that we are getting value for this money. In fact, I would like to see tabled as a routine measure in both Houses of Parliament the annual reports of these organisations, because since the Barbados Government has to make a financial contribution, it seems only right that we should know how that money is being spent, and I put forward that suggestion which I believe is in keeping with some of the regulations or practices which direct that the Audit Department of Barbados should in fact oversee the accounts of organisations contributed to by the Barbados Government.

The third point I want to raise concerns a cultural point. Senator Boxill manufactured a beautiful word "CARIFIASCO" and it has the merit of sounding good and in fact sounding as if it is accurate. I do not believe it can be accurate. What is wrong with the present arrangements for CARIFESTA is that it has not got enough publicity and I suspect that is only because its organisation is controlled and directed by a Government Department who never see things in the same way as people outside. But perhaps I should say a little bit more about the origins of CARIFESTA, because the more I talk about it the more I realise that people do not seem to understand or remember how it started. CARIFESTA started because Mr. Burnham in Guyana in 1972 was persuaded by a number of Caribbean artists to present to

the Heads of Government conference in October 1972 a document which argued a case for a regular festival of the arts in the Caribbean to bring the artists of the region together and to express a Caribbean identity by merely exhibiting and displaying the works of those artists.

Now if you remember the past twenty years or so, the beginnings of the Caribbean identity in art did not start in the Caribbean. This is not unusual. At the end of World War II a number of Caribbean people found their homes in London or New York or Toronto and in the case of the French in Paris, the history of the Caribbean all over again being one of fragmentation, one of what Lamming calls the pleasures of exile. It became necessary for those people in these foreign parts to embrace their togetherness in some tangible way, and it was they in fact who were the majority of people who attended the first CARIFESTA in 1972. The opportunity was taken then to circulate a paper for signatures asking Mr. Burnham to present the case for a Caribbean Festival, and whatever you may say about Guyana and the direction that the Government has taken, no one could argue about Mr. Burnham's serious dedication to the cause of Caribbean art and culture. He did so take this case and the result of that Heads of Government conference in 1972 was that it was agreed that CARIFESTA should become a permanent part of the Caribbean calendar of artistic and cultural events, that it should take place every three years and that there should be a cultural desk in the CARICOM secretariat. This was in 1972.

Jamaica at that conference agreed that it would host the next CARIFESTA in 1975. For reasons which were political, the Jamaica Government did not host CARIFESTA in 1975, but in 1976. The next CARIFESTA should have been in 1979 and I understand that Barbados who had offered to host it then found itself unable to do so and ceded place to Cuba. Now that introduced an entirely new element into the whole CARIFESTA arrangements because, remember, the origin of CARIFESTA was at a Heads of Commonwealth Caribbean Governments which certainly did not include Cuba. However the Caribbean is a plastic kind of sea and the argument for the inclusion of Cuba, in fact Guyana made an argument for the inclusion of Brazil in the first festival, but we understood that there were ethnic reasons and there were reasons in history why the Caribbean Sea should be extended and so Cuba held the CARIFESTA in 1979. Three years from then would have been 1982 and that was the period when Barbados was expected to host it, but 1981 suited the Government better and now we are hosting it only two years after the last one.

In many ways Senator Boxill is right to say that two years are not enough, but the hosting of CARIFESTA by Barbados only two years after the last one, the reluctance of Trinidad and Tobago to say nothing at all about the participation in CARIFESTA,

suggests difficulties in the whole event. I have been hearing rumours that Mexico wants to host the next one. This is a most unfortunate direction CARIFESTA is taking because what is going to happen clearly to me is that we are going to have in cultural activities the whole LDC-MDC all over again, and Antigua, St. Vincent, Grenada and Montserrat will never host CARIFESTA and once again we will be seeing the fragmentation in cultural terms of the Caribbean. This is unfortunate but Barbados has a chance to do something towards this in hosting of this 1981 event, because although for some reasons Barbados is regarded as an MDC, it in cultural terms is not, so here is a chance for the powers of CARIFESTA to put on a Festival which more accurately reflected Barbados' cultural side.

I and many of my forethinkers would have wanted to see a Festival which would not attempt to do Havana or a Guyana of 1972 or even a Kingston of 1976 but reduce CARIFESTA to a size which would not lack enthusiasm of participation but which would not attempt to fill an Auditorium and big spaces but which will use all spaces, the small corners of the country, the Museum, Court Yard, Farley Hill, Queen's Park, all the small spaces and so produce a Festival which will be unique given the Barbados size which would have a particular flavour of a Barbadian CARIFESTA.

That way, smaller Islands like Antigua, and St. Vincent would be induced to say, "Yes, we can host such a Festival, a Festival which reflected our character and spirit. Unfortunately, it seems to me that a lot of money is being spent but it is being spent in an attempt to compete in size with other CARIFESTAS and I am afraid that this is probably the reason why it appears to Senator Boxill that it is a CARIFIASCO.

The truth is that even now the situation is not irretrievable because certainly in July there will be a number of Caribbean thinkers and sympathisers and the opportunity will once again be present to shape and give direction nine years after the original one of what CARIFESTA might be and I can sincerely hope that this opportunity is taken.

The opportunity can only be taken now if the Government gives the Artists their ear. Governments, in my experience, know nothing at all about our culture and many of them care less. They simply do not know what they are dealing with and they must, in this case, listen to people who know and not to let people around them who they think know. They must really do better than that and exploit, mobilise what all of the total cultural amenities of the entire country. Direct them, not sit

down and wait for them to come forward, as noticed in each case in an Election Year, to provide the circuses while they provide the bread. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

SENATOR W. FRANKLIN: Mr. President, an estimate gives people who are not in Government the opportunity to examine the collection of revenue and the spending of this revenue. It also if closely scrutinised will allow one to discern the political philosophy of the Government of the day and the priorities they gave for the dispensing of revenue that was collected largely from the masses of the people in this country. The 1981 Estimates, however, Mr. President, gives me this opportunity to have a look at the present Administration to discern from their allocation of funds what are their priorities for this country.

Only today when I reach the Senate I was given some corrective figures, therefore, the figures I use might be a point or so out since they were calculated from the Estimates that were made available to me sometime ago and in order to try and see if there is any difference in direction from the present Administration to the previous one, I did a small exercise on having looked at the areas of certain expenditures in the 1975/76 Budget being the one from the last put up by the Democratic Labour Party and the Estimates of 1981/82.

In the Estimates of 1975/76 the total Recurrent Expenditure was then \$186,551,459 of which the Social Services, Education, Health, Social Security, Housing and Community Development and other Community and Social Services accounted for some \$103,529,900 or 56% of the dineric and the Defence and Security at that time was \$867,212 or less than half of 1% of the total Estimates.

The figures coming out of the 1981/82 Budget showed and they were corrected since then but the figures I calculated were \$469,161,000. This has since been changed to something like \$479 million but the percentages would hardly be an appreciable difference but at that time the Social Services Expenditure was \$239,099,451 or an Expenditure of 51%.

The Economic Services accounted for \$41,583,654 or 8.9%. Defence and Security Recurrent Expenditure was \$10,858,850 or 2.3% and General Public Services about 24.9%.

When one looks, Mr. President to see where that Revenue was collected from one would see that in the 1975/76 Revenue by way of direct taxes something like \$91,410,699 or 45% was collected. The Counter Revenue for the 1981/82 Estimates is \$202,663,310 or 41.9%.

Under Indirect Taxes and this is the 1975/76, the amount collected was \$72,610,395 or 35.7%. The comparable figure for 1981/82 is \$230,571,150 or 47.7%.

Mr. President, the sources of revenue showed direction of the two Governments. We would see from those figures just recalled a significant change on emphasis on revenue collected from Direct Taxation to Indirect Taxation, a change which, Mr. President, I would argue in a poor society like Barbados is a change in the wrong direction and that can only cause increased hardship on the masses of this country.

We all believe, Mr. President and we know that the levels of direct taxation in Barbados are quite high, but at least direct taxation has the political philosophy and the social philosophy that we can place on those who are better able to pay carries a larger sphere of the economic burden. Consequently, the moment that there is going to be a shift of that emphasis of revenue collection, you are going to be forcing by way of Indirect Taxes namely, on imports, food, more recently the Consumption Tax, a burden on the poor people of this country in which they are not as well placed to carry as the ones who are better off. This shift Mr. President must comparatively interfere with the cost of food, the cost of transport, the cost of housing the cost of clothing and subsequently in the long run the quality of life of poor people in this country.

If we have a look at the last outfall figures, or the projected figures, Mr. President, you will see that the Consumption Tax speaking from memory is expected to yield some \$69 million in the revenue year. I believe in the last Budget Speech of the Rt. Hon. Minister of Finance his projection at that time was a very modest \$21 million, or \$27 million. I will see, if you would bear with me if I can find the figure, his projection at that time was a modest \$27 million. While we are on this point Mr. President, I want to have a look at the Estimates of Revenue and I have concluded when I look at these Revenues that one, or two things is projected to happen in the year 1981 - 82. One, either that there is likely to be a recession in the economy, which from all available figures seems not likely, or two, that the estimated revenue seems to me, Mr. President to be very conservative.

If you look Mr. President at the revenue projected on taxes and incomes and profit, in the Income Year 1980-81 the revenue collected was \$161 100 000, the projected estimates for the Income Year 1981-82 is \$183,000,100 or an increase of some \$22 million. Mr. President, it was stated quite forcibly throughout the Estimates that the last salaries increases granted by this present Government amounted to some \$59 million if my memory serves me right and numerous other negotiated settlements in salaries during the year, incremental increase in salaries during the year would mean that there is going to be a far bigger taxable base than there was in 1980-81.

My contention is that with increased revenue of \$60 million one way by Government, plus the other revenue

injected in increase in salaries in the private enterprise, that it is very likely that the taking from the taxes on income and profit is going to be a little bit more than the projected increase of \$22 million. Similarly, Mr. President, if we had a look at the taxes taken on properties, you will see that the Estimates for the 1980-81 year, those taxes yield \$17 709 000 and the projected Estimates this year is \$19,000,563, a little less than \$2 million increase. The taxable base for properties this year Mr. President is being reviewed by the Valuation Department and it is my knowledge from my personal analysis and from information in the Department that there is a general increase in Tax Base of about 20% or one fifth of what it was last time. Assuming therefore that the rateable value is likely to be the same as it was in the last year, one would assume therefore to have seen an increase of about \$3.6 million to \$4 million in this particular estimate for revenue.

If one comes down the column and compares the projection, the difference in 1979-80 revenue against the 1978-79 revenue considering the inflationary trends that have gone on, and the fact that you are now purchasing at a lot higher price your goods and services, it is expected that your taxes on goods and services would have yielded a bit more. That is why Mr. President I am therefore of the opinion that we seem to be aiming this year for some release by way of either increased allowances of one's income tax hopefully an increase in the rate of property taxes and namely a reduction in the consumption level on certain materials particularly in the housing industry and the clothing industry, which I will show you later has been seriously affected over the last five years by inflationary trends.

Mr. President, my quick summary of these economic figures seems to suggest that the masses of this country are paying more and receiving less. They are paying more because as I showed you, the Indirect Taxations have moved from a percentage of the recurrent held on revenue of 35.7% to something like 47.7% in the period from 1975-76 and the present estimate year of 1981-82. I will contend later, Mr. President, at some stage that this shift in public financing has affected the masses of this country and although figures which show some improvement in the economy, the life standards of the masses of the country is not reflected with this improvement at all.

Mr. President, I propose to go quickly through the Revenue Heads in order that I would not miss any that I have a contribution to make on because I have made some notes on the appropriate Heads and I will now proceed to go down these Heads and follow my notes in order.

The first Head, Mr. President, I want to have a quick look at is the Head of Defence and Security. My

only look at this Head is one under the Capital Estimates page, and you will see under the Capital Estimates for that Head that there is something like \$14 million being expended. While this might be well spent money, it bothers me when you have a look at the other Capital Estimates disbursement, and my memory shows me that there is a disbursement of about \$13 million going towards building new roads and providing adequate drainage, which is less than that. There is even a small disbursement of \$6.5 million for CARIFESTA and improvement to facilities for that, then there is only a disbursement of \$6 million for the National Housing Corporation for the continuation of its housing development programme; there is only a disbursement of \$3.4 million for the purchase of new buses for the improvement of facilities at the Transport Board, there is only a disbursement of \$4.8 million for the water and sewerage development, there is only a disbursement of \$8.5 million for the construction of factories for industrial estates, and there is only one disbursement of \$5.51 million which has been included to finance the National Health and Drug Service. I am dealing with page 5, Highlights of Capital Expenditure.

I would say, Mr. President, when one considers the total Capital Expenditure projected of \$199 million — I think it has been changed to \$200 million by the more recent figures — one will see that that Head is responsible for a sizable amount of that money. My colleague has made it quite clear that we in the Democratic Labour Party are not against a Defence Force as such, but I am saying, Mr. President, that there are certain trends that we have to be very careful with, and I will just draw your attention to one or two that I have seen personally.

About three days ago I was driving opposite the National Insurance Building and a van transporting soldiers of the Defence Force came down and like is always the case, there was quite a large amount of traffic at that particular junction, and we were all patiently waiting our chance to move on, but the new found authority thought it possible to go ahead of everybody else. I think that we have from the beginning to instil and hope that we see that sense of discipline, that sense of training that is supposed to be meted out to them coming out in their public behaviour and in their public display. The gentleman figured it was too much for him to wait quietly in the queue like we were all doing, and the driver of the van got out of the van and he summarily waved a couple of the vehicles to the side and he wound his way through. I do not think it was a case of emergency, because I did not hear of any emergency on that particular day. It might seem like a very small thing, but I am beginning to see that if we do not instil in them and allow them to understand their rightful role they are to play, they could well exceed their authority. That is all I have to say on that Head at the moment.

I would like to have a look at the Head of Agriculture. I am beginning to be a little concerned about the lack of direction of the Ministry of Agriculture. The first thing I observed in looking through the Estimates was that if you look at the breakdown you will notice that in the section labelled Administration in the Personal Emoluments section you will not find in that section a Chief Technical Director. He comes in the section under Crop Research. That signalled to me a little something that I am a little concerned about, and that is, the general policy of the Agricultural Department.

If you turn to page 27 of your Personal Emoluments section, you will see Subhead 1, and there is a note in the Estimates which says that it has to do with general administrative policy, etc. of the Department. You will see the personnel breakdown shows Permanent Secretaries, etc., Administrative Assistants, and you come down the line, and nowhere in that particular Subhead will you find the Chief Technical Director under the Head.

Now, I am a little alarmed, Mr. President, that when you look at the Personal Emoluments breakdown, going under that Subhead, which accounted for the Statutory Expenditure under that Subhead of something like \$708,000 and Other Expenditure of \$916,000, if you look under Statutory Expenditure you will find that the post of Chief Technical Director does not feature in that direction. I was alarmed to think that you can have a Subhead under the Ministry of Agriculture purporting to deal with initiation and review of policy and personnel like the Chief Technical Director not included.

If you peruse that later on under the sub-head, I think you will find him under sub-head dealing with crop research, that was sub-head 4, you will find his post listed specifically dealing with crop research extension. Mr. President, that is the first thing that signalled me into the Agriculture Department. (A VOICE: He drew it to your attention?) No, he did not draw it to my attention. I am not privy to such counsel. I wonder if the Senator on the other side is telling me that it is so obvious that I could not pick it up. If he looks at it, Mr. President, the Ministry of Agriculture has not been known to perform at the type of level that you would know would be a credit to it during its last year or so. There has been a serious run down of the extension services, so much so that it is now fairly common knowledge that the stations at Sayers Court and Jerusalem are about to be closed, and it is also within my knowledge that the senior agricultural officer who once headed the extension services is now earmarked to be going over to the rural scheme along with another officer from this department.

Now the question I pose here is what is the future of the extension scheme of the Agriculture Department? Is it of so little importance now that you are removing

the senior agricultural officer that was dealing with extensions and earmarking him for a sub-programme, the rural programme which you would see under the same Agriculture Department for which is earmarked something like \$12 million? Who would be advising the small farmers out there? Who are going to be taking the results of the research section to the small farmers and who are going to be supervising the activities of your small farmers? Is this an abandonment of the small farmers by the present Government?

If you look further, the tractor scheme seems to be in total disarray. As a matter of fact, it is in so much disarray that it is within my knowledge that quite a few people had to have their money refunded which they had paid in for the services of the tractor, and now you will find that there are quite a few people in private enterprise who have now acquired tractors and are performing this duty at higher prices naturally than was being done by the tractor scheme. If we are to encourage peasant agriculture, Mr. President, we certainly have to provide the back-up services. Not only that, some of the operators you have in the tractor scheme seem to be very inexperienced and have not been doing the kind of job that they are expected to do under the tractor scheme. For argument sake, Mr. President, we now know that at some of the agricultural stations it is fairly difficult getting stud services and those types of services that were once available to the small farmers, in so much that the quality of your pig industry, the quality of the dairy herd have been affected because of this problem.

This brings me to the policy of the Central Livestock Station. This station seems at the moment just to be keeping animals and carrying out the necessary feed trials. They are supposed to be doing the cross breeding, but so far none of the results of this section has been passing down to the farmers in private enterprise. This is a very serious problem, Mr. President, in this particular section of the Ministry of Agriculture, and as you will see, all these things affect the small peasant farmer.

With respect to the black belly sheep programme which is being carried out, there is very little information coming out from the programme to the black belly sheep farmers of this country. At the moment it is certainly not on stream as it is expected it would have been. The same thing is happening to the pig industry. It is very difficult now to get good quality piglets from your agricultural stations as it was before, and one would know, particularly those of us who live in rural communities that the small people who keep pigs look forward very much to these agricultural stations for the purchasing of good quality stock to keep in their backyards. These are now very seldom available and as a result it is interfering with the quality of the pig industry in this country.

Mr. President, under the head of Research, if there is research going on, at the moment it is research for research

sake because this research and its results certainly are not reaching the farmers out there. I say this because the extension service over the last couple of years has been further weakened and at the moment I do not know if it exists, and you would see that there seems to be positive indications that it would be coming very much to a close with the removal of the senior extension officer and one or two of his other extension officers into the rural agricultural scheme to which they are going.

Overall, Mr. President, there are one or two other things that I would want to have a look at in agriculture. What has happened to the cotton industry that the ADC was trying to have a look at? The statistics available to me reveal that there is very little cotton now being grown and I was trying to see if I could find the statistics. I would like to find out from the appropriate person if there was a problem in the cotton industry. Mr. President, in 1975 we produced 162,176 kg of lint; in 1979 this was reduced to 16,984 kg, about one-tenth of the production between 1975 and 1979. That is how the cotton industry has gone. It has almost disappeared during those years.

Mr. President, yams. In 1972 we were producing some 12,000 tons of yams; in 1979 we produced 5,909 tons. (Asides) In 1975 it was 6,609 tons. Mr. President, sweet potatoes in 1975 were 4,444 tons and in 1979 2,219 tons. Mr. President, vegetables - beans: in 1976 - 522,100 pounds. In 1979 - 297,959 pounds. (ASIDES) No, I will give you the information. It is Agro Stat, 1979 and it is put out by the Agricultural Planning Unit. I am just trying to draw to the other's attention certain areas of concern and this is where we should always be looking at.

The whole idea is not to score a political point. The whole idea is to see the direction how our agricultural policy has gone and to ask questions why our agricultural policy has gone in this direction, to find out from the present Government what is the present policy for non-sugar agriculture because we must realise that in an area where the import bill for food is closely approaching \$1 billion, the last figure I overheard, that one has to be very seriously concerned about any reduction in production of food crops etc. Therefore, it is not a matter of trying to see what source I am trying to score a political point. I think we should have reached a stage of maturity where our gravest concern would be the total development of our country regardless of who the Administration was at that particular time. That is not important, Mr. President. The important thing, Mr. President, is that I think that Agriculture has gone off course and I want to know from the replying Senator on the Other Side what is the policy of the present Administration to bring it back on course.

Mr. President, under the Head of the Ministry of Trade and Industry, there are a few things I want to have a look at under this Ministry now and the first one is the lack of a Price Control System in this Ministry. Mr. President, in an importing community like Barbados where you are importing most of your essential foods, you are not at the other end to have anything to do with the cost of production. Therefore, you cannot tell a farmer over there what he should sell his product at.

You cannot dictate to the Transport people what they should charge for transporting the food from wherever it is grown to Barbados. Therefore, Mr. President, you have very little control over the eventual c.i.f. cost of the goods, the cost of Insurance and Freight. The only area of control is the movement of those goods in your local market and that is the price which it receives by the importer and the price comes out to the retailer or eventually the customer.

I have heard contentions put forward that a Price Control Policy in Barbados was a failure. I do not agree with that contention at all. The counter argument is that you should allow market forces to pull the price of a commodity down. Let us be serious, Mr. President. In a small country like Barbados where there are well known cartels, where it is well known that there is an agreed Pricing Policy by the big importers, where is the competition to pull the prices down there. Therefore, it would mean that the only area of control is the fixing of a price to the consumer by the appropriate Ministry.

They have removed Price Control but what is the substitute? The substitute was a Government Information Service Programme in which you would hear, I believe it was about twice a week, that the following commodities are available at this place, at Goddard's at \$2.00 per lb., at Big B's \$2.55 per lb, at J.B.'s some place \$2.25 per lb. The objective apparently behind that programme was by way of public disclosure to force the dealers in these items to reduce their prices. Now, let us look at the folly of that whole exercise if you listen to the radio any particular night you would find that Big B would have two items out of six cheaper than Goddard's. Goddard's might have two out of six cheaper than Big B and somebody else will have the next two so in other words, a housewife in order to take advantage of these would have to drive around all day long from one store to another just to pick up coffee because it is cheaper, go to another place and pick up salt-fish because it is cheaper. Now when you are finished with that exercise, Mr. President, do you seriously believe that this is any alternative policy than a sensible Price Control Policy.

The Senator on the other side is saying that it is a failure and it is within my common knowledge that serious attempts are now being made to reconstruct the

Price Control Division and to reintroduce it. Therefore, I am saying that in that type of circumstance, in an importing community where you have no other say over the cost of goods to a consumer besides the local mark up that it is a Government's duty to ensure that that mark up policy is one that is fair to all persons concerned, a reasonable profit to the importer to cover his overhead in his projection so that it will get to the client at a reasonable price.

I would say, Mr. President, without any contradiction at all that that area has been seriously neglected and is responsible in no uncertain way for the increase in food stuff that we have noticed during the last four to five years, the phenomenal increases in foodstuff and those of us who take time out sometimes to go to the supermarkets will realise that sometimes on one item if you take off the price tag on the top the bottom of that price tag you will see that it was at a lower price. It shows the rapidity of movement in that area.

Under this particular Head, under the Ministry of Agriculture, and the next area of concern is that of the Veterinary Services available to the farmers in this country.

There is a very difficult problem to the peasant farmers to obtain veterinary services and even when they obtain the veterinary services from the veterinarians who are employed by Government, it is my knowledge that they also have to pay fairly high charges for these services. I would say that that is also another area where you should have a very serious look at, the provision of proper veterinary services to the peasant farmers of this country. We are encouraging the improvement in our dairy herd, we are encouraging and we are near self sufficiency in the poultry industry, I would say that whatever steps have to be taken, I realise that the veterinary surgeons are very limited people and that they are not readily available, but those that are available should be within a reasonable reach for charges to peasants irregardless of what way their remuneration is worked out, it should not be a drain on the peasant farmers for paying for veterinary services.

Mr. President, under the same Ministry on Fisheries department, I would say too Mr. President that this is another area which needs very serious attention paid to it, since statistics that are available show that there has been a considerable drop off in the fish available to this country, for whatever reasons. You would have to look at it. Flying fish Mr. President is the only one which seems to have more or less kept pace. In 1975 about 2 063 tons were landed, in 1979, there was a slight improvement 2 119 tons. If you look at the other subheads though Mr. President, you will find that we had not been bringing in a lot of the other fish in this country. Dolphin in 1976 we landed 1 208 tons, in 1979 it dropped to 1 000 tons.

If you have a look at Bill fish you will see that in 1976, we brought in 420 tons of billfish, in 1979 there was only 261 tons. If you look at the overall thing, you will see Mr. President that there has not been a lot, if any at all, improvement in the fishing industry in this country.

I would say that in an area where there is a scarcity of proteins, proteins from meat is becoming very expensive that everything should be done to encourage this protein source, namely fish and the Fishing Industries Department should provide a further incentive to improve our fishing and allow us to benefit from the seas around us.

Mr. President, if you look at Head 37, Ministry of Communications and Works, under this Head, Mr. President my main concern here is the atrocious public transport system available to the users of the system. It is a well-known fact that this system has gone down hill and I wonder if a lot of us have seriously considered the social implications of a bad transport system. If you pass on mornings on your way down and you see the number of people, workers at bus poles who cannot get to work and you thought of the total number of man hours that have been lost in production due to this faulty transport system, I think it is very short sighted not to make whatever funds and management expertise that is necessary available to the Transport Board to correct this because a cost benefit analysis will show that the increase in production in the public sector, the private sector that addition to the Gross Domestic Produce will more than offset any subsidy that you will be putting to improve the transport system. (ASIDE). Mr. President, you do not have to do an analysis to realise this.

If the Honourable Senator on the Other Side took any notice of the number of people, I make a note of looking at it, there are many sites in the country, if the people do not have their own individual transport, they have to close work earlier than they should in order to get transport to their homes and that is a loss of production hours. It concerns me because I am from a rural parish and I pass on mornings, unfortunately I cannot do any more personally, I see so many children, particularly school children on the road waiting many hours to get to their jobs, or to get to their schools. I have tried it on more than one occasion, I have waited one afternoon over on the district highway 4B from 2.30 p.m. an afternoon until 5.30 p.m. for a bus and you know what had happened at that time, you saw numerous buses going up and then, they were coming back down, they were not stopping because they were going back to the depot at Mangrove. When I inquired the scheduling was such that they were supposed to be working what you call the school routes and as soon as they had done

the last trip at 3.00 o'clock they finish for the day and those buses are going into the depot and leaving hundreds of people at bus stops, who have worked a whole day and are now trying to get home to their families and to whatever recreation is available to them, and they have to wait hours upon hours.

In the longer routes, it is more frustrating because the mini buses are not available, the mini buses do not go up to the long routes, the mini buses go into the shorter routes that are a lot more lucrative. Therefore, I think it is incumbent upon the Government to provide these out districts with a proper transport service. I do not know what is the solution, but I am saying whatever financial, and physical human resources is necessary must be applied to the Transport Board. It is a human problem, go to the bus stands on afternoons, I think that some of us should do it and you would appreciate the plight of the working people more than we do. Go to the bus stand any afternoon and you will see the almost jungle like attitude and it would make your heart bleed if you have a little human sympathy for people who are less fortunate than you all. The Honourable Senator is telling me now that you have to make a study to know that you need that?

Under the same Head, Transport, Mr. President, it has been said already and I would just repeat it that the quality of our roads are now at the stage where it is going to be very costly to reinstate them. There was a policy once and I believe it is still operational in a small way, where a cantaneer was responsible for a mile of road and it was his responsibility to upkeep that particular section with assistance from a particular depot when he needed. It is true that at that time the road did not carry the type of traffic, but what was the good point about that system is that whenever there was a small defect in the road, he never allowed it to get out of hand, it was immediately repaired and therefore it was an idea of maintenance before you got to the stage where you needed overall surgery in most of the cases.

I am saying that you might have to have a serious look to see what type of machinery you are going to make available to the Ministry of Communications and Works for the upkeep of the roads because once again, what you find is if you allow the roads to get too bad, the cost of repairs is certainly a lot more expensive, than the cost of upkeep and these social services costs must build up.

If I may refer back to the Transport Board for a moment Mr. President, I am going to touch on an area which is very tricky and which sometimes annoys a lot of politicians, but I think that too many of us engaged in politics are creating problems for ourselves, and I will tell you why. Two weeks ago I saw that 71 conductors and drivers were about to be disciplined because they did not

turn up for work on a Sunday, and when I enquired I discovered two things. One, that there were no overtime rates being paid to these drivers and conductors, and two, which is even more fundamental, that there were large numbers of people employed at the Transport Board who are Seventh Day Adventists, and from the time they go for their appointments they make it known specifically that it is against their religion to work on Saturdays, and they are employed with this understanding. It is my understanding that they are not asked to work on Saturdays. If this is not true, I would be glad if anyone who has accurate information can make it available to me, but this is my information. This has triggered a reaction from the people who worship on Sundays, that if the Adventists do not get disciplined for not working on Saturdays why should they be disciplined if they do not work on Sundays.

Now, the point that is also very, very ticklish, and I say it is bad, I have known that a few people have applied to the Transport Board for employment and on more than one occasion they were told to go and bring a letter from their representative. Do you know what this has resulted in? There is a young man whom I know quite well who drives a Transport Board bus, and the only thing this young man has not licked up so far is a box cart. He crashed a bicycle, a motor cycle, a motor car, a van, and believe it or not, with that type of driving history he is employed by the Transport Board. I saw that young man one day on the St. Patrick's route and you would not believe that he was driving a bus. He had his driver's cap on with the peak behind, and this bus which was fully loaded was going up St. Patrick's as recklessly as you would never believe. Now, a simple thing like this shows that there is absolutely no sense of responsibility on the part of that person, and I am saying that the high accident rate at the Transport Board is a direct result of the recruitment policy of the Transport Board.

I have travelled on Transport Board buses on more than one occasion. Very often I do it for two reasons. One, it sometimes is more convenient to have my personal transport loaned to somebody who might be doing some work for me, and two, I think that those of us in public life must know how the masses operate, what is available to the masses, and I would only invite some of them to share the services that are available to the masses and they would be a lot more appreciative.

You get on these buses and sometimes you find that the conductors are less than courteous to you. You look at it too. Another very bad habit they have, and this is what the people in Environment should look at, you are driving behind a Transport Board bus and every now and again you see coming out of the bus like missiles, snow-cone cups all across the road. There is no policy at the moment that forbids people from eating and drinking

and disposing their cups on the Transport Board buses. It is most disgusting, and I think that small things like these, like management problems, need to be looked at at the Transport Board. This is nothing that any of us takes any pride in, because this is a service that all of us at some time would use, our families would use it, our relatives would use it, and it is only natural that if you have the love of Barbados first that you would appreciate and look to improve. I am saying that the Transport Board problem is a human problem, and when you look at the management structure of the Transport Board you see that the Transport Board has no management structure. Those of you who are in management, or even looked at a management book would know this. There are 1,700 people employed there.....(ASIDES) I still think that this is a case.....(ASIDES).

Mr. PRESIDENT: Order, please.

SENATOR N. W. BOXILL: On a point of order, Sir.

Mr. PRESIDENT: I trust you are not going to make another Second Reading speech.

SENATOR N. W. BOXILL: Not at this stage, but according to the regulations I think I can, Sir, on a point of order.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Or according to what I say. What is it you are rising on?

SENATOR N. W. BOXILL: On a point of elucidation.

Mr. PRESIDENT: On your speech? Proceed, Senator Franklin. Let us have some order, I am not standing any nonsense.

SENATOR W.O. FRANKLIN: Thank you, Mr. President. Back to the Transport Board. It is within my knowledge, Mr. President, that the maintenance on those buses is absolutely horrible. I have driven in a few of them that had no seats, but what is even more alarming, and I think it is only when we have a fatality of the limit that we had some years ago as we had down at Lancaster that we are going to be more careful. You talk to any of the drivers, Mr. President, and they will tell you that three out of every ten buses that they are forced to carry on the road have faulty braking systems. Mr. President, I realise that there is a shortage of rolling stock, but how can one be that callous? I have spoken to the drivers and they say when they report that the braking system is deficient, the only reply they get is that they do not want to work, and that they should carry out the bus. Therefore, on many occasions they have buses on the road — I would risk to bet you now, Mr. President, that right now at any one hour if a census was made of every bus operated by the Transport Board upon the road, and they were tested, you would find not less than

three out of every ten are not fit to be transporting passengers.

I hope, Mr. President, I sincerely hope that the authorities will not wait until the day when one of them plunges down a precipice with all the lives in it, to take a very serious look at it. (ASIDE). Mr. President, I will not deal any longer with that, I just say it is my sincere hope that it does not occur. This is why when I looked at the Capital Estimates for \$3.4 million for the Transport Board and compared it with \$14 million for Defence and Security, it was not because I have anything against Defence and Security, but it is because I think that the emphasis is wrong, totally wrong, Mr. President. We need to have a look at it. Look at Housing, more money for that. Back to the Transport Board, it got so bad that there was even cannibalising of chassis, new brand chassis that were brought here for bodies to be put on by Acme. Some of them were cannibalised, parts were taken, tyres were taken off them to put on buses that were operating. You go up to Mangrove and you will see them there at Mangrove, new brand chassis from which tyres were taken off to put on buses. Some of them are rotting in the rain because for some reason or the other the Acme people had stopped producing bodies, but I understand that they have gone back now.

My only thing on this, Mr. President, is to let the resources that are necessary for the improvement of our bus service be made available to the Transport Board. If you need, as it is obvious, to strengthen your management structure, do that; if you need to increase your rolling stock, do that; if you need to provide better physical conditions in the workshop, do that; but whatever is needed, let the public be able to get to and from work and school at reasonable times to add to the productivity of this country.

Mr. President, Head 38 — Ministry of Education and Culture. There are only two small areas under this Head that I wanted to talk about and it is one dealing with the provision of uniforms for the kids which has now turned out to be a grant of \$100. My bone of contention may be a small one, but it is significant. We have children in this community who take the 11+ examination and it is a well known fact that those who are not successful in gaining admission to what they call the older secondary schools are looked down on and there are some serious pressures brought to bear on these little kids, and they begin to feel that they are failures. My plea is not to let them feel further that they are failures by not extending the \$100 to them as well. If they are leaving the 11+ system and going to the all age schools, let them have the \$100 if that is what you are giving to them as well, because you cannot continue to make them feel inferior. The parents are down on them already because they have failed, and to give those who have gained admission \$100 for uniform and forget those who have not gained admission and are going on to the all age schools, I think

is further giving them a sense of inferiority complex. It is a small thing, it cannot cost a great deal of money, so please introduce this as soon as you can.

Schools meals have been talked about already, but there is only one little area that I want to touch on. It was said that there is nobody in the Government Service now who is getting less than \$500 a month. The maids are getting that. I was a little bit surprised when I examined these Estimates to see that the school meals assistants are now getting \$5,064 a year or \$422 a month. Certainly I think this is an oversight on somebody's part, and I think it should be corrected as soon as possible because you have gone on record as saying that nobody in the Government Service gets less than \$500. I know the maids get that because if you look at the schedule you would see that the last one is around \$500 a month. This is the Z scale — \$5,064 a year. This is in Appendix "C" on page 17. Unless there is a clerical error, you will see that that works out to \$422 a month.

Now I am dealing with the topic, Mr. President, there is one other area that had slipped me which I must refer to, and that is our industrial estates. I have noticed quite rightly that the Senator on the other side who is Minister of Labour has pronounced a policy of a minimum wage for domestics. I am not sure what it is. One section of the media said \$65 and another said \$75 a week. As a matter of information I would be glad if the Minister would tell me which it is because it is going to bring out the point I am going to speak on now.

SENATOR THE HON. D. G. BLACKMAN: If the hon. member would give way.....

Mr. PRESIDENT: This is a bit irregular, surely. If you have a point to make, make it and then the Minister will answer when he is speaking.

SENATOR W. O. FRANKLIN: Thank you, Mr. President. In our industrial estates, Mr. President, where we have been spending vast sums of money in the promotion of industry, I am certain that the Minister of Labour is aware that there are still certain industries paying \$45 a week, and I think it is absolutely necessary for something to be done about this. I will give you an example of what I mean. I was discussing with a worker in one of these estates the work situation, and I was told that during one week they were put on a piece production rate in a garment section, and she made \$128 for that week which the factory owners figured was far too much money for a worker. They immediately stopped the piece work from the next week and reverted to the weekly pay of \$78, but the girl was still expected to produce the same amount of garments for which she was paid \$128 a week on the piece rate. That is the type of behaviour you are getting in these industries. The industries are costing us money. We are providing in most

cases the physical plant, it costs us money in promotion to bring them here and you get that type of behaviour being displayed by the owners of those industries. I would be very glad if the Minister in reply could give me an indication of the net gain in employment in the industry. By net gain I mean the new jobs created, minus those that were lost by factories being closed or by dismissing girls in the industry, because I think we have to have a very serious look at our IDC programme.

Mr. President, we are providing all types of incentives, we are providing physical plant and sometimes the employers do not want their staff to be unionised. They pay them the minimum amount of money they can, a lot smaller than the amount that is being propounded for domestic people. They work for long hours sometimes in conditions that are not suitable for anybody to work in, and when it comes to the end of their tax free period, they pack up or change their name or change the scheduling structure with one or two other people still maintaining some interest for the original people. That is an area we will have to have a very serious look at.

Under Education and Culture, I am glad to see that some emphasis is now being placed on the elementary education in this country. Some of the physical stock has long got to the stage where it is not conducive to good work. There are still one or two areas of complaint particularly in the provision of textbooks for the elementary schools. It is within my knowledge that there are few schools which have not got their quota of books over the last couple of years. I have already talked about the provision of the \$100 for those going on to the all age schools. Whatever is necessary should be done for improving the school meals programme once again, and that leads us back to the secondary schools which we now find divided into what is commonly known as the older and the newer secondary schools. Mr. President, some bold steps need to be taken very soon in this situation of the secondary schools.

We have a historical background of what is more commonly known as the Older Secondary Schools in which quite naturally there is a preference by most people for, which sometimes result in children travelling long hours on the bus, taking one and two buses. You will find the boy living in St. Philip and going all the way down to Coleridge and Parry. He has to take a bus to town and then has to take one from town to Coleridge and Parry. Not only is it expensive in energy and time but it is also expensive that when that child comes in at night he is quite tired and cannot usually do his homework as he should. The whole idea of Zoning has been talked about for a little while and it is one that very serious consideration would have to be paid to.

I believe it is a chicken and a hen situation. What are you going to do? Are you going to provide the pupils first and then include your human resources and your physical stock or you are going to do it the other way. You are going to improve your physical stock and then improve the human resources. I think we should have a serious look at improving the physical stock at more of these Newer Secondary Schools.

I notice in the Capital Estimates that provision is made for some of them, for one or two. I would be very glad when the new Education Act comes about to remedy these slight differences in the way of Management, one by the Board which has a kind of autonomy and the other one by an Advisory type of Board. We need to work on this very, very fast because I think that the Educational system would be better served in the country if we have an upgrading of these Newer Secondary Schools and prevent the movement of our children over these large distances which is not only costly on the Transport system but it is also costly on the people and parents as well.

Mr. President, under Education there is the Industrial School which my colleague spoke about which I hope that the recommendations of the Committee will be implemented as soon as possible on that particular one. That, Mr. President, deals with the Educational one.

Mr. President, the next Head I would have a quick look at is the Ministry of Health and National Insurance. On that particular Head, Mr. President, I am not going to spend anytime on the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. We all know the problems that have been aired in the Other Place on the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. There is only one section that I need to draw the attention of the Senators on the Other Side to and it has to do with the Animal Control Division.

Mr. President, it has been drawn to my attention that the Animal Control Division which is now used in the Section of the old Lazaretto Compound seems to be posing a bit of a problem. What has happened there is that the School of Education was down there as well as the Archives Division and within more recent times there has been the Old Peoples' Home down there in the same compound and then even more recently, the Animal Control Unit has been placed right in that compound as well.

The problem that seems to be arising down there is the proximity of sometimes diseased animals before they are exterminated; with the Old Peoples' Home in that area. Not only that but I was made to understand that the policy of getting rid of these animals is to gas them and then they are burned in an oven which is seriously affecting the Archives Division, the School of

Education, and more particularly, the Old Peoples' Home.

I think that is an area that we need to look at because these old people quite naturally are at the stage where their resistance to illness would be quite low and you are bringing in animals, some of them could well be diseased animals, into that compound and there is some period before they are put away and one has to be very careful that this does not create a health problem for the people in the Old Peoples' Home down there.

I think it was a matter that the Animal Control Division was very badly placed. It had no right in that type of complex where you had already existing those offices which I have drawn to your attention, the School of Education, the Archives and the Old Peoples' Home and I think that some speedy action should be taken in removing that. It does not fit in to the overall development of that area. Remove all from that area as soon as possible before you have a health problem being created in that area.

Under this Head, Mr. President, the one I want to deal with a little bit more thoroughly is the one with the Sanitation Authority. If you travel, Mr. President, on Highway 5 from just a little West of Windsor Road to Brighton, you will find that that is one of the filthiest streets anywhere in Barbados and the reason that it is so is that trucks going up to the land fill more often than not, open trucks, going up that road and you have all types of garbage flying from these open trucks at the side of the road and in the process of time that area has now become a very disgraceful and distressing area to drive through and I think that some Regulation has to be enforced.

I have even seen a truck going up the road from one of the houses that prepare chickens and it had feathers and one or two other residues of the chicken and it was an open truck going up that road and it has made that road a very filthy road. You get the same problem going up the road leading to the Airport because these are mainly the two roads they use going to the land fill. One or two of the trucks will have a net and in most cases the nets are in bad condition and the nets cannot hold in anything on the trucks and they are seen going up the road with the garbage flying all over the road. Mr. President, that is an area that needs urgent attention and I would invite the Senator on the Other Side to draw this to the attention of the Minister of Health.

One other area which is one that bothers me a lot as a whole is a lot of dead animals that you find on the roads. I do not know the policy on this but I have seen Sanitation Trucks pass and they have seen these

dead animals on the road. I understand that they are only certain trucks that are allocated to collecting these animals but I would think that if they had a certain pride that they would report this back to the appropriate Authority that there is a particular dead animal at a certain place and it would be removed.

I know that I on occasion have drawn to the authorities' attention the existence of a dead animal at some part of the road. It takes some time, sometimes it reaches the stage, where it begins to create not only a health hazard but a nuisance. More and more you are seeing it on the highways and I do not think that this is so big a problem. It needs to have a special, or small unit to carry out this type of function, I do not think that you would need more than one truck or two to service the entire island in this particular area.

In the papers about two, or three days ago, it was brought home to me even more forcibly with the idea of the carcass of a cow somewhere in the Bank Hall, Bush Hall area which was allowed to reach the stage that it was decaying and nobody even came in from the Health Authorities to take care of this. I think this is an area that we need to have some clear directive of who is responsible, if you call in and you should have some type of units available for that type of thing.

Mr. President, under the Ministry of Housing, Lands and the Environment. Mr. President the more recent legislation passed in the Lower House and this Upper House making chattel mortgages available would immediately aggravate the problem existing in the housing situation in Barbados of service lots for people to put units on. Records in the National Housing will show that there is quite a long list of people who have applied for service lots and have not been able to be served from the existing amount available under the Ministry of Housing, Lands and the National Housing Corporation. This list is going to go even further with the availability of a mortgage scheme to people for the construction of chattel houses and I think that it is imperative that the National Housing Corporation should embark on a serious sites and service programme and in this programme, Mr. President, it should be as well that not only should they provide sites and services, but where it is needed by the people who are going to site the unit, they should provide a water borne sewerage system for the people who will ultimately be leased the lots, or better still be sold the lots.

This brings me, Mr. President to the much talked about tenancies programme by this present Administration and I think it is necessary to give some historical background to the programme as it now is because in the absence of historical background, the present Administration seems to think, as sometimes they want to that all things started in 1976. Mr.

President, if you would cast your mind back to the era before the Tenantry Control Bill you would well remember the sight on Sunday morning of a truck moving a chattel house from one spot to the next because of that lack of security of tenure which existed at that time. It was as a direct result of this lack of security of tenure that the Tenantry Control and Development Bill was introduced.

The objective of that Bill, Mr. President was that wherever there are six, or more units on a parcel of land that parcel was declared a tenantry and it was well nigh impossible after that for the owner of that tenantry to make the tenants remove, as long as they paid their rents which were regulated and any increase had to be taken to a magistrate and it was with the advent of this Bill that one saw the dramatic improvement in the housing stock in the wooden type house particularly in the plantation estates. You saw with that Bill, the wall backs starting to go up in plantation estates replacing the wood and with the wall back the introduction of a water borne sewerage system.

During the time Mr. President that I functioned in the Barbados Government as Commissioner of Valuation, I was Chairman of a Committee appointed by the then Honourable Minister of Lands, myself, the Chief Town Planner the Housing Officer at that time, Mr. Redman, Mr. Delbert Bannister from the Ministry of Communications and Works, Mr. Casper Springer at that time was with Town Planning. We were charged with the responsibility of making a detailed analysis of all plantation tenancies and to prepare a report for the better use of those lands. We went about Mr. President on this Report by using the Land Valuation Index and maps that were available and we identified every single plantation tenantry at that time in the island and the information we sought was the size of the tenantry, the number of houses in the tenantry, the number of agricultural holdings, its proximity to roads, water and electricity and the approximate age span of the people.

From this information, we then divided the tenancies into three categories. Category One was the tenantry that was too far away from existing infra-structural work, where it would have been more costly to provide the upgrading of these services, water and electricity than to resite the people. Category Two were those tenancies that there was some type of infra-structure available, but they needed improving and Category Three where there was none, or little of the available infra-structure by way of roads, water, electricity. The intention of this programme, Mr. President was that after the information was available to do one of two things. The plantation owners would have been approached and an appeal made to their civic conscience that in consideration of the long services rendered by the people on plantations and sometimes

their fore parents that these lots should be made available to them free of cost.

In the case that we met those who did not have this type of social conscience, negotiations would have been opened on acquiring at what would have been a sensible price. It was at this stage, Mr. President that Administrations were changed. The Tenancies Bill, Mr. President is now well-known, the aims and objects of the Tenancies Bill.

I will say there are one or two areas that some serious consideration should be given to, and the first that comes to my mind is the fact that the stipulated area allocated to a house is some 3,000 square feet. I have not worked it out in metres, but 3,000 square feet is approximately 50 by 60, which in the first instance is a lot size that is discouraged by Town Planning. Town Planning has been discouraging lot sizes smaller than 4,000 square feet, and I find it a little alarming that the unit of measurement adopted for this programme should be one below the required minimum allocated by Town Planning.

Be that as it may, the problem attached to this is that in most cases there is a bit of agricultural land attached to the house spots that the people have been using for subsistence farming, and because no clear policy or directive has been issued about what is to be done with this additional land, we find that it is now left for the tenant after he has been allocated his 3,000 square feet to open negotiations with the plantation owner for any amount in excess of 3,000 square feet.

Mr. President, this is going to pose a problem for some of these tenants, because let us suppose that you meet one of the owners of this land without a civic consciousness and a tenant has 8,000 square feet, 3,000 on which he has his house and 5,000 on which he has been growing a couple of canes or a couple of yams, and he is not able to negotiate a reasonable price with the plantation. Now, hopefully this would not occur very often, but it is sure to happen on a few occasions. That, I think, Mr. President, is something that needs to be looked at. It is wrong. I would think that the policy should have extended to the existing area held by the tenant, and if need be there should be some machinery that the Government has a say in that would negotiate or fix a price on the additional area. Once again I would like the Senator on the other side to draw that observation to the appropriate Ministry so that they would not wait until the problem pops up and there would be no administrative machinery to deal with it.

Another problem, Mr. President, is this. Wherever you go in these tenancies the question is being asked, quite rightly, when and how soon will these infrastructures be improved, because there is a very

close connection between acquiring a freehold in a property and expecting that that freehold in a property, particularly a residential property that is well serviced. I know that the Ministry of Communications and Works has been charged with providing a phased development programme for these tenancies, but I am saying that this in the long run, the total cost of that unit to the people by way of their direct amount they pay and by way of an indirect amount paid out on their behalf by the Government for services is going to be quite a sizeable amount of money.

I do not know if those of you who are in rural areas are picking up the feeling by some that with the present rents being so ridiculously low, why should they incur, even though it might appear to be a small amount of \$300, why should they go into this expense and immediately start to pay taxes on the property that is now theirs, when they had been enjoying this privilege for very small rents, sometimes 10 and 15 cents a month. This is one of the things that have been going on for a little while.

Mr. President, the next Head I want to have a look at is Labour and Social Services. Inasmuch as it would be stated that we should steer clear of this Head, my observations on this Head I hope will only lead to a better understanding, a better functioning Department, and I start with an observation.

The Welfare Department, Mr. President, seems to be going through a developmental period in which the present Minister carrying responsibility for it feels that there are certain functions that would be better administered by Statutory Bodies and not by the Central Administration, not the Welfare Department. In pursuance of this policy, we see that the National Assistance Board, which comes under Subhead 14, is being provided with the sum of \$939,029, and the explanatory note says: "Provides an annual subvention to the National Assistance Board, which was established by the National Assistance Act, Cap. 48. The Board has responsibility for administering the Housing and Welfare programme, the Senior Citizens Home Help and Day Care Programme and Senior Citizens Homes."

Mr. President, if you look under the Schedule of Personal Emoluments that goes with this Head, you will see that under the Welfare Department you have a staff structure of a Chief Welfare Officer, one Deputy Chief Welfare Officer, three Senior Welfare Officers and 23 Welfare Officers, plus supporting administrative staff of one Executive Officer, one Accountant, one Assistant Accountant, etc.

It is my information, Mr. President, that the senior professional staff of the Welfare Department are trained social welfare workers and you find that they

are responsible for about \$28,000 which is the vote under Subhead 10. (Asides) The appropriate Minister seems to be in quite a big hurry about this, Mr. President, but I am not in a hurry. It is my information, Mr. President, that it is the intention of the present Minister to have the foster care programme administered by the National Assistance Board. (Asides) Mr. President, it is that exact type of behaviour.....

Mr. PRESIDENT: All right, let me deal with the behaviour.

SENATOR W. O. FRANKLIN: It is that exact type of behaviour that has caused Mr. D. D. Garner who has offered tremendous service to this country to be personally abused last Thursday in a manner not becoming the office he would carry by the supervisor of the home help programme on whom Mr. Garner, Mr. Felton Weekes and the executive officer were in the process of serving a letter.

SENATOR THE HON. D. G. BLACKMAN: On a point of order, the Honourable Senator seems to be saying that I in some way am responsible for an alleged altercation which took place between the supervisor of the home help programme last Thursday afternoon and Mr. Garner. If he is saying this, Mr. President, I am asking you to ask the hon. member to withdraw.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Just before this thing gets a little bit out of hand, surely the correct procedure if something of that nature occurred would be for the hon. member to draw it to the attention of the relevant either Minister of supervising authority and have the matter cleared up and only after that bring it before this body. Isn't that the usual thing?

SENATOR W. O. FRANKLIN: Mr. President, thanks very much and I accept your advice.

Mr. President, all I am seeking to do in this debate as I have done all along is to try to bring some reasonable approach to the administration of Government business in a way that the masses would benefit most. I have been doing this either successfully or otherwise until I have got to this head. Mr. President, it is common knowledge that there have been some uncomfortable relationships existing between the members of the Welfare Department and the Minister responsible for that department which resulted in the work stoppage and picketing at the Government Buildings for one day.

Mr. President, there seems to be a new type of feeling running through some of the present administrators of public business that the presidential type of administration should be done here in Barbados. We have known and have been fortunate in that the

civil servants of Barbados have in general been recognised to be mostly efficient, and whatever you may say, they do their work regardless of whatever administration is in power. I am certain that a lot of the present administrators of Government would agree that in the civil service of Barbados they have had ample support and back-up services. This present Minister responsible for the Welfare Department obviously does not think very much of the quality of the staff and the way that they have been performing, and this was actually uttered in public, and there was a reaction by the appropriate people in the department. Resulting from this reaction, Mr. President, a few things came to light. Under the National Assistance Regulations people are not allowed to be drawing both old age pension and national assistance. It was discovered that in the constituency of St. Thomas there was an unusually large number of people, over 100 or so, receiving both of these benefits. The officer at the time quite rightly after investigation drew this to the attention of the Chief Welfare Officer. The Chief Welfare Officer following the regulations laid down instructed the officer that wherever it was proved that this was the case, they should be removed from the old age pension list.

The officer, Mr. President, proceeded to do this and it appeared as if it came to the attention of the representative of that parish who at the time happened to be..... (Asides).

Mr. PRESIDENT: I am going to allow the Minister in due course to reply to any allegations which concern him in this Ministry, so you finish your speech.

SENATOR W. O. FRANKLIN: Mr. President, as I was saying, verbal instructions were issued to stop taking off any more from the roll, and rightly, Mr. President, the officer.....

SENATOR THE HON. D. G. BLACKMAN: On a point of order, Mr. President, I am the Minister responsible for the administration of national assistance under section (1) of the National Assistance Act, Cap. 48, and I repeat, the Act confers upon me full responsibility for administering national assistance.

The Senator has indicated that verbally, now I do not know they were written or oral since verbal instructions maybe written or oral, where given as a result of an intervention by a representative of the parish of St. Thomas to discontinue what he said the illegal practice of having persons receive both National Assistance and National Insurance Pensions.

Now, since such instructions can only emanate from me, is he saying that I gave instruction to violate

the Law, Mr. President? If so, I want an unqualified withdrawal or let him prove it to this Chamber.

SENATOR N. W. BOXILL: Mr. President.....

Mr. PRESIDENT: Just a minute. Senator Boxill, please be seated. I will conduct this Meeting in accordance with the Rules. I am satisfied that the response that the Minister is making would be more suitable to his Second Reading Speech and I would suggest that although he is seeking to stop a mis-apprehension or a mis-representation at this stage, it would be much better for him to deal fully with the allegations at a later stage.

Will you please continue Senator Franklin and finish your point. Order, please.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: On a point of order, Mr. President. Sir, I would like to draw your attention to Standing Order No. 34 concerning Contents of Speeches because it would seem to me and under Section 5 he is not supposed to impute improper motives to any member of either House, then it must be improper for a Senator to suggest that another Senator has been guilty of deliberately infringing a Statute that he is called by Law to carry out.

I think therefore that I am on an appropriate point of order because where are we going from here?

Mr. PRESIDENT: That is a point of order but the point is that the Senator in question said this. My impression was that when Senator Blackman intervened, he wanted to get it clear whether that is what he had intended to say or not. I did not hear the Senator say that. I said before that the intervention was allowable to clear the atmosphere in case such an allegation is being made but that the consequences of any such allegation or the development in relation to the incidences that were mentioned could be dealt with fully by the Minister in his Second Reading Speech.

I have not understood, so far at any rate, that Senator Franklin has accused directly the Minister of doing something. He said something about verbal instructions being given and when Senator Blackman intervened was to ask who he was suggesting gave those verbal instructions. I have not had a response to that.

SENATOR W. O. FRANKLIN: Mr. President, I worked in the Barbados Civil Service for quite sometime and unlike what the Minister responsible seems to be thinking, my general observations are motivated by one objective only and that is to make sure that we do not develop in Barbados the feeling in the Permanent Staff Establishment that their job security is at any state at anytime and that they are subject to be removed by way

of a transfer as the Minister openly said or is alleged to have said or anywhere involving with that kind of thing.

Mr. President, I was saying. The present policy pursued by this Ministry is to remove from the Central Administration certain areas of National Assistance, namely, the Housing Welfare which has been up sometimes, the Senior Citizens in the Day Care Programme and the Senior Citizens' Home. I do not think, Mr. President, that there is a lot of information available to a lot of people on the Senior Citizens' Home Help Programme.

I would like, Mr. President, since it seems to be a very contentious point with the Minister, if you for the enlightenment of the other Senators in his reply he would give the disposition on the working of that Programme particularly, Mr. President. I will tell you what, Mr. President, is going through my mind. We have known, Mr. President, that the Administration under Boards usually is not as tight as under the Central Government. We have seen that earlier when we talked about the functioning of the Transport Board. We can go through the Government Departments and see a lot of Boards that are not functioning effectively therefore, one has to think twice when you see that a new Programme or that efforts are being made to remove.....

Mr. PRESIDENT: I cannot follow if members keep interrupting.

SENATOR W. O. FRANKLIN: Mr. President, with your permission I would like to take a break for refreshment and then I will start in five minutes.

Mr. PRESIDENT: No, no. I am the one who dictates. Order, please. The person who dictates Sittings and Suspensions is the person who is occupying the Chair and who happens to be me at the moment. Proceed with your speech until I feel it is due for us to suspend.

SENATOR W. O. FRANKLIN: Thank you, Mr. President. Mr. President, I am saying that it is because of the present Administrative structure of this Citizens Home Help Programme that we have had two distasteful episodes within recent times and the episode, Mr. President, the one to which I referred earlier involving the Chairman of the National Assistance Board, resulted from the fact that the recruitment policy of these Home Help Aids were carried out under the direct supervision only of the Assistance Board and there seem to be some conflict of interest or there existed since I am informed that the Supervisor of the Programme is no longer operative, there existed some conflict of interest between the Supervisor of that Programme and

the staff which resulted, Mr. President, in some ugly occasions.

Mr. President, what I am saying is that I have seen that in recent times there has been an Advertisement for Welfare Workers in the Newspapers and it is my understanding that the former Deputy Chief Welfare Officer has now been appointed — I do not know if he is a permanent appointee or not — to work with the National Assistance Board to administer this programme.

All I am seeking to do Mr. President is to find out whether or not this fragmentation by removing or not placing certain functions under the Chief Welfare Officer is to the betterment of the community.

Mr. President, in summary, I would say that when we examine the Estimates in its totality and we look at the revenue, how it was collected and realise that there has been a shift in public financing to Indirect Taxation away from Direct Taxation and we note that there has been a decrease in the percentage spent on social services, one can only conclude that the overall effect of the Estimates would be that the masses are paying more and receiving less. This can be seen by the fact that they are now paying more bus fare than they paid in 1976, they were paying twenty-five cents then and now they are paying forty-five cents for an inferior service.....

Mr. PRESIDENT: I would appeal to Members to keep order. I am the only person in here who has to listen to everything that is going on. Other Members can go and relax, smoke a cigarette and have a sleep. I am the only Member here who has to listen to everything and if I am being interrupted I cannot follow and may inadvertently miss something which may be very grievous to Members concerned. Please preserve order and let me follow the debate. Proceed.

SENATOR W. O. FRANKLIN: Thank you, Mr. President. There is now a situation, Mr. President where except the special cases as enunciated by the Honourable Minister of Health that where before you could obtain drugs, from the hospital free, you now have to pay for them. All of this, Mr. President would lead me to believe that nothing Mr. President in this Estimates has made it any better for the masses of the country.

Thank you.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Truss.

SENATOR A. TRUSS: Mr. President, Sir, I see the Summary of the Current Estimates for the year 1981-82 with Revenue estimated at \$483,726,736 and

the Expenditure \$469,161,361 with the excess of Current Revenue over Current Expenditure \$14,565,375.

When one looks back and sees where we have come from to reach this stage, I must say Sir, that I am very proud to be associated with the Government whose careful management of the very fragile economy has put us in the forefront of the Caribbean. We are respected internationally, as a small island that has allocated its resources properly over the last four and a half years. We should really consider Sir, what is being said about us.

From time to time, articles appear in the press, sometimes in the foreign press and sometimes in the local press and in this particular case, this article is written by Mr. Raymond Whittaker, Correspondent of the Financial Times of London. This is what he says about Barbados:

"The country's political stability and economic prosperity, its Gross Domestic Product at US\$22 million per capita puts it in the forefront among developing countries. It excites some envy among its Caribbean neighbours. The Government is headed by Prime Minister J. M. G. M. Adams and under its stewardship, he is also Minister of Finance. There has been four years of steady growth accelerated to seven percent in 1979."

He goes on to say; Sir:

"Of the 13 members of the Caribbean Community and the Common Market, Barbados recorded by far, the highest real economic growth in 1979, despite the oil wealth of Trinidad and Tobago and the bauxite resources of Jamaica and Guyana."

He continues to the end, Sir that:

"while many neighbouring Caribbean economies have been shipped in water, Barbados has notched up five consecutive years of real growth in GDP."

Mr. PRESIDENT: I think that you better make that a document of the House.

SENATOR A. TRUSS: I could, Sir. It was reproduced by the Advocate on 19th January, 1981 and I am prepared to make it a document of the House.

Sir, real GDP for the last year grew by three and a half percent which was not bad considering that the US economy as forecast sank into deep recession and it has faced a real negative growth of three quarters of one percent. When one considers that real growth in the United Kingdom declined by two and a quarter percent

and by three quarters of one percent in Canada and that growth in output in EEC countries slowed to a drawl, one point three percent, the performance of Barbados of three and a half percent over the last three years I think is commendable.

Senator Franklin said that there there was a move for the worse in collection of Revenues, as he outlined in his statistics which he compiled, as a comparison between 1975 as against 1980. He claimed that the masses are paying more and getting less and that they are getting less in social services. I do not quite agree with him. He has his point of view and I have mine, but the difference between our points of view is that I have the facts, which I am prepared to share with many of our Honourable Senators.

Sir, in highlights, if I give a brief revision of the tax rate structure of the successive Budgets of the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister over the last four years, you will see that the increase in the top rate of Income Tax from 65% to 75% was introduced, that is, affecting the people at the top. There was a grant of tax credit for persons earning \$6,000 a year or less. As a matter of fact, all those persons who earn \$90 weekly no longer pay any tax, some 30,000 Barbadians are now earning tax free money. The introduction of separate income tax assessment for working wives also was a way of helping the person who was at the lower rung of the economic ladder. Further changes Sir, such as the widening of the gap between the tax brackets were introduced by Prime Minister Adams which was strongly in favour of the taxpayer.

Now, he introduced the tax on premium incomes for insurance companies. Additionally from the operating year of 1977, companies were required to pay an additional five percent tax on profits, the total tax on firms is now 50% inclusive of the Corporation Tax.

Landlords must now pay tax on their rents. I am merely pointing out, Sir to you and to this Hon. Chamber that the Prime Minister in his Budgets has taxed those who are able to bear taxation and has given ease to those who cannot bear it. I am not saying that those at the top are not too heavily taxed, because it is said that Barbados is perhaps one of the most heavily taxed countries in the world, but I think if you run a country you must first consider who needs the tax benefits more, and in my opinion the Government is right to look at those at the bottom and try to redress the imbalance which has been created over the years and which has not been adjusted over the last 15 years of Democratic Labour Party rule.

Sir, by removing price controls from a number of items, in many cases there was a reduction in price, contrary to what Senator Franklin stated. I remember

only too well between 1971 and 1976 when Mr. Branford Taitt was Minister of Trade there was a licensing system. Not only was there no price control system but there was a licensing system and this licensing system created shortages and created a situation in the free market enterprise where you had to get Government's permission to bring in a number of commodities. As a result of that the demand sometimes was greater than the supply, consequently the price went up; simple economics.

I have here, Sir, some information which I collected on the licensing system. Between January and September 1st 1976 prior to the Labour Party coming into power, between that period January to September 9,226 licences were submitted and processed and 44 were turned down. You had to get a licence, Sir, for beef, for salt beef and pork, for soups, for prepared foods, for flour, for dried peas and beans, for salted fish, to name a few, and of the 9,226 licences that were applied for 44 were not granted, which meant that you had a Minister wasting his time going through licences, 9,226 to turn down 44. We abolished the system because it was futile, it was stupid, and it proved, Sir, that we were right so I do not think that prices today are any greater dollar for dollar. One must take inflation into consideration of course. People would remember the time that chicken cost \$1.80 a pound in 1976, today it costs \$2.50, but they do not remember that in 1976 a Government's maid earned \$44 a week and today she earns \$119 a week, so if you have to pay 50 cents more for a pound of chicken and you are earning three times as much as you were earning in 1976, when wages can go up faster than prices, that too, Sir, is what you must look at, you cannot deal in isolation with prices because everything is relative.

Again, Sir, in the Prime Minister's Budget Speech there was an imposition of an employment levy of 2½% tax on the payroll. This was a stimulus for the creation of employment for youth. Mr. Barrow himself in a speech in 1976 after he had lost the Government said that over 10,000 youths were unemployed and this was particularly the reason why he thought he had lost. Here again is a Government who is conscious of the people at the bottom, an attempt was made in every Budget Speech to try to redress that imbalance. The abolition of the 5% sales tax came about in 1976 because, Sir, that was a regressive tax. This was a tax which proved beyond the shadow of a doubt to be harder on the person who was earning the smaller amount of money. For example, if a person wanted to buy a fridge for \$1,000, the 5% on \$1,000 if that person was only working for \$100 a week, meant more on his salary than a person who was working for \$1,000 a month. In that sense the 5% tax was a very regressive tax.

The Government for the first time in an unprecedented move loaned the Barbados Workers' Union \$1 million for the construction of homes for workers of the Barbados Workers' Union, the Democratic Labour Party never did that, even though the Barbados Workers' Union is very closely associated with the Democratic Labour Party. We did it, putting politics aside because it is something that we thought was necessary.

The tightening up, Sir, of provisions and regulations concerning property tax in 1977. Here again the people at the bottom of the ladder do not own property, these are the people who are hardest hit, so when Senator Franklin says that this is where you are raising the money, I do not think he is right, because if you introduce laws to tighten up the provisions and regulations concerning property tax, we are hitting the people who are property owners and we are taxing those persons.

The Landlord and Tenant (Registration of Tenancies) Act. Anyone who is renting premises has to be registered. Before 1976 you could afford to rent your place, of the rent that was collected there was no supervision so you never paid any taxes. We changed all of that by creating this Act in 1977, the Landlord and Tenant (Registration of Tenancies) Act. Anyone who rents a property that does not give the tenant a book, because you must have two books, the landlord must have a book and the tenant must have one, and if you do not abide by these rules and regulations, what the Government says is that the person who is staying there do not have to pay you one cent. Again, we have taken the side of the person at the bottom, not because we are trying to prove that the man at the top must always pay for the man at the bottom, but because we try to run the Government in my opinion, Sir, with a conscience, a social conscience. You have to take into consideration everyone and all concerned.

Further rationalisation of the tax system came into being through the consumption tax in 1980 when 5%, 10%, 15% and 30% consumption tax was added to a whole host of commodities. What the Democratic Labour Party has been saying is that this of course increased the cost of living, but what they do not say, Sir, is that a lot of the consumption taxes that were there existed before. What the Government did was to reduce a lot of the taxes from 10% and 15% to 5% and increased the taxes on consumption items that people were best able to pay. For example, the Prime Minister in his wisdom understands the nature of people. You can change consumption patterns by way of introducing budgets. You cannot tell someone who has champagne tastes and mauby pockets that they cannot afford to do something, because they will be against you, they want to do it. You must provide policies that will restrain

them to do the things that you know are in their very best interest. It is like an adult, Sir, having to caution or discipline a child. You know what is in that child's best interest, the child may not know it for very many years to come, but you have to discipline. Similarly with a Government. We had a situation where in 1976 cars were getting bigger and bigger, the consumption of gas was getting more and more, and the drain in our foreign reserves was becoming more severe. You could not tell a man that he could not buy an American car, but what you did was to introduce through the Central Bank restrictions, and the Central Bank saw to it that the commercial banks would not lend money in the following way.

If you wanted to buy a car for \$10,000 the banks told you that you could find 20% and they would supply you with 80%. If you wanted to buy a car for \$15,000, the banks said you would have to put 40%, we would lend you 60%. If you wanted to buy a car in excess of \$20,000 the banks said you would have to find 80%, we could only afford to lend you 20%. That is what I mean by consumption patterns, so the man who wants to buy the \$25,000 car has to look for 80% of that money, which is \$16,000. If he does not have it he cannot blame the Government, the Government is not stopping him from buying it. He only has \$2,000 or \$3,000, so the banks are telling him they would lend him \$8,000 if he wants to buy a car for \$10,000, so by changing consumption patterns people make their own choices. This is where I think the Prime Minister has scored. He has in the best interest of all Barbadians made decisions in the overall interest and in the long term interest of Barbadians, though they themselves sometimes are short sighted and do not see exactly where he is going.

It was like in 1961, Sir, when the Barbados Labour Party lost the elections, because Sir Grantley Adams talked on the platform about introducing the fork lift at the Harbour, and the Democratic Labour Party said that once he did that he was putting people out of work, but Sir Grantley Adams was twenty years ahead of his time, and today we see fork lifts. The people did not understand then that it would be impossible for them to lift the amount of cargo that would come into the port after we built the Deep Water Harbour, but Grantley Adams saw twenty years hence, Sir. It is the same principle.

They also said that we built the harbour to put people out of work. In 1971 when we talked about the minimum wage Bill, the Democratic Labour Party gave us licks on it and said that we wanted to pay people the minimum amount and they wanted to pay people the maximum amount.

People can be fooled by these things, but the facts speak for themselves. An Act was passed in 1980 which

provided for the imposition of tax on the proceeds of sales of certain services, and the Commissioner of Inland Revenue has the power to assess the taxable proceeds. Again a businessman who was doing his little business at home and not paying his taxes has been caught. All the Government is saying is that we want our fair share of taxes. Again what are you hearing? That you are taking from someone something that they should be paying in the first place and something that they can well afford to pay, and you are using that money and filtering it down through to persons at the bottom of the social ladder.

An increase of the Property Transfer Tax from 10% to 15% for foreigners. Again we are taking bread out of the foreigners' hands if you wish to put it that way and feeding Barbadians. I see nothing wrong with that. If Senator Franklin is against that sort of taxation, then I would like to see what the D.L.P. would introduce as their form of taxation. Sir, we are a Government that has a social conscience, and I would just illustrate. I cannot possibly take the time to go through everything because I know that there are other Senators who would like to speak; but in the Estimates it is perhaps the only time that Senators have the opportunity to talk on all areas of Government without having to be confined to one specific area as when one is dealing with a Resolution or a Bill. I suppose this is why many Senators are more long-winded than usual. A note of caution to Senator Franklin. I think it is better to make a speech with substance and to speak for fifteen minutes than to speak for two hours and speak nonsense.

Sir, the Government has awarded cash gifts to parents of pupils to assist with the purchase of school uniforms. Free school text books have been introduced by our Government and the establishment of a permanent students revolving loan fund. Last year I think we spent just over \$2 million in helping Barbadians to study overseas by giving soft loans. There is a criterion that if you earn in excess of \$18,000 a year, I believe the amount is, you do not qualify for the loan; so clearly one can see that this \$2 million is for people who cannot afford to send their children overseas to better their education. All Barbadian students reading law at the University of the West Indies do so freely, compliments of the Barbados Labour Party Government.

I just want to touch very briefly on Minister Don Blackman's area. I know that he is here and can present himself better than I can even begin to represent his Ministry. The subvention in 1976 to the Thelma Vaughan Memorial Home in which I have an interest was \$18,000 for the physical handicapped children at the Glebe. Today it is \$75,000. In addition to that, Senator Blackman has given The Home a grant of \$20,000 to pay some arrears which were owed last year to its staff. Now when you look at the difference between \$18,000 and \$75,000 in four short years, that is a tremendous achievement. There

is a day care centre for senior citizens, the first of its kind to be implemented in Barbados. Again a very fertile idea from the brains of Don Blackman. There is \$35,000 allocated for the first full-fledged foster care system which has been financed by the Government of Barbados. We have doubled the dependency grant for children. It took effect from 11th October, 1980, and approximately 8,000 children are expected to benefit from this move.

As I said, I do not want to venture too much into the Minister's area, but there are one or two things that are worthy of mention. The qualifying age for life pension for widows was reduced from 55 years to 50 years. Persons who are blind, deaf and dumb who reach the age of 18 years, because it was 25 years before and we have reduced it to 18 years, are entitled to full pension. All persons 65 years and over, some of them get their water rates and electricity bills paid. The Minister can tell you how many they are, but I am sure they are in excess of 2,000 for the year 1980. The age of eligibility for old age pensioners has been reduced from 68 years to 65 years bringing into the mainstream 2,000 pensioners. These things cost money.

The amount spent on old age pensioners, Sir, in 1975-76 which is the last financial year that the DLP was in power was \$7,917,278 and in 1979-80 the Government of Barbados allocated \$18,079,834. I was looking for it in the Estimates for 1980-81, but I could not find it. I understand that it has been increased now to \$20 million. So we have moved from \$7 million to \$20 million in four years, and the Senator said that the masses are paying more and getting less, that there is a move in the wrong direction. I suppose, Sir, if you represent special interest groups perhaps it is a move in the wrong direction, but if you represent the vast majority of Barbadians I think it is a move in the right direction.

The drug plan. I could not pass the Estimates and not make at least a brief comment on the drug plan. Again a Government with a conscience. It is felt that the health of a nation is very important. Miss Miller, the Minister of Health, had always promised us that it would not cost as much as Education and I see it has not. I think we are spending \$68 million as compared with \$111 million in Education. It is a good programme. It affords people who cannot afford to buy drugs to get their drugs cheaper and in some cases free by going the generic route. I do not want to go into the drug plan, Sir, because I am sure we are all aware of it since we debated it in this Senate already.

The last Senator who spoke mentioned buses. In 1979, I would not go so far back as 1976, we allocated for the purchase of new buses and the updating of the equipment \$1,800,000. In 1980 \$2.5 million and in the current Estimates for 1980-81 \$3.4 million. Now there

was an aside that the Transport Board was bequeathed to the Barbados Labour Party from Boxill with love. That may be so. The problems with the Transport Board are tremendous. We cannot minimise them by pretending they do not exist. When you have a Government that cannot afford to do all the things it would like to do, you have to have patience. Working with the little scarce resources which we have at our disposal, I think that even with the bus service as it is it is much better than what we had prior to 1976, and we can still go further with it.

In agriculture, Sir, just to touch on that for one brief moment I would like to identify a couple of areas which I think the Government has performed well in assisting the small man. Again the theme of my speech this evening was mainly to prove beyond the shadow of a doubt that the Government has been for the small man, contrary to what Senator Franklin has been saying. There are 15,000 small farmers who will be involved in the integrated rural development project. That will take about 10,500 acres of land that will be used in the scheme. The Spring Hall land lease project in St. Lucy where 27 agricultural farms ranging in size from nine acres to 34 acres are being leased to farming families totals 427 acres. The land is being rented at specially low rates and special support services including adequate training and financing are made available to these people.

Again I do not see, Sir, how Senator Franklin can say that the masses are paying for more and getting less in social services. We have a drug service. The Minister will talk about the social services in his programme, so I do not want to venture in his area. There was talk about a move for the worse in the collection of revenue when you are taxing people who can afford to pay more and easing the people who need to be eased. I am not quite sure I am hearing correctly. The facts speak for themselves.

Sir, I have for a long time followed Minister St. John in civil aviation, tourism, trade, industry and commerce, and I think that he as a Minister has done a tremendous job.

He certainly has served Barbados well. Mr. St. John found the situation in Tourism in Barbados where it was actually on the decline and in four years has almost doubled the amount of tourists that came to Barbados from 1975 - 1980.

The Hotel Sales and Restaurant Tax in 1976 was \$4.2 million. Last year it was \$14.5 million. We had 186,000 tourists coming to Barbados in 1975/76. We were just short of 390,000 tourists in 1980 and in spite of the fact that the Arrivals for 1979 were slightly higher than 1980, point three percent, reduction of the actual amount of money increased by 26% and Tourism is now earning Barbados \$477.5 million and that is a remarkable amount of money.

It has been estimated that over 782 new beds have been built for the Hotel Industry in Barbados and we see provisions being made in the Estimates through the Barbados Development Bank for, I think, money that would be able to satisfy the demand in Tourism and in small industries for those persons who are expected to venture into these particular fields because there was a time, Sir, and you will remember, when the Barbados Development Bank was hamstrung for funds. They had loaned money to Bath Plantation. There was the Heywoods Project which could not get off the ground and a number of other projects, Seafoods.

I believe the ship which they bought to transport cement, so they said, was funded either by the Barbados Development Bank or some other Financial Institution in which the Inter-American Development Bank, CIDA, the Canadian International Development Agency and those Foreign Agencies were involved and in 1976 the Barbados Development Bank was hamstrung for funds because no one would give them money so long as they had these areas of investment which they had ventured into. They had proven to turn sour and had cost a lot of money. As a result the Government of Barbados had to clear the books, set the records straight and start fresh and now there is no problem with money.

People have been saying that we are borrowing too much money. I read a Report recently from the Other Place in which Richie Haynes was making a comment about the National Debt. Sir, borrowing money is one thing. Being able to borrow is something else. There are a lot of countries in the World that would like to borrow money and cannot get it.

When you talk about the National Debt you must deal with that in relation to every thing else. It is all well and good for me to say, Sir, that Mr. John Brown owes the Bank \$1 million. That is only on one side. That is only the liability section you are looking at. You must look at what the assets of the man are and if his assets are \$5 million, owing \$1 million is negligible. He still shows a net profit of \$4 million so when you talk about the National Debt and do not look around and see what is happening to the country I think you are trying to fool people who really do not understand simple economic matters.

Again, Sir, let me quote from page 10 of the *Advocate News* Thursday, March 19th, 1981. On the caption "Jamaica disappoints in utilising benefits" and this is dealing, Sir, with the fact that like I said, there are countries wanting to borrow money and cannot get it and other countries who get money and do not know how to spend it because the criteria are wrong. They do not have civil servants to do it. They do not have the infrastructure.

This is what it says:

"Jamaica has shown little imagination in utilising the benefits available under the Lome Convention. It has also been slow in spending aid funds allocated under the agreement that ties the countries of the European Economic Community (EEC) to 59 developing African Caribbean and Pacific states."

It goes on, Sir:-

"Under Lome I, which expired at the end of last year, Jamaica was earmarked for U.S. \$26 million in assistance from the EEC, and although 83 per cent of the money was committed to projects, only 39 per cent had actually been spent.

Some U.S. \$50 million has been allocated to the Island under Lome II."

They had not even taken all the money that was allocated to them under Lome I and they had another \$50 million to draw down under Lome II and they could not take that up either and the person being interviewed in Kingston, Jamaica, when he was asked how the other Caribbean countries rate in their utilisation of the EEC Aid he said:-

"It varies. Barbados is superb, Guyana not bad, Trinidad, hopeless. But they don't need money. They don't know what to do with it if you give it to them."

Again, Sir, whenever people speak of Barbados in whatever terms, the praise which Barbados has received internationally over the last four and a half years I think is commendable to the Government and with that, Sir, I see everyone is perhaps a little thirsty as I am and I would not suggest as the last Senator did that we have a tea break. I leave that up to you.

SENATOR D. MACKENZIE: Mr. President, as the introducer, the Hon. Leader of the Senate said, this is the last occasion that this Senate will have the opportunity to debate Estimates and because this is the last occasion, Sir, I would like us to reflect on the past Estimates Debate that we have had and to recall the figures of the past four occasions.

We will recall, Sir, that on one occasion, only in the year 1977 to 1978, did the present Administration estimate for a deficit on Current Accounts. The Estimate on that occasion was \$50,609,000 and actually it came out to \$32,209,000. In every other year surpluses on Current Account were estimated for and achieved.

In 1978/79 the actual surplus was \$21.7 million. In 1979/80 it was \$27,032,000 and in 1980/81 it was

\$17,829,000 and I am glad to say, Sir, that I am very pleased to see that again for 1981/82 that their plan for an estimated surplus on Current Revenue Accounts of some \$14,565,000.

To me, Sir, this is planning of which I think we can all be very pleased. To plan for a deficit, Sir, on Current Accounts is bad planning and it really is economic nonsense for a country to expect to live beyond it means by continually planning for a deficit on their Current Account. No individual and no country can do it with impunity so I am glad to see that for at least four of the five times that we have had the opportunity to debate the Estimates in this Honourable Senate that we have estimated for and hopefully in this last year will achieve a surplus on Current Account.

I think, Sir, that everyone knows and I can assure everyone that it is not my intention to run for any political office in any coming Elections.

I feel therefore that I can say without any problem or at least I would like to say and to give credit where credit is due, by saying that this present Administration has handled the economic affairs of this country over the past four and a half years in an exceedingly good manner. By praising them and by saying this Sir, I am in no way trying to say, or to imply that the last Administration did not also perform creditably when they were in power I am saying as I have had the honour and the privilege of being a Senator for this past four and a half years, I can speak from first hand information and I feel that I can truly say that the Administration has done a good job.

Although Sir we understand and I think all of us understand and we accept the economics of planning for surpluses on our Current Account, we have never been able to plan for enough surpluses on our Current Account to pay for our Capital development requirements. As a result Sir, every year, we increase our National Debt by carrying forward the overall deficit. Senator Truss mentioned that it was simple economics, but for me it is not so simple Sir, because if we were to look at what we have been doing, we are in fact increasing our National Debt every year. If I were to look at 1977-78, you would see that in that year, we had a net overall deficit position between Current Account and Capital Expenditure of \$109.5 million. In 1978-79, it was \$43.6 million, in 1979-80 it was \$55.9 million, in 1980-81, it was \$98.9 million. This year, we do not know what it will actually work out at, but according to the Estimates, it would be another \$184 million, Sir we will be carrying forward. Now these are large figures that we are carrying forward and if we look at our National Debt which is listed on page 62 of this document Sir, we will see that the December of each of the years, 1977 our National Debt was \$334.6 million, in 1978 it was \$372.1 million, in

1979 it was \$426.3 million, in 1980 it was \$493.2 million. So, it has progressively been increased.

Now, this National Debt is made up of two components Sir. One is the local component and the other is what we borrow from foreign sources and over that four year period the notable content of the National Debt rose from \$279½ million to \$329.3 million which was 17.8%, but when we look at the foreign part of it, it rose in 1977 it was \$55.1 million and in 1980, it was \$163.9 million the foreign part which rose by 197% which is a very substantial increase.

Now, as a result Sir and I understand why we require to make loans because there is political pressure that we have developed the country and that if one Government does not do it, the other one will and it is important that we continue to develop. But, the question somewhere along the line comes as to what level we should go with this borrowing. I cannot really answer that, and we would have to rely on other people to do that for us, but I am merely pointing out the fact that it is accelerated instead of being held constant.

Now, as we increase the National Debt and as we borrow money, so too the charges on public debt increase and if we were to look at our Estimates on page 25, we would see that in 1980-81 the charges on public debt was \$52,375 million and in 1981-82 it is going to be \$60.8 million and it is getting higher and higher. Now, what worries me Sir is the overseas content of this money because the more overseas loans that we make, the greater the demands become on us as a country to provide the foreign exchange in order to pay it. Well Sir, as long as we continue as we are going and continue to earn foreign reserves at the rate at which we are currently earning them all well and good, but if for some reason these foreign reserves should fall off, and this could be for a variety of reasons, then we would have to make tremendous sacrifices in being able to maintain the payments on the loans that we had borrowed in the preceding years.

I think that we have to remember Sir that we are what is termed as an open economy and that we have to import to a very large measure the things that we require and if the foreign earnings should fall off this would have disastrous effects not only on, well, unemployment mainly and every sector of our community. As I said before, I really am not the person to say whether the National Debt is too high, too low, or what. I think that we all have to rely entirely on the judgment of our Rt. Hon. Minister of Finance and we have to rely on him in regard to the question of what the total should be, how much of it should be local borrowings and how much of it should be foreign borrowings.

I know that he has said on many occasions in the past, Sir that our Debt Service Ratio was very low as

compared with many other countries, but somehow I have a feeling in spite of this fact, this is a fact, I have a feeling that in the future, it would not be prudent for us to continue to significantly increase our foreign position of loans, or the foreign content of our National Debt.

I would like also just to make a few comments on Tourism Sir. As Senator Truss said earlier on, Tourism did not do as well as we had hoped for in the year 1980, but in my opinion, Sir, in view of the prevailing circumstances I still think that it put in a very creditable performance, by maintaining, or almost maintaining for 1980 the number of long stay visitors we had for the year 1979 which was 17% higher than any other year that we have ever had before. Although the number of long stay visitors for 1980 fell short in 1979 by approximately one thousand, the average stay per visitor from nine and a half days approximately to ten and a half days. This consequently had the beneficial effect of increasing the total number of bed nights and therefore, the total amount of revenue we got from the slightly diminished number of tourists.

But, I speak of tourism Sir because the tourist industry with all of its spin-offs, wish to emphasise again is still by far the largest industry that we have. It is the largest earner of foreign exchange and the figure which Senator Truss gave of \$477½ million has been upgraded by the Central Bank to \$500 million for the year 1980 now and if we were to compare that kind of foreign exchange earnings \$500 million with what the manufacturing sector did which is estimated at \$214 million and what sugar did which was \$112½ million you would see that in the tourist sector alone exceeds all of our domestic exports put together.

That is the size that industry really is, and we must not forget it at any time. The industry also employs both on a direct and an indirect basis about 15,000 people. It is a creator of considerable tax revenue. We have heard one of the taxes, the hotel and restaurant sales tax, and \$14 million expected to be collected by it, but that is just one. There are landing fees for aircraft, airport departure tax, registration of boats catering for tourists, a charge per head for every tourist who goes on the boats, 8% tax on the proceeds of all self-driven cars. There is a tremendous amount of tax revenue coming in from the tourists through the tourist industry.

Again, Sir, it is important that if we were to look at the breakdown of the tourist receipts.....

SENATOR A. TRUSS: On a point of elucidation, Sir, I would just like to inform the Hon. Senator that my figure, \$447.5 million, is accurate and it is not \$500 million, \$500 million is projected for 1981-82. I was dealing with the figures for 1980.

SENATOR J. D. S. MACKENZIE: Sir, it really is not terribly important which figure is accurate. I got my figure from the Governor of the Central Bank and I assumed that what he had said was right, but I am quite happy with \$447 million too, it still is more than all the others put together, and the point is still made.

If we were to look, as I was saying, Sir, at the breakdown of the tourist receipts and just see how widespread the benefits of the tourist dollar really is, a survey shows that 60% of it goes to the hotels, 25% to shopping, 10% to transport, 4% to entertainment and 1% to what they term as "Other". Again, as a point of interest, I would like to point out that in some departmental stores the duty free sales to tourists amount to about 25% of their total sales, and their non-duty free sales to tourists, another 25%. In other words, what I am saying is that in several departmental stores half of the total sales that they make per year — and in some instances it is more — are to tourists, so you can understand how important the tourist is in the business sector as well. The point is that if tourists should decline, or the numbers of tourists coming to Barbados were to decrease significantly, I do not think it requires any imagination to understand what would happen with the loss of employment for a very large number of Barbadians.

With regard to the tourist industry, I have two areas for concern, Sir, both of which I think that we can actively do something about to rectify. Firstly, I am concerned about the increasing incidents of criminal activities against tourists. By this I mean the muggings and the bag snatchings and these things that we read about almost every day in the newspaper. I think that it is absolutely necessary that everyone should really recognise and appreciate the value of tourism and tourists to Barbados and I think that everything possible should be done to put a stop to these criminal activities. It can harm our tourist trade tremendously. You must remember that tourists do not have to come to Barbados, they do not have to go to any country in which they do not feel that they are safe or they do not feel that they are welcome, they can go elsewhere, and if they go elsewhere and they do not come to Barbados, the effect will be on all of us. It would be on the hoteliers, the people who work in the hotels, the merchants, the beach vendors, the taximen, the entertainers, the Government revenue would be seriously affected, and a lot of people who work in the spin-off industries will no longer be able to sell their labour.

In regard to these criminal activities, let me say that I am very happy and I am very pleased to hear of the plans that the Attorney General has for improving the Police Force and to have them assist by increasing the patrols in certain areas in deterring the criminal activities that have been occurring to tourists in various areas, but I

still feel, Sir, that we require a bit more than that. I would like to see the Tourist Board and the hoteliers together recognise the problem and do something about it. I feel that they should hold seminars with the people like taxi operators and with their own hotel employees, with the vendors who sell things on the beach in front of their hotels. I think they should hold these seminars to bring home to them in the strongest possible terms the possible effect that these criminal activities could have on them as individuals and on their own livelihood, and I think they should try to recruit their assistance in trying to stamp out these criminal activities as quickly as possible.

The second area concerns the pricing of tourist accommodation and restaurant charges. I am not saying that we are pricing ourselves out of the tourist market, I am merely saying that we should look at what we are doing very carefully. I feel that the hoteliers and the restaurant operators should carefully monitor the charges that they make in relation to the charges that other competing resort areas make and see that we do not get out of line with them. If they do not carefully monitor it, Sir, very easily could they price themselves out of the tourist market, and again this would be to the detriment of us all.

In this area, too, Sir, I feel that the Union has a responsibility as well to see that they do not make demands that would force hoteliers to make charges that would put them out of line with other tourist areas, because that, I think, would also be equally irresponsible on their part.

Only this year for the first time have many of my friends who come from overseas to visit have made mention to me, and it made me think of it, but they have all mentioned that Barbados is becoming a very high cost tourist area. Several people who are not poor people, they have lots of money, have noticed the cost of hotel accommodation and they have noticed the cost of the rental of houses, and they have noticed the cost of food in various restaurants, and they have all made the comment that we are getting very high indeed, and so because they have a wider view of charges made in other areas to what I have, this is why I am saying that the hoteliers should take a careful look at what they are doing in relation to their charges.

From the Estimates, Sir, I am very pleased to see that the Government obviously again recognises the tremendous importance of tourism and the necessity to promote it as vigorously as is possible, particularly at this present time, and the Estimates show that they have increased the grant to the Tourist Board from \$6 million last year to \$7.2 million this year, and I have every confidence, Sir, that the people in the Tourist Board, who are professional people now to a large extent, will spend

this money wisely in the promotion of tourism to bring more people to Barbados, because to spend \$7.2 million in the promotion of tourism, to bring approximately 370,000 people here who will then spend with us the kind of money they are spending, \$447 million, that is one tremendous and very good investment. There are very few of us who can do that; in fact, none of us.

In the area of manufacturing, Sir, this is the second most important area that we have in terms of earning foreign exchange and in terms of providing increased job opportunities. Exports of manufacturers in 1979 were \$162 million and this rose to an estimated \$214 million for 1980. Again, Sir, in the face of what has been happening during 1980 in overseas markets, I think this is indeed a most creditable performance.

Again, Sir, manufacturing, I think, is recognised as being very important because it has I think at this point in time a greater potential for growth and for job opportunities and for the earning of foreign exchange than tourism, and I am very happy to see that the Government seems to recognise this point and has again increased, I think it is on page 58, the grant to the IDC from \$2½ million to \$3 million for the ongoing programme of industrial promotion, and they have increased the amount of money allocated for factory space from \$7 million last year to \$8 857 450 this year. I think it is very important that we should continue to give funds to the IDC for the promotion of more industry in Barbados. It is the one area in my opinion from which we will get the quickest results in the increase in job opportunities.

The IDC for 1980 is the body charged with the development of the industrial sector. They reported for this last year 21 new enterprises and those were enterprises that have approved status, and they provided an additional 355 jobs for people during the year. The capital investment was \$12,671,000 and again the local content of that was \$4 million and the foreign content was \$8.6 million. Again it seems to me to be disproportionate an amount that the foreign people are putting in relation to ours, and this again worries me because when I look at this bank statistic here and I see the number of savings deposits that private individuals have in commercial banks increasing in the way in which it is to a level in December, 1980 of \$324 million and the number of deposit accounts that those individuals have exceeding the number of people we have in Barbados, it means that several people have more than one account. To give you some idea, in 1979 the demand deposits in commercial banks by individuals were \$13,883, time deposits 7,417 and savings deposits 229,443 making a total of 250,743 deposit accounts by private individuals as of 1979 with a value, as I said before, at the end of 1979 of \$268,987,000. In 1980 this moved from 250,000 accounts to 270,000, more people than we have in Barbados. Here is the money that these people have in

demand deposits, time deposits and savings deposits and we are not utilising it as we ought to for the industrial development of Barbados.

Mr. President, I feel that it is important that we harness this money. I do not know why the money is not being channelled. I do not know whether the opportunities are not given or what, but some way some how I think we have to make people become more investment orientated and that we have to go forward vigorously now with the Barbados Securities Exchange so that people, if they make an investment and require their money, would be able to dispose of their shares in exchange for cash, because I think this is one of the reasons why people do not invest in companies.

The last point I would like to make, Sir, is again the one thing that although steps have progressively been taken and I hope will continue to be taken, the area of taxation. We come on to this business about indirect taxation and direct taxation. In the Prime Minister's Budget Speech of 1980, he said and I quote: "Therefore it is abundantly clear that if greater individual effort is to be encouraged, the balance between direct and indirect taxation must be restored." He said this after he had shown in the preceding paragraph that in 1969-70 the proportion of revenue raised through indirect taxes was 45% while that resulting from direct taxation amounted to 42% with taxes on incomes and profits being responsible for 36%, and by fiscal year 1978-79 the picture which emerged was a complete reversal of the earlier trend. During that year the contribution to indirect taxes had declined by 39% while direct taxation had increased to 49%. And so he recognises here one of the problems of which I have always been speaking, and on page 29 of his same speech, Sir, he said "as I have explained earlier, there is enough evidence to suggest that the income tax structure of the country has reached the point where it is becoming a disincentive to individual effort, but that such a development has taken place should not be surprising." And then he went on to explain why that had happened.

Now after the recognition in his Budget Speech, he made various adjustments in relation to direct and indirect taxation, but direct taxation and personal taxation are still higher than the level of indirect taxation, and I think that he recognises the problem and wishes to restore it the other way; so the observation that Senator Franklin made is a perfectly straightforward and normal observation that appears to be the continued intention, but I cannot agree with him on the basis that the increase or the shift from direct taxation to indirect taxation would increase the hardships for the less well-off. This is not in fact correct because consumption taxes have not been imposed on food and basic commodities. Secondly, I think the Prime Minister recognises this when he said on page 12 in his Budget Speech by way of explanation: "I

will give a few examples of how the application of the standard rate will result in lower duties on a number of items; fruit and vegetable juices which with chocolate confectionary are practically the only human food items subject to the tax at present, carry a rate of 10%. This will be reduced to 5% so that the tax on local and CARICOM fruit juices will be halved and on foreign juices reduced to an effective rate of 7.25%."

He went on to show all the areas where relief would be given and therefore the commodities to the people at the lowest level of income would normally go to purchase would be reduced in their price and therefore he is not by broadening the base of Consumption Tax interfering with the areas or the items that the people at the lower scale would normally purchase or buy.

The other thing he did was to lower the basic tax rate to remove a large number of people. As Senator Truss said, it was 30 people and I think it comes on page 30 of this same Report, Sir, where it says:-

"These changes in the Tax Credit will result in over 30,000 persons being no longer liable for Income Tax, that as from next week persons working for \$90 a week would not be subject to PAYE Deductions, not next week, not next month, not next year."

So he has again relieved a majority of people who were paying tax at the bottom end and putting the money into their pockets. The items that they would normally buy, that they would require for everyday living he has reduced the level of taxation on them. Therefore, he has increased the Indirect Taxation by Consumption Taxes does not affect the people at the bottom end of the scale, who are the poor people, so it is not a true statement to say that it will cost the people at the bottom more to live because they have been given the additional money so I do not think that it is a fair or accurate comment.

Again, Sir, the Senator mentioned about Price Control particularly on food items. I was out of the room and came in at the end when he was speaking on the subject but he did identify clearly that there is little that this Administration or any other Administration can do with regard to the cost of food up to the point where it gets into the Merchants Warehouses but they can, as he said, control the level of mark-up on that food to see that it is a fair and reasonable mark-up and therein lies the problem. What is fair and what is reasonable and two people or five people would all have different views but I will like to remind him of what happened under the last Administration.

You remember there were parts of the licences that were covered by Senator Truss, under the last

Administration and there were very vigorous and very harsh, in my opinion, price controls placed on a large variety of food items and they did that hoping that it would keep the cost of living down for everyone and this thing comes under the heading of what I would call "The cost of good intentions." It was their intention to do good. It was their intention that they would be doing something for the people who were less well off and in fact by what they did, it turned out to be a disservice to them. The reason being that although it had the intention initially to reduce the price of commodities, the consequence of what they did was that it forced the small shopkeepers to close their doors because the volume of sales that they were making in the rural areas was so low that they could not support themselves any longer on the small amount of profits that they were allowed to make and the few items that they carried for the people particularly in the rural areas. They could not make a living. They shut their shops and everybody was driven into the supermarket. They increased in size and the small man was put out of business.

It also created hardships for the people living around the shops. No longer could they get what they wanted. They had to travel. They had transport problems to come from the rural areas into other areas that were big enough to support supermarkets so that they could go out and buy food so let me say that price control for the monitoring of prices I do not object to. I think that that is a sensible thing because it would have stopped anyone from exploiting a situation but I believe that the difficulty that would come about if it was ever done again is exactly what I just asked. What is reasonable and what level of mark-up would you allow because you will find that people on the Government side would wish to come down as low as possible and on the commercial side they would wish to go back up and I am afraid that if an error is made that the same sort of thing will happen. That is, no doubt, because of good intentions, Sir.

Many Governments continually, with every good intention, interferes with various things in commerce that upsets the apple cart and causes a great deal of hardship unintentionally. To give another example. One of them could apply to Barbados. I think it was somewhere around 1974, I was on a course at BIMAP at the time and the cost of rice from Guyana increased considerably and the Government of the day felt that it was a good thing that they should subsidize it and they subsidized it so that it would not go up thinking that they would be doing everyone a favour and what happened was that it became a cheaper commodity than feed because feed went up for animals and the people were buying the rice and feeding it to the animals so they had to change that quickly and go back and allow it to go up. Again, the cost of good intentions when you interfere with the market process causes problems.

In the big United States in 1973, when the OPEC oil countries put up the price of oil and fuel, the United States Government, with good intentions insulated the car industry in the United States. They had not pressure on them to have to make smaller cars, more economical cars with smaller engines because the price of gas was the same and because this was so, when they could no longer continue subsidizing it and supporting it, by then the car industry had not reacted in the way it should have started to react in 1973 and the Japanese, as you know, Sir, have produced all of the cars that are economical and the United States was in absolutely disarray.

Now, the Government did not intend to put people who were working making motor cars some of them possibly into bankruptcy and to put so many people out of work but as a direct result of their subsidization of the cost of fuel and the protection they gave, because of those good intentions that is what has happened so the cost of good intentions is often very high indeed and not appreciated by people when they do various things.

Now, Sir, to come back to the last Budget again, I think that we were all very happy and pleased to see what the Prime Minister had done by way of the redress of this imbalance between direct and indirect taxation. I still say that in spite of what has been done it has not gone yet far enough.

High personal taxation, I repeat is still the cause for what I will term as poor productivity in industry and commerce. There is a general unwillingness by many people to work overtime. High absenteeism is still plaguing most industries. People do not come out to work, particularly industries that employ people who have some form of skills that they can sell on the outside.

It still accounts for the lack, in my opinion, of initiative in middle-management and I still feel that there is a lethargy in expansion and development in Barbados by investors and by top management because I do not feel that in many instances they wish to go to the trouble and to go and increase the burden of work that they have to do to provide more jobs, to make more money for the Company, to make more money for themselves and then have 75% of it wiped out of their pay packet.

They rather not worry with having to employ more people and have more headaches. This is the type of thing that was happening, it is happening less now and I hope that it will happen less and less and less. But, people are not interested to go and to work harder than they are without reward and I think that the redress has to go on.

Sir, I really do not think that I will take any more time to speak on any of the other Heads. I just wanted to say that during the four and a half years that I have been in the Honourable Senate as an independent Senator, I am very pleased and very happy and congratulate the present Administration for the manner in which they have been handling the economic affairs of this country over the past four and a half years and I hope that the two Honourable Senators sitting here from the Opposition Benches will not feel that I am trying to imply with that praise, that their Administration during their time of office did not do well as well because I am sure they performed creditably during their term of office. But as I said before, I wish to give praise where praise is due and I think it is due.

Thank you. (APPLAUSE).

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Deane.

SENATOR C. I. E. DEANE: Mr. President, I shall begin more or less where Senator MacKenzie left off. I should like to say what an honour and a privilege it was for me to be a member of the Senate especially under your Chairmanship.

Now Sir, first of all this Estimates for surplus seem to be an ongoing thing this year. This is the fourth year that the Estimates has been a surplus. I should like to congratulate the Government, Sir on having come so near notwithstanding the vicissitudes and adversities of very high increases in wages, public emoluments and things like that which is a good thing in a way because do not forget Sir when the Government gives — and this is not depredate them in any way, they are quite right — when they give a big increase, they get a big Pay As You Earn packet from that same money, so it is coming back to them. I congratulate them on their foresight.

However, Sir, with regard to the highlights of the actions of this Government, apart from this surplus of revenue over expenditure the Tenantry Bill has been perhaps one of the most revolutionary things that any Government has ever done, I did hear this morning about some of the tenants feeling, "why should I buy it and pay tax to the Parochial Treasurer, or whatever, when I can rent it for, in our case eighty cents a week?" There is also some doubt as to what is involved in the sale of this land. The land must be a minimum of three thousand square feet. This is my understanding, Mr. President. The Government finances it but if it is more commercial like a piece of agricultural land, or something like that, the landlord is supposed to sell it at the said price as the three thousand square feet \$300 I believe, but whereas the Government finances the first three thousand square feet, they do not finance the rest of that. That is my understanding, whether I am wrong I do not know, but I

know that it is under consideration now. Now, Sir, several things came up here.

First of all, I should like to congratulate Senator Franklin, Senator Truss and Senator MacKenzie on their statistics and understanding of the financial and commercial running of the island, but there are one, or two other things. I feel constrained to deal Sir with the question of agriculture first. Now as far as this Government is concerned, they, apart from this rural development have just decided to take careful note of the McGregor Report and in fact, a lot of the recommendations in the Report have already been implemented. I do not want to go too deeply into it to forestall things and speaking of forestalling things, there was great doubt as to whether the small farmers will participate in the crop bonus that is going to be paid on Friday. Well, the Sugar Organisation was told by the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister that he would make a statement and it was their business to wait until that statement was made. It has been made and you will know Sir that the small farmers are going to benefit to the same degree as anybody else by the crop time bonus. (APPLAUSE) But I repeat Sir, it was not in our place to make that public before the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister had made his statement as he said he would.

Now Sir, I will go by and I will miss out all of the things dealing with statistics because these Honourable Senators have dealt far better with those than I would have done anyhow. Now Sir, with regards education, there is something that has been bothering my mind for a long time. If, as they report, the population explosion is being controlled, with the building of these schools, I am not talking of repairing of them Mr. President, I mean building the new schools. Are they being built in such a way that they can be converted for other usage if the population reaches the stage like it did in Canada not long ago, where you do not have too many schools for the children that need them? That is one thing that is bothering my mind with regards to education.

The other thing is I wonder, at a recent meeting at which you were present Mr. President, the question was raised as to whether in the education system, there was enough flexibility that the children coming out of schools could accept a job not necessarily commensurate with the degree, or whatever to which they had been educated, that is a problem and that is the cause of a lot of the unemployment on the island. Moreover, immigration is not a reliable source of unemployment and if you get children coming out of school, who are not prepared to take the jobs that they can get until the job that they want comes along, I think that you have a very difficult problem there.

Now Sir, with regards to Tourism. Senator Truss read an extract from a London newspaper and I hate to

do this, but I also have an extract from the Toronto Sun from a Canadian visitor to this place, I know him very well and it says:

Do not go to Barbados because the violence over there has increased to such a degree that you probably never get back home again.

words to that effect. I handed this clipping to the Honourable Minister of Tourism and he is well aware of it. It is general talk in Canada that apart from the high prices that Senator MacKenzie mentioned that there is also a question of violence, mugging and so forth.

Well, I need not deal with taxation because long ago, I knew that sooner or later that the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister in his wisdom would change the structure of taxation altogether.

Now do you know, that the Prime Minister actually has given an edict to the Sugar Producers' Association that they appoint a small farmers' representative for extension purposes and such. Actually, Mr. Trevor Rudder has already been appointed, so what I am trying to drive at, Sir, is this, that this Government is roping in the whole agricultural sector under one umbrella and they are doing wonders for the small farmers. There is no doubt about that. As a matter of fact, Mr. President, you are probably aware that they are going to buy shares in the Barbados Sugar Factories Limited for small farmers. The whole idea is to have all agriculture under one umbrella.

Now, Sir, Senator Franklin very wisely and rightly said that the production of potatoes had decreased, the production of yams had decreased. He quoted 1979 which was a particularly bad year to quote, because in 1978 most of the potatoes that were grown either were left in the field and ploughed in - but I do not believe in that, and I called the whole district and said, dig the potatoes, I want to plough the ground. Other people even sprayed them to get rid of them with weedicide. With regards the yams, much the same thing happened. There were lots of yams but there was no sale for them, with the result that in 1979 very little provision was planted. Now, the situation has changed, because the Government through its good offices has obtained sales for yams in the United Kingdom. This is the regular Lisbon yam, and a great number is being shipped at the moment, but that is responsible for the falls in those years, and the real cause and reason for that is the lack of the possibility of marketing of the produce. You grew it and could not market it. That was the trouble, Mr. President.

Now, with regards to fishing, I do happen to know that the Barbados National Bank has Extension Officers working on the question of fishing. I understand, Sir, that the price of an engine has gone up to such a degree that a

lot of fisherfolk that went in on a large scale before cannot any more, because they cannot afford it, because pay day has to come anyhow.

There is one thing that I want to make straight, Sir. I gathered from what Senator Truss said - and I stand to be corrected if I am wrong - that the landlord paid the rental surcharge. He does not, you know, Sir, it is the tenant that pays the rental surcharge. Sir, I understood him to say that. However, that is only a small thing.

On the whole, Mr. President, there is one ugly thing I want to say. Do you remember some years ago I said in this Chamber that I thought the proper thing for certain types of felony, and I refer to things like rape and that kind of thing, I said that the felon should be put on a platform, a scaffold, between Lord Nelson and the Cenotaph, stripped to his waist and publicly whipped with a tamarind rod. Sir Theodore Brancker saw me the same night and asked me if I had gone mad, but now he says my madness seems to have been correct, because it is the only thing to stop this kind of thing, but I do not agree that the Government should go into the expense of maintaining people that have committed that kind of crime. I really do not, and I do think that if it was made as public as that, then people would be more reluctant to embark on this particular crime.

Now, Sir, the police of Barbados need a boost, because it must be most frustrating for those old, dedicated members of the force - not old in age but old in membership, and there are many of them - and with all that has been taking place in the Police Force and the aspersions cast upon them and so, I think the public should do all in its power to co-operate with the police and build them up as a true Force in Barbados.

Sir, I would also like to place on record my appreciation and the appreciation of the Fire Service of the work done by the Chief Officer, Mr. Gittens, and his men. They do a wonderful job. They have put out fires this year that the plantations did not even know of until they rang and said we have put out a fire at such and such a place. I would like very much to place that on record, Sir.

There is not very much more I have to say, Sir, except that where Education is concerned again, Sir, this is a minor thing, an elementary thing, and I am taking a page from Senator Franklin's book. Something that I notice as I pass along the road, especially coming down Government Hill, they have a Security Guard there, a little lady that you can hardly see, with a kind of banner or something, and I the other morning stopped, as I thought I should do, and this gentleman rushed pass like if the girl was not there at all. He can easily argue he did not see her, but if you put a big, big white crossing as a pedestrian crossing, a wide thing - and I have already

spoken to Mr. Minister Tull about this and he agrees with me - but I would like to see it done, and I would not like us to wait to have one of those little children - because you know what little children are, especially if there are late for school, they will dash across the road regardless, and I would like to see it done as soon as possible.

Also, Sir, above the Queen Elizabeth Hospital on Martindales Road, I was in there recently. It did not trouble me, because I work in a sugar factory and the noise made no difference to me, but all night long the people passing there in their cars and on their motor cycles and things, you would think they were on a racing road or something, and they revved up the engine, or whatever you call it. Most disgraceful! The whole road there should have, I think, these humps. If you want to drive along at that speed and go through the roof of the car, it serves you right, but I think notice should be put to the effect that they are there, but I think the sooner we put them up the better. There should also be pedestrian crossings, and again I repeat, Sir, this is the last time we should be doing Estimates and I feel myself privileged and honoured to have served in this Senate as an independent Senator, and as I said just now, under your chairmanship, presidency, whatever. Thank you, Sir.

SENATOR K. HINDS: Mr. President, we have heard Senator Franklin this evening put his foot into quite a few things and I know that come tomorrow he will be coming up for the necessary replies for which I suppose he might be a little sorry that he extended himself that far. I am not one for attacking people, but I suppose I may take it upon myself to just lay the foundation for what Senator Franklin might have coming to him tomorrow. I am going to take, Sir, just a brief look at what Senator Franklin had to say about the Transport Board. He tried to give the impression that there was something very wrong with the Transport Board as far as the personnel is concerned and that there was a group of people who were Seventh Day Adventists who seemed to have special privileges, one being that they were not asked to work on Saturdays which we know is the foundation or part of the foundation of the Seventh Day Adventist practices, not to work on Saturdays; but he tried to give the impression that on the other hand there may be a large number of other persons who represent other religious denominations who were to some extent unfaired because they were penalised for not working on Sundays.

Now this is I suppose quite in keeping with the philosophy of his party which seems to think that impressions are always more important than facts. On checking the question of the Seventh Day Adventists it was drawn to my attention that there are hardly more than twelve persons out of 1,700 at the Transport Board who are Seventh Day Adventists who request not to be asked to work on Saturdays. On the other hand those persons who do not turn out for work on Sundays have

never stated it is because of their religious beliefs, and the Union has been called in on several occasions to deal with these cases, and the Union does not support the attitude displayed by these persons who would not turn up for work on Sundays, and it is nothing to do with the fact that there are some Seventh Day Adventists who do not work on Saturdays.

Now I know the Barbados Workers' Union and I know the attitude of the Barbados Workers' Union especially since 1976, and as a matter of fact one Transport Board Worker told me that they had some problems prior to 2nd September, 1976, they called the Union on several occasions and could hardly get anyone to represent them. So I know if the Union is not supporting these workers at the Transport Board on their absence from work on Sundays it is because the workers do not have a case. That is only one point.

What Senator Franklin did not seem to understand, because at some point he mentioned that these workers were not entitled to any special pay for Sundays, is that in any organisation like the Transport Board or the Queen Elizabeth Hospital or the Police Force these people work five days a week and that five days is any five days in the week. It is a shift system and their time is not fixed from Monday to Saturday or Monday to Friday and then Sunday is considered a different day. Sunday is part of the working week; so probably if he had done a little checking he would have discovered that they were not entitled to anything special for working on Sundays. You are entitled to something for working overtime which would mean more than your forty hours or whatever the prescribed working hours are.

The Senator also mentioned that the Transport Board employed some person who has a record of being a write-off person, one who has crashed some of everything from a box cart if you can go that far. Now the Transport Board itself cannot be blamed for this. Persons are asked to bring a certificate of character and various other things which qualify them for employment, and if they do not have any record of the person being involved in accidents, especially if it has to do with reckless driving they can only judge the person by the way they perform after they become employed by the Transport Board. If a person is involved in accidents, it is taken into consideration the type of accident. Here again the Union is brought in because the Union states specifically that you cannot fire a man just because he gets into an accident or every type of accident; so until the Transport Board can prove that this person is reckless they really cannot up and dismiss that worker because I am sure the same hon. Senator would be one who would be keeping the most noise in support of the person whom he would believe to be dismissed wrongfully.

In addition to that, I think as a citizen of Barbados, if Senator Franklin is aware of any malpractices on the

part of a Transport Board worker especially a driver, I think it is his duty to make a report to the Transport Board. So you just cannot go around giving impressions when these impressions are not really facts, and if you believe they are facts, they are not well founded. On the question of brakes, no driver is asked to work a bus with faulty brakes. As far as I know there is a sheet that the drivers are asked to fill out in relation to defects in a vehicle and there are some defects with which a vehicle can work, but certainly as far as I understand, not brakes. In addition to that, and this is getting back to what I believe Senator Franklin might have seen, there is no way, Mr. President, that you can get a bus stopped properly doing 40 miles an hour depending mainly on brakes. So if a bus driver reports that brakes are not functioning and he is trying to stop a bus at 40 to 45 miles an hour within a few yards, it is understood that brakes are not that efficient on any vehicle.

This reminds me of a little joke I heard some time about a guy who bought a car and within five minutes he took it back to the garage and said it was shimmying, and the salesman said it could not be shimmying, I drove that car all around. The guy said "well, you come." He got in the car and they drove off, this time with the salesman driving. He hit 50, 60, 70, 80 miles an hour. He looked at the purchaser and asked "what happened?" and was told "Go ahead" and when he hit 95 it shimmied, and he said "you see what I told you, it is shimmying."

Mr. PRESIDENT: I hope that did not happen in Barbados.

SENATOR K. HINDS: So this is similar to a Transport Board driver to tell you that his brakes are not functioning 100% efficiently when brakes normally do not function 100% efficiently on any vehicle, and especially when it is doing 50 miles an hour.

Another point about what he said about cannibalising. This was a little change, cannibalising the chassis by taking off the tyres. As far as I know tyres are really not part of a chassis but let us assume that there is something in what Senator Franklin is saying and he thinks that the tyres are part of the chassis. It is the policy of the Transport Board to take off new tyres off some chassis, if you use it the way that Senator Franklin wants to use it, taking off some new tyres off the rear tyres to hold to the front and using remould tyres on the rear so there are times when they exchange tyres but this is not because they are faulty tyres but it is still good economics in running the transport system and it is also the policy of the Transport Board.

In addition to that, when a chassis has to be taken to the workshop...

SENATOR FRANKLIN: Mr. President, the Hon. Senator well knows that when we use that expression,

they come down with the hood, the chassis and the tyres. He well knows this and he knows what I mean when I use an expression like that.

SENATOR HINDS: Sir, I would not be saying that if he did not specify chassis but these are mistakes that immature politicians make from time to time. As I was saying, if a chassis has to be taken to the workshop, you are not sure how long it would be in the workshop when work is being done on the body and so on so there is no point sending it there with the best tyres when the tyres can be used outside so it is really done for the good running of the Transport Board to make the best use of the tyres and it is not really cannibalising the chassis.

In addition to that, he spoke of a more humane problem and this is one that one can sympathize with Senator Franklin for talking about the human element of the running of the Transport Board. He talked about the people who suffer as the result of an inadequate supply of buses and that sort of thing. Now I do not have any quarrel with Senator Franklin in this area except that instead of merely criticizing the Transport Board and the system and the Government in itself, there are other sides of this story.

For instance, we are running almost on a 24-hour bus service now. There is a lot to be said about the transport service. There is tremendous improvement and for instance, the hotel workers who may be paying \$5.00 or \$10.00 taxi fares to get home at nights now find it easy to pay 45 cents bus fare to get home. It has assisted in the industrial area where industries like Intel can now work a three shift system per day because they know that their workers will not have a problem getting home after work.

In addition to that type of thing, the cheaper bus fares, more bus hours, the system where you can now travel places on buses where you could not travel before, we also have to look and see that this improvement has come in the face of some rather trying circumstances. If you were to look at the figures for the travelling public previous to 1976, you look at 1970-1972, you have something like 17 million passengers travelling on these buses. In 1971-1972 you have 18 million. In 1972-1973 you are back to 17 million. In 1973-1974, you have 17 million. When you look at these figures, Sir, you will see that there was a certain element of consistency in the number of persons using the public transport.

I would like to think that if you are having that type of figure annually, it is easier to plan and improve your system but then when you move from there and you look at 1974-1975 where you had 17 million but then you look at 1975-1976 and you see 19 million, then 1976-1977 27 million, then 1977-1978 you have 35 million, then 1978-1979, Sir, 41 million. Now, you

cannot just get up and flog the Transport Board for not being able to do this and do that.

You have to take all of these things into consideration and if they can still survive under these circumstances, you have something like general travelling passengers, 33 million, school children 7,800,000 and then you have to take into consideration old age pensioners and these are now something like 610,000 travelling only on the buses so when you are going to criticize the Transport Board, there are a few things you have to look at first and then after you have asked yourself some questions you look at the fact that we are still maintaining a cheap busfare. We have improved the bus hours, as I said earlier. We are doing almost 24 hours now. You see that even though there is a bit of inconvenience here and there for some people, there is tremendous convenience for others and we cannot hit every area at the same time.

In addition to that, there has been a number of new buses on the road. The Transport Board has been employing many more people today than they were before 1976. In a lot of areas, Sir, the Transport Board has made its contribution to this country. Not only as far as transportation is concerned but it has saved money in people's pockets.

There are a number of jobs which have been created - somebody is talking about washing the buses. That is something that you can - I had better not talk about that, Mr. Chairman. As I said, I am only laying the foundation, the real attack will come tomorrow and I hope that Senator Franklin will have a good night's rest and come back tomorrow and that he would not cow out just because I am warning him now. It is said that to be forewarned is to be forearmed. I must also tell him that this will also help to toughen him up for the forthcoming General Elections. (ASIDES) I am not saying that he will be successful, I am saying that it will help. At least, he will be able to take his lashes better than if he did not have this little touch up this evening.

Mr. President, I am taking the cue from you, you said that we over here should not indulge in making any long speeches and that is why I want to take one little aspect of the Estimates to prepare Senator Franklin for what is coming to him tomorrow and that is all I would like to say at this point, Sir. (APPLAUSE)

SUSPENSION

MR. PRESIDENT: Honourable Members have had a long day and I think that this is a convenient time to suspend the sitting. This Sitting will be suspended until tomorrow at 2.30 p.m. I sincerely hope that Honourable Members will be punctual and try and let us get on with this because these long days are rather trying particularly for the Chair.

This sitting is now suspended until tomorrow, Thursday, 26th April, 1981 at 2.30 p.m.

On Resumption:

Thursday, 26th March, 1981.

Mr. PRESIDENT: The Sitting is resumed.

SENATOR R. E. BRATHWAITE: Mr. President, I am very happy this evening to associate myself with the Estimates of 1981-82 for the island of Barbados. The first Item I would like to touch this afternoon is Defence and Security.

It really disturbed my mind yesterday to be sitting here and listening to members of this Hon. Senate in the way they reacted to an outstanding Estimate, I would say. We heard quite a lot about \$14 million that was spent on Defence and Security. I heard also that \$447 million was earned through tourism. That is only one industry, so I would feel that \$14 million to spend to secure \$447 million alone would be justifiable.

Mr. President, I would also like to let you know that yesterday Senator Boxill almost had me. I really believed that he meant what he was saying when he talked about Dodds. He said you do not have any white boys at Dodds and I thought it was a genuine statement, but as I listened to him down through his speech I could see that it was only a kind of vote catching exercise.

He spoke about the Defence Force, and I have to say that some of that Movement is in my parish, St. Lucy, and I feel very happy to have it down there because I feel it is a help to the community, and I am sure that all people have a tendency as soon as they start to move up and be responsible they like to have security. But Senator Boxill said — and this is the third member of the Democratic Labour Party with the same statement — but the only thing that worried my mind was in case the people of Barbados got mad one night to change this Government, what really would happen to the island of Barbados. Those boys down there in the Defence Force, I do not see one white skinned boy down there. All those people I saw down there are poor, humble boys and girls who are trying their effort best to work for a livelihood, and they are doing a fine job.

Every now and then you can hear the members of the Democratic Labour Party trying to discredit the Defence Force. I wonder, Mr. President, why. I think there is some serious reason in that, because as you notice from time to time there is a coup, or we hear that someone is coming to overthrow Barbados, you can be sure that members of the Democratic Labour Party have close association with such people. I am sure if you hear about one of our small islands where an attempt was made to take it over with guns, they have close association with the Democratic Labour Party, so

you can see from that why they do not want Defence and Security.

I am very happy with it, I can tell you. I am accustomed to driving on the road at very late hours at night, and I think things have looked up a little, things look much better, because St. Lucy is one of the biggest sea parishes, from one end to the next is sea boundary, so it might be a sure case that we might be invaded from that side, so I always try to stand up with that Force. I feel it is a very good effort of the Government of this country.

I would like to touch a little on Agriculture, Mr. President, because as a small farmer it really touches my blood when you start to talk about agriculture. I always looked at Senator Franklin as a very honest person, but from yesterday I really cannot look so seriously now, I have to change my mind a bit, because Senator Franklin discredited the Minister of Agriculture and he said all sorts of things about him. I disagree with him, because right there in Kirtons, St. Philip.....

SENATOR FRANKLIN: On a point of order, Mr. President.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Just a minute, let me handle it. You must be careful when you say that you regarded him hitherto as an honest person not to imply that you now regard him as a dishonest person.

SENATOR R. E. BRATHWAITE: I withdraw that, Mr. President. What I was trying to say was that a place like Kirtons, next door to Senator Franklin, was a place that was run away in grass and now today 170 acres have been cultivated and back now in agriculture. I can think of Greenland, St. Andrew where there were acres of rab land running wild, and all of that land today is back in agriculture bearing canes and all those kinds of things.

It worried me when I heard that speech yesterday, because it seems to me that this member was somewhere in Italy living for a very long time and just came in yesterday morning by plane and did not have time even to drive from the airport. Because as you look around you can see the movements and you can see the progress of this country since the Barbados Labour Party came into power. Mr. President, gone are the days when people will say they do not want to see a cane blade in this Island. I am telling you we have a Prime Minister who is willing to make sure that agriculture triumphs in this country. I am sure there are small islands below here who have to buy sugar at the rate of \$3.50 per pound. I heard it is \$2.50 per pound in St. Vincent, not as bad, and I am sure that the Prime Minister of this country is going all out, even at a time when wages come up, to try his utmost best even to release some of the levy at times to try to make a compromise that the island of Barbados

will continue to progress as far as agriculture is concerned.

He spoke about the food crop production, about feeding your country. I wonder where Senator Franklin was in 1979 when a small man like me planted yams, and I call people from around the district who would like yams free, and you could not even find people to give them to in 1979. But you cannot blame this Government for that, because we just came, and I will say, Mr. President, we are planning big business here now at Lower Estate, where the small farmers and even the big farmers can go ahead with a drive, and they are sure now when the BMC gets everything up there fixed up we can gear ourselves, where we will have our produce going there, because it is a very serious thing to work land, pay dear labour and then to have things on your hand like that and nowhere to take them. As I say, you cannot blame this administration, because they just came.

Fifteen years ago, I believe if the Democratic Labour Party had the small man at heart, those small people that grow cabbages, tomatoes, lettuce and things like that, it is a lot of hard labour, and then after you grow those things there is a glut on the streets and you just have to give them away for little or nothing. So when he says that we do not make plans for food I do not agree whatsoever. It is the first time in 20 years that we have food. The plantation by me had to plough back the yams and potatoes in the field.

He also spoke about the pig industry. Mr. President, I was very surprised, I was ashamed of that also, because as you know, in the sixties under the Barbados Labour Party regime there was something called a subsidy where poor people raising breeding sows could have free feed to try to encourage the industry. As soon as the Democratic Labour Party came into power in 1961 that was abolished, that was scrapped, so when he said that there is a shortage, I would like to let him also know that this Government, the Minister now, just last year brought in 103 pigs from Jamaica and St. Vincent trying his best to get things built back up, because you cannot get things built back up overnight, Mr. President, so I believe that he is doing a fantastic job and I feel that we should give credit where it is due.

As a small farmer, again I say we have never had it so good as we have it nowadays. I remember there was a time when people who owned big plantations used to get a bigger share at the factory per ton, but now thank God today if a man has 5,000 tons he gets the same amount of money per ton as the man who has a quarter ton, and I think that is something that we should commend and feel very happy about, because we all have to pay the same labour and everything in that category.

Mr. President, I would also like to touch a little on the poultry industry. In 1975 when the Democratic Labour Party was in power the produce was 6.3 million pounds of poultry meat; in 1976 under the Barbados Labour Party regime it was 6.9 million pounds. Look at the drive, Mr. President, and also the improvement in just one year's time. In 1978 there were 9.3 million pounds and in 1979 some 11.6 million pounds of poultry meat; so when you compare it, Mr. President, it is practically twice as much as it was in 1975, so you can see the movement of this Government and these Ministers on this side of the board and the work they are performing.

Broiler chick sales increased from 2.7 million in 1976 to 4.3 million in 1979. In 1969 egg production was 4.5 million and in 1979 it was 32 million, very nearly eight times as much as it was in 1969, so you can see the strides and the progress that this Government is putting into agriculture. As I said, when you look around this country and see the poultry farms — and the thing about it is that all of them can always get sales for their poultry products — that is a very good sign, Mr. President.

This Government also made it possible to encourage the small farmer and owners of ten acres of land by giving them free cane plants where they can plant their holdings again. He spoke also of the fishing industry. Mr. President, I am from a fishing area which is Half Moon Fort area which is one of the biggest fishing spots in Barbados, and I know that years ago there were some men from the area who owned fishing launches and they say "Thank God I was in the time of the Barbados Labour Party." As soon as the Democratic Labour Party got into power in 1961 there were no more loans to fishermen to own boats. You have a lot of boats running through the sea now, but they are not owned by fishermen at all, so when he talks about the condition of the fishing industry and things like that, the Barbados Labour Party had it geared in such a way that you could help the poor fisherman to own his boat and help himself; but those things went out of existence as soon as the Democratic Labour Party came into power.

I would like to touch also here on Social Services. I think normally it was a disgrace to mention such a point and the folk should commend the Estimates because I remember as a youngster going to Bathsheba and seeing a social club, and I will tell you that in 1976 when the last Government handed over the reins of Government, the only way you knew a club was there was because of where the toilet wall was, because everything had rotted and went to nothing; but now thank God the Minister here has a sum with which he can start to put back a community centre in that area. Also in Pie Corner, in my district, I remember Senator Cox putting a pavilion in that area and I can tell you that it is shameful that in 1976 before this Government got into power they had to put a

new roof on, build a road to it and clean up around the place and make it something. Not one nail was driven into that place from 1961 up to 1976, and since this Government got into power which is practically four and a half years they have down there transformed with barbergreen road, new roof and everything fixed and looking tidy and nice, and then you see members come out and attack the Government and say there are doing absolutely nothing and talk about conditions. Mr. President, I would like to let you know that I wonder how they can do so many things with so little money.

I would like to touch a little on Communications and Works. Mr. President, quite a lot has been said about the bus service in this country. I had the privilege to travel to a few of the big countries of this world and I would like to say that at peak hours in New York with trains coming every few minutes with twelve cars behind, sometimes men get shoved right over the track, and that is one of the most progressive countries you can think about. It is so in New York, in England and in Canada. That is progress. We all agree that from 1976 up to now we have twice as many people working than we had in 1975; we have 350 more minibuses running in this country and still we cannot compete with the passengers on the road. We did not cut the buses shorter; instead of cutting the amount of buses, we brought in more buses and although we brought in buses we gave the minibuses permits where the Democratic Labour Party had them completely frozen; but you know, Mr. President, you cannot compete when you are thinking of achieving progress. When you look around at least the north of the Island you will see sign-boards asking for labour to come and help to do things. There are sign-boards saying "labour wanted". We never had it so good yet.

Mr. President, I am wondering if the members of the Democratic Labour Party believe that the people in Barbados are so dumb. They are not an electorate like in 1961 when you would have buses starting from my parish which is the farthest out from 5.30 in the morning and finishing before 1 o'clock on nights. Some poor people go to the hospital with a child with a fractured limb, they cannot afford to pay a car to wait on them, and as soon as they go to the X-ray, they can take a cool walk at 12 o'clock to the bus stand and get a bus bringing them to St. Lucy or to any part of the Island of Barbados, and yet there are some people walking around trying to discredit the movements of the Barbados Labour Party. I feel that kind of thing is not fair in the sight of the folks of this country. So, Mr. President, as I say, I am very happy to be here to stand up and say a few words on behalf of these Estimates, and I am glad to know that we have such a team that we can adjust ourselves in such a manner that all over the world can be very proud of this country. There are some times when many of us try to do things for the sake of profiteering or trying to put up a good front, but it is

very detrimental to this country. There are quite a lot of things that we all know we should not publish. There are some times when our heads hurt us, and before you look around there are some people ready to publish it in the daily news, things that they know will affect the tourist industry in this country. There are some small things that some people can make a big mountain of. Everybody is saying now that the tourist industry has dropped back a little; it is not as flourishing as it used to be, but these people should examine themselves and know the damage they have done with their tongues to the tourist industry. Mr. President, as I said in the past, that \$14 million is money well spent and I will always stand by it. Some people talk in here about the tourist industry, but I would say that the \$14 million is to help protect the tourists that come to this country.

SENATOR SIR MENCEA COX: Mr. President, I shall not be long, but I am going to speak on the same note as the hon. Senator has just spoken, and that is the Defence Force. It is my feeling, Sir, that every independent country must provide adequate protection for its citizens against invasion and things of that sort. Now, Senator Boxill in his speech yesterday, I am sorry he is not here, gave the impression that it was unnecessary.

Now the Newspaper people write about the waste of money and that sort of thing and I think Senator Boxill went as far as saying that the money could have built a Hospital for children and that sort of thing as if there are no Hospitals in Barbados to accommodate children. However, Sir, from my experience I would say that a Defence Force is absolutely necessary and essential for the protection of the people of Barbados.

Now, Sir, he made fun at the Sidney Burnett Alleyne question as if nothing really happened. There are still some people in the Island who feel that it was something that was made up against Alleyne and these people, although Alleyne himself has made it clear that he will try and get back here even on a dolphin's back to liberate his people. What he is going to liberate them about, I do not know but this Item Sir, was the idea of the former Government and if the former Government felt it necessary at that time to provide for a Defence Force, you had the Coast Guard and so on, how much more so. In the times gone by and even now it becomes necessary for the people of Barbados to be protected.

Now, Sir, I was happy to have had some information and talked with some people and it is a fact that when that yacht left St. Maarten to come to Barbados that news was passed on and before that, a telephone message was sent on to meet two men at the airport and the man who was to meet them to take them to the place got there a bit late and those two people went to Abbeville in Rockley Road at that Hotel, and

the man when he left the Airport and did not find them, he then collected them there and carried them down to Martin's Bay. I was reliably informed about that.

What did these two persons come here for? Information was given, they were approached by the Police and were deported out of the country a few days after they were here. Alleyne was arrested, he and the yacht, and the yachtman. Alleyne was jailed and was fined U.S.\$10,000 and his partner was also fined U.S.\$10,000 and the yacht was confiscated.

Mr. President, some time after listening to the 6 o'clock News, as I generally do from London, and then you get the World Today, I heard something come over about some coup again. I said to myself, are these people repeating this thing which took place ever since but then when I listened to the 7 o'clock News I realized that this was another coup arranged by Alleyne and his gang to take over the Government of Barbados by force and I am not doubtful. I have no doubt in my mind that it was not so.

A friend of mine who died about two years ago, he told me of his association with Alleyne when Alleyne said he was running a Bank here in Barbados. Before that, I think Alleyne was here and he apparently used some remarks about blowing up the Light and Power Station, saying that he had negotiated or something of the sort, the sale and he was not compensated. He did not get his commission and I understand that the Police were rounding him up and he left.

Alleyne came back here, Mr. President and was given a licence to run a Bank and a very good friend of mine, someone took Alleyne to this man's home, or near his home in a car. I do not wish to mention the man's name either because he is a very strong supporter of the Democratic Labour Party and Alleyne spoke to the man and said he would lend him \$1,000 to purchase a tractor and he was told to come in to the office the next day. When my friend collected his solicitor and went to his office, to his surprise, the Attorney General of Barbados, Mr. Moe, was Alleyne's Legal Advisor. He saw him there and he also saw Patrick John whom Alleyne was promising to lend a lot of money and all of that sort of thing.

Do not let us make any mistake in thinking that Alleyne was no longer connected with the DLP as was said when this thing took place and Alleyne was always prepared and I believe still is prepared that if he gets his opportunity and this Government is in office to push it out by force.

Now, Sir, the Government has a responsibility and a large responsibility and that is to protect the lives

and safety of the masses of this country and although perhaps those persons who associate themselves with Alleyne with this intended crime, they are not sure what will happen to them because when these things take place the innocent, many of the innocent are destroyed also. Nobody is safe and I have had some information about the second intended coup which brought me to the conclusion that this Island was gone, if it had taken place.

However, Sir I want to say frankly that I support 100% the Government in preparing against raids, coups or whatever you call them and I repeat that an independent country must be prepared against outside invasion and things of that sort. If, for example, we had no Force and when the question is being talked about increasing the Police and giving the Police this and that, the Police Force is a Civil Force. The Police Force has to look after the people of the country, to catch thieves and crooks and bad behaved people and so, prosecute them and things of that sort.

Crooks and bad behaved people and so and lock them up, prosecute them and things of that sort and keep the peace in the Island. But the Defence Force is particularly provided to prevent people from invading and destroying our country and therefore, I am satisfied if never before, that the attempts made by Alleyne were sufficient to allow this Government to prepare against invasions. You cannot say that you are independent, you have no Defence Force and then, what happens if an invasion takes place? You try to get help from England, or the States and quite a few people in this country believe that they are free, they believe that they should wipe their feet in the English flag, they believe that they are finished with colonialism and any of those of us who still appreciate the Monarchy and so are regarded as neocolonialists and all that sort of thing. But, I am satisfied that even with a Defence Force, there may be times when an independent country will have to call on some other country to assist it if it is invaded by any terrorists, or other people to bring down the Government. So, that is one point.

The other point that I just want to make is as far as the Waterworks Department is concerned. When the Water Bill was being discussed, Senator Boxill spoke of the difficulty which he experienced in getting a meter put on his domestic service and then, he went to the extent of saying that he had a meter in his garden and so and he also appealed to the department to connect his domestic service to the meter that he already had. Now, Mr. President, I really could not have replied at that time, but it surprised me to see that Senator Boxill was in difficulty of having a meter, or even wanting a meter because I remember in 1961 somewhere around October, when the Labour Government carried a five year plan to Parliament, in that plan provision was made for \$500 000

or half a million dollars to purchase meters. Now, I would like to say from the outset that I was opposed to that being mentioned in the plan and my reason for that was that people would not have accepted it as it ought to be.

That came about Sir, as a result of our bringing to this country, from the United Nations, an Economic Expert in the name of Cadbury to give us an economic survey of Barbados. He recommended among his other recommendations that we should have meters put on every service because of the expense it takes to lift the water from all around with the exception of Codrington spring. The Codrington spring is a gravitation spring and it takes nothing to bring water to the St. Philip, Christ Church area and so. Incidentally the area was owned by the late Josh Haynes or the Haynes and we used to lease it or to rent it and eventually when I was the Honourable Minister responsible, I suggested that we purchase the area so we no longer had to pay any rent.

But with the various wells we were sinking throughout the island, he said it was going to cost a lot of money to lift water by electricity and he even suggested that we try to lift it by wind. He discussed it with the Cabinet and he also discussed it with me privately in my office and I told him why I did not agree with it and so. However, the Cabinet against my advice put it into the five year plan. Some people perhaps may not understand what a plan is. A plan is not money, a plan is something similar to a Manifesto, I would do so and so within a certain time, but those things which you will do have to be bought and paid for and after you will do these things, you have to go to the House of Assembly, or to Parliament and get money Resolutions passed to implement that plan. No money was passed Mr. President to enforce any of the water meters.

The Opposition then played a very clever game. A clever game because when it was discussed, the Opposition kept mute on that particular item, not one word was said, as if they accepted it in its totality. But, I saw something in it that I said was going to happen. Immediately after that plan was passed, the Opposition went into *Gazettes* with a meeting and blurted all over the place telling the people that we got rich and now we got rich we were preventing them from getting a bucket of water, poor things, and all that sort of thing and turned quite a lot of people against us. I was the main target of this and I lost a lot of support as a result. But, Mr. President, what happened with these meetings — at a meeting in the Pine, the people were told by a member that he had passed somewhere that day and he had seen some of these meters installed. I do not know if you pass it in October, how you can get these meters in the island by December because the Election was held somewhere around the 2nd or 3rd December, 1961. I do not see how you could get them in because you have to get the money resolution

before the House, you have to get in touch with the Crown Agents and everybody and it must take some time before it comes into this country. We never imported one.

However, this went along, but what is peculiar, Mr President, is the fact that in their very first Estimates, a copy of which I have here in my hand, you will see here, I have 1962 and 1963 — that they have provision here in their very first Estimates for \$16 000 Purchase and Maintenance of Meters. This is their very first Estimates. Now, if they were truthful that we had brought in this half million dollars in meters, why would they have to put in their very first Estimates for 1962-63 — \$16 000 to purchase and repair meters? This is their second Estimates 1963-64 and this has also Mr. President, Item 39 — \$16 000 Purchase and Maintenance of Meters. That is the position as it stands and that is what the people probably came for and especially your humble servant.

You know as well as I do that on the 17th December, 1956 after the election, that on that day I was invited to Government House and when I got there in the yard I saw Garner, Mapp and Miller. When we were asked to come upstairs, I saw Sir Grantley Adams, I say yourself, the Governor and other persons there, and you will remember well that the Governor pushed a paper in my hand to take an oath and sign a document transferring me to Trade, Industry and Development, Tourism and Labour, and I was assigned to that office until I was removed from Parliament by the electorate. I would not say that I lost my seat, because the seat was not mine, the seat was the people's seat and the people will put in those seats the persons they want when they want to. I was no longer connected with Communications, Works and Housing, which was my original portfolio, but it was carried all over the island that I was this bad person and that I was doing all sorts of things against the people and so, and this was done by the party to which the Hon. Senator belongs, Hon. Senator Franklin.

Now I was disappointed in his maiden speech, when Senator Franklin accused the Government of Barbados, this present Government, of victimisation and going all through the country and talking about corruption and so on, and so on. Mr. President, victimisation came from the Democratic Labour Party and nobody else other than the Local Government that was down that place. When the people elected that Government in office one of the first things they did was to get rid of the persons who were members of the Boards which we had set up. I had set up the Tourist Board, the late Mr. Cave from Cave Shepherd was the Chairman. They got rid of all to two, Peter Morgan and somebody else they allowed to remain there. They got rid of the present Sir Kenneth Hunte who was Chairman of the Industrial Development Board, they got rid of that Board and left two, and then the next

thing that Government did was to insist on every person who went to register their names at the Labour Board for employment, they insisted that every person should have an Identification Card, and what was it for, Mr. President? To identify those who were opposed to them, those who were labourites, to victimise them, which they did. They laid off people at Highways and Transport and at different places. They got rid of the people at the Housing Board, and so on.

Now let us compare that attitude with the attitude of the present Government. When the present Government took over the present Government appealed to members of the Opposition to sit on these Boards, and they refused. That is one attitude. Another attitude is that persons who were seen canvassing and talking against the Labour Party, rather than transferring them or something like that or trying to get them fired, promoted them, sent them further. I do not want to call names, but some of you know them. I want to know where this victimisation which Senator Franklin spoke about is.

I can tell you this now, that as far as talking about corruption, that also originated from the Premier Barrow of Barbados, and many people will remember that immediately after he took over he told Parliament, and it was published in the paper, that he had a file 12 inches thick and he gave it to the Attorney General to prosecute the former Ministers. He told the people that the Government Savings Bank was empty, and when the people started to run on the bank to get out their money, he said they had misunderstood him. He went so far as to say that that Bank was better off than the bank in Jamaica, and so on. You will find it in the Official Gazette. I had a copy, I believe I will still find it at home. He was to lock up all of us, and I wrote in the paper, both the Daily News and the Advocate, and appealed to him to lock me up, and I ended by stating that any person who knows of a person who commits a crime and fails, especially a person in his position, and fails to bring the person to justice is worse than the person. I have not as yet been prosecuted, although I asked to be prosecuted. Left and right we were accused of some of everything, none of which was true, none of which could be proved, and I was told by one or two Civil Servants how they were harassed. One went to the extent of telling a Minister that he was a liar, and when it reached that stage you can understand, trying to get information to see if they could prosecute any of us. One silly man who was supposed to be a schoolmaster, or an ex-school master, propagandised on me saying that I was trying to get away at Seawell a night and the Premier took away my passport, as if a Premier could take away my passport, and I gave that man my passport and told him to keep it and see if the fellow or anybody will put their money in the place of their mouth. He kept it for over six months.

That was the behaviour, Mr. President, of the former Government and there is a lot more that I can say today on that. So when Senator Franklin said what he said at the time in his maiden speech, I would like to tell him right now, I know I will hear about Duffus but when a fellow is guilty of a crime and a clever lawyer gets him off, he still knows he is guilty, the lawyer knows he is guilty, God knows he is guilty and so on, but he was able to slip. I will say very frankly that this country was in a state of bankruptcy. When people are asked to go and pay their land tax and otherwise early and they will get a rebate by a Government, the Government is looking for money to pay the civil servants. We know civil servants did not get paid at times when they should be paid, and one or two of the cheques bounced too when the Democratic Labour Party was in office. Merchants could not get their money. A merchant spoke to me once and told me that they had owed him \$30 000 and he could not get a cent all he tried, and I want you to understand that this does not exist and has not existed from the time this Government took over. There is a different set up altogether. So when you get this type of criticism as was made by Senator Franklin and Senator Boxill, it does make one think and it makes one refer not in a pleasant manner or not in a complimentary manner to conditions as they existed before.

The law of this country states that where the Auditor General is concerned that every year after the financial year not later than December the Auditor General's Report is to be put to the Speaker and to the Senate, and the 1971-72 report came out in November, 1976, then the 1972-73 came and so on. You were not getting them, but you are getting them now. You are getting whatever the law says now. Proper administration, honest administration, intelligent administration and expert administration is running this country today, and I must tell you very frankly that I am not saying this because I am a member, because I have had differences with the party for years and I express my views and feelings. I was never a person afraid; I am a person who likes to work and not steal and so on, and therefore I can talk to any person any time any place. All I am saying, and all intelligent and fair-minded people in this country who look and see the vast change that has been made economically, socially and otherwise since this Government has taken over, now running five years, and especially with the destabilising attitudes of some people with their attempts to destroy the Government, attacking and abusing, lying and so on from day to day, is that this Government has done a remarkable job in a short space of time in the worst conditions ever existing as far as Government in this country is concerned.

Your Government had promised the people a lot of things; your Government promised the working classes beach houses with playgrounds where they could go and have a holiday with their children and all sorts of things.

Your Government promised and said it was a must. I have a three year programme of your Government, I mean the Democratic Labour Party. They said there must be a cement plant, an immediate thing. They stayed fifteen years in office and never did one thing. As a matter of fact, I will say this now for those who do not know. In 1961 in July the Barbados Labour Party Government gave the Millers here connected with some people in Canada pioneer status for cement and at that time Luther Miller told me that his legal representative was no other than E. W. Barrow, and immediately as they took over the Government they cancelled the pioneer status we gave to Miller and the people in Canada to establish this cement plant. So we never saw any cement plant; we never saw any flour mill, we never saw a shoe factory, we never saw any of those things. We never say a house built on the beach or on the road for the workers to go and take their holiday with their children to play around or anything of the sort, and when they come all they had to do was to fight for independence. We had brought everything to the Cabinet system where the Governor or anybody else could no longer preside; the Premier presided and you had nothing to do but just go on.

I want to say something, and if the occasion arises I will do it. But do not forget that Government when it took over criticized the Barbados Labour Party for giving civil servants \$3 million in increased salaries for that same year, and the Premier said he had to get back that money, and that this Island could not afford it and the Premier went as far as telling the civil servants not to come to him for any increase in the cost of living or anything unless there was an international spiral of the cost of living. That is what the Premier said. Go in the Library and look at the bottom page of the 4th May, 1962, and you will see that. He said he had to get back the money and he criticised us for giving the lower branch of the people, the key scale and the cantoniers and those people a 35% increase in their wages and salaries. He criticised that. Look in the Official Gazette and see that and look in the Official Gazette and you will see that he said he was not going to tax the people, that we had overtaxed them for ten years, and when Mr. Goddard, the junior member for Christ Church got up, he said "relax, go home and rest. When I say I am not going to increase any taxes, I mean neither company tax nor personal income tax." That was the position. I say that now because these two Senators who have just arrived here seem to come with an understanding that they can upset the equilibrium of this Honourable Chamber with this sort of talk they are talking and therefore I just want to let you know that there are still persons in here who have a historical background of the whole set-up and will not let you get away with it as long as some of us, including myself, happen to be around.

SENATOR K. HEWITT: Mr. President, as this Senate debates its fifth and final set of Estimates, it may be appropriate to look back just a little bit to see or comment briefly on the progress made during the period of our stewardship.

Mr. President, I do not think that there is really anybody who could seriously challenge any comment that the Barbadian economy experienced reasonable levels of growth during the past few years. This, Sir, is indeed a commendable achievement bearing in mind various experiences on both the international and regional scenes but growth, Sir, though providing the base for ascertaining high levels of employment should never be viewed as a goal in itself but rather as a means to other goals in that achieving or striving after economic growth per se there are normally certain social costs to be borne.

One can cite as an example the establishment of a Chemical Plant which ostensibly may lead to economic benefits but have disastrous social effects on the environment. Rather, Sir, the overall purpose of any national policy, I believe, should be to maximise the economic welfare of the community however one might define that economic welfare or measure it. That is why, Mr. President, I think certain Senators in the past have sought to distinguish between growth in itself or development or quantitative growth.

Although perusal of the Estimates before us will give us some idea of Government's sense of priority in the fields of say, Education, Housing, Health and so forth, yet almost by definition and/or tradition, they do not provide us with the qualitative type of information or opinion which, Sir, would indicate the efficiency of the output to the public sector in terms of the welfare of the country.

What I am saying, Sir, is that the format does not really permit a comprehensive review in the context of a comparison of actual results with stated growths. The way how the Estimates are compiled, we will see factual things, expenditure of millions, or X hundred thousands and so forth but there is no attempt at all ever made to effect a comparison between what was actually spent and the actual achievement in the context of a previously stated goal.

Perhaps this question of comparing results with stated goals can best be left to a Public Accounts Committee and the Auditor General who, Sir, in addition to attempting to determine wherever expenditure has been properly incurred for the purposes intended and within the limits specified, will in time also have to concern themselves with the questions (1), Are Government Programmes achieving their objectives and (2) Is value for money being obtained in Government spending? These are general points not reflecting a particular Government

that we are saying that the time will come when the Public Accounts Committee and the Auditor General will have to get involved with what is now called comprehensive auditing and give some indication as to whether in fact Government expenditure is being effectively spent and indicate or assess the extent to which goals are being achieved and the extent to which things are being done efficiently.

Sir, although we cannot look at the Estimates and pull out a figure which would indicate the general economic welfare of the country, I think by observation we get the feel that in fact the economic well-being of Barbados is definitely on an upward trend. Sir, we need to look just at the proposed National Health Scheme, the proposals with regard to ownership in tenancies, the recent introduction of legislation dealing with mortgage insurance for chattel houses, the various housing programmes, Sir, especially those related to the proposed housing development in the City areas, in particular the one which would strive to remove some of the more sordid sights of the City.

There are also various educational programmes at the Community College, programmes which seek to produce people capable of meeting the needs of the society as distinct from people with a sort of general academic background. There are programmes of the short modular form, 12 week programmes in areas of Fine Arts, things like ceramics, batik and that type of thing which I think another Senator is more qualified to talk about than I. All of these programmes I cite as an indication of what I construe as a qualitative type of development that I feel we have been experiencing over the past years.

As I say this, Sir, one must not come to the conclusion that there is not room for improvement or that one necessarily agreed with every programme or piece of legislation introduced by this particular Government. Of course, the record will show that there have been programmes which I and other members of this Senate did in fact oppose.

All in all, it is my opinion, even in spite of disagreements at various times, it is my opinion that in general the trend is to a better type of living overall over the past few years and this in fact may only be a continuation of a trend which was there previously. After that somewhat general comment, I would like to turn to one, or two particular matters.

The first point that I will deal with Sir is the question of the public debt. Recently, the public debt has come in for some comment in the Honourable Senate. I think that it was Senator Boxill who indicated that he was somewhat amazed that every time or so it would seem, that every time he opened the newspapers, one could see that Barbados was receiving a new loan from an

external source and then, in this debate itself I think the question of the public debt was raised by Senator Truss, who in his own way thought that it was a simple matter and it was also raised by Senator MacKenzie, who noted the level of the public debt, especially the external portion of the public debt. As I was saying Sir, Senator MacKenzie referred to the level of the debt and also referred to the increasing rate of that level and he was mostly concerned with the foreign portion of the debt in that he felt that obviously, that was the most important aspect in that that foreign portion of debt would obviously be putting demands on any future foreign exchange resources. But, he indicated that he could only observe levels of the increase rates before the necessary information and analysis and so forth, he was not in a position to sort of evaluate whether we had reached danger point, or not.

But, I find myself somewhat in the company of Senator MacKenzie here as I said without information and perhaps not possessing the particular analytical skills, even if I had the information, I might not have been able on my own to find out whether or not the public debt and in particular the external portion of the public debt was reaching danger levels. However, Sir, I was fortunate enough to happen upon an article which appeared in the Quarterly Report of the Central Bank, December 1980 Quarterly Report of the Central Bank. That article, in fact, it is a research paper, I should not just call it an article. The quality of it definitely deserves my referring to it as a research paper.

That research paper is entitled, "The External Debt of Barbados" and it was a research paper done by a Mary Zephrein from the Central Bank. Now it is from the December 1980 Quarterly Report of the Central Bank. I obviously would not attempt to summarise Miss Zephrein's Report, in any case, I do not know that I would necessarily do her justice. However, I thought it my very informative. Miss Zephrein in addition to other things intimated the various components of the public debt over the last ten years or so. Whether those components were for general budgetary purposes, or whether the part of the acquisition, or the acquiring of the external loan was for balance of payments, or whether the loan was for infra-structural projects and so. In other words, a schedule, a sort of analysis would have indicated how the public debt over the past few years was made up. In addition to that, we also have some schedules which sought to relate the level of the public debt with other types of economic data, thereby trying to measure, or to indicate whether the danger signal so to speak was there. So that in one part of the analysis we have the schedule expressing the debt service which would be the principle servicing of the debt expressing that as a percentage of exports, exports being the source of foreign exchange and in another table expressing the debt, this is the foreign portion of the debt, as a percentage of

public revenue and so on. As I said, I would not attempt to summarise the paper, time is not appropriate and so forth, I do not think that I have that type of skill.

But however, it may be appropriate at least to summarise the conclusions that were made. The point is as I intimated before, like Senator MacKenzie he does not have the information, nor the tools to do an analysis and therefore arrive at an opinion and as such, we have to look at others who have done such analyses and perhaps consider their opinion. The main conclusion of this paper, Mr. President on the public debt and the foreign portion of the public debt was that although the external debt had in fact risen rapidly, the debt servicing requirements had not in fact absorbed substantial resources. Although there was a rapid increase in external debt, the servicing of that debt did not require comparatively substantial resources. The projections were that these favourable features were likely to continue.

Another point was the deciding factor in debt servicing would be the external environment and the degree to which there was proper balance of payment management. She felt too that manufactured goods would be a more reliable source of substantial growth in foreign exchange earnings in the long term, that is, even though the inflows from tourism and sugar would remain important in the short term. She advocated that in future external borrowing, the authorities should seek to obtain longer periods of repayment and in fact should attempt to shift, or should increasingly shift foreign resources from social and infra-structural programmes to projects which would expand export capacity. The logic there should be quite obvious.

Sir, it is true that the opinion expressed here which in one global summary is that despite the level of public debt we are in no sort of danger position of not being able to service the debt, that opinion is the opinion of just one lady, but it is the opinion which is based on some considerable research and analysis and one which I obviously would have to accept, unless presented with a different opinion, but obviously based on the same type of research and analysis. Noticeably the analysis and a comment dealt mainly with the foreign portion of the debt as distinct from the local one, and I believe it is felt that the local element of public debt in future, looking at Barbados as a whole, would result only in the shifting of resources. In other words, Government would have to pay somebody locally either the interest and/or the principal, so from a national point of view it is not a point of concern as the foreign portion would be, in that the foreign portion obviously would be a demand on future foreign exchange resources.

The final point on that, Sir, is that obviously in looking at the public debt we cannot just look and say absolutely that a figure of \$400 million or \$500 million,

whatever it is, is high or low. The thing has to be taken in context of what other economic data and only after some extensive analysis and relationships could one come up with an informed opinion as to whether in fact the said debt is high or low.

Sir, if I can just move from the public debt and perhaps make a few comments with regard to Capital Expenditure, the 1981-82 Estimates for Capital Expenditure — in fact, the initial Estimates for 1980-81, which is last year — the Estimates for Capital Expenditure was some \$162 million. At that time I observed when considering those Estimates last year that the figure of \$162 million was in fact more than twice that of the previous year and more than any two previous years together. I also queried our capacity to make meaningful Capital Expenditure on that level. I think, Sir, that events would have proven that my observations were well founded, for the actual Capital Expenditure as indicated here in the Estimates for 1980-81 is now expected to be some \$117 million, or approximately 72% of the original Estimates. In fact, this \$117 million was achieved in the context of considerable strain and stress in the construction sector.

Now, Sir, in the context of what I construe to be almost excessive strain on the construction sector, it may be that some consideration should be given to bringing the various Government projects on stream at a more gradual basis. Consideration might have been given already to effecting some temporary restraint in the private sector, because somehow my little interpretation of the measures of the Central Bank earlier in the year would suggest that indirectly those measures could have the effect of having some restraint on construction for a period, and as I said, that sector of the economy seemed to have really — I do not know if the word is overheated — but it seemed to be definitely at peak demand, so much so that the ability to obtain labour and so forth was very difficult. One found therefore that workmen were able to move around almost willy-nilly, contractors having very little control, I would say, on the situation, the question of the demand for labour by far outstripping the supply of these skilled people.

In this type of environment, Sir, it would seem also that some attention must also be given to the efficiency of the construction sector. I believe that the increasing labour cost in that sector is not only a reflection of the increase in activity, but is also a reflection of the increase in inefficiency, and I would feel that in addition to training — I am thinking now of small contractors — in addition to training the various artisans in the particular skills and so forth, that some of them too must also undergo some type of training in the management of small projects. They must be made to have some appreciation for the importance of planning and proper scheduling. For argument's sake, Sir, there is no point in tiling a floor and then plastering the ceiling, there is no

point in running out of materials and then having to send and get them while workmen stand up idle and so forth. So I am saying that perhaps a combination of the Polytechnic, BIMAP and the Community College should in fact consider effecting some programme whereby those small contractors could sort of improve their management skills.

Now, I think this point with regard to the construction sector is relevant, because in addition to the pressures of the past year, it would appear, bearing in mind the estimate of \$199 million for the 1981-82 year, bearing in mind that type of estimated Capital Expenditure, it would seem that the construction sector will continue to be under some severe pressure, and it is my opinion that over the past twelve months we have had a situation where in fact former apprentices, or people who formerly would have been regarded as apprentices functioned, say, as masons, whereas masons functioned as foremen and foremen as contractors; that type of situation just happening because of the great demand for people.

Sir, looking at the revenue side of things, I must admit that as I more or less review the Estimates year after year, I begin to appreciate more and more the problems of decision making by a Minister of Finance. A Minister of Finance must not only provide the funds so that the various other ministries can carry on effectively the various social programmes, and in Barbados, believe you me, Barbadians are very demanding and rightly so in those areas such as education, housing and health. He must not only look for the funds to continue these programmes at continuing levels of improvement, not only more services but better services, but in raising these finances he must always be conscious of feeling that he would not necessarily overburden the populace with taxes, and having thus concluded the level of revenue to be raised, he still then has the problem of considering how to allocate that burden between the various sectors. It is as I said an unenviable situation to sort of make the decisions especially in the context of politics.

Now we have had previous discussions here with regard to the pros and cons of direct taxation and indirect taxation, and I think that at least it was agreed that what should be strived for is some healthy balance between the two types of taxation. Whatever the theory may be, it is pretty obvious at least I believe at this time that at this point of our development we cannot have all direct taxes, neither can we have all indirect taxes, and therefore we must have a mix and the relevant question is how that mix should go. The type of balance will have to be one that would not blunt the initiative of the enterprising or make it over abundantly difficult to attract skilled people from overseas whilst at the same time ensuring that any shift

towards indirect taxation would not prove too heavy a burden on those least able to bear it.

Now I think that there has been some talk about this shift from direct taxation to indirect taxation, and whereas one would conclude that there has been some shift, yet based on my calculation, and this is the arithmetic of the whole thing, it does not seem to me to be any great shift. When I start from the 1974-75 year and express taxes on income and profits as a percentage of total revenue, the figures I arrive at in the various years starting with 1974-75 are as follows: this is a percentage of taxes on income and profits, and I am expressing taxes on income and profits as a percentage of total revenue: 1974-75, 43%, 1975-76, 41%; 1976-77, 43%; 1977-78, 42%; 1978-79, 43%; 1979-80, 38%; 1980-81, is expected to come in around 41% and based on the Estimates so far the figure for 1981-82 is 38%, but that figure obviously may change by the time you reach March, 1982. So we have a high, let us say, of 43% and a low of 38%. Just looking at the percentage it would not appear to be any significant shift from direct to indirect.

Looking again at the absolute amounts, one would see that in 1979-80 the actual revenue from taxes on income and profits was \$138 million. The revised Estimates for 1980-81 show \$161 million and the Estimates for 1981-82 - \$183 million. It would indicate that this thing is gradually increasing, and the thing to note, Sir, is that a lot of the changes in the income tax rates and in the income tax bands over the last two years were really over due and to a large extent were really correcting a situation which had been made quite intolerable because of inflation. A lot of these rates have not been changed since 1968 so that it was not so much a question of any large shift to indirect more than trying to correct an imbalance which to a very large extent had been caused by inflation.

Having made that comment about the long time some of these things took to be changed, as I said some were from 1968 and were only changed last year and the year before last, that brings the question to mind as to whether the various allowances and the various bands should not be put at a reasonable level and then from there on indexed. In other words, having been put at whatever is construed to be a reasonable level, then automatically they would change year after year in consonance with the rates of inflation. This is a practice adopted elsewhere including Canada and it may be one that may be appropriate in this situation. Having said that, and looking at the consumption tax situation, the figure from 1979-80 to 1980-81 did increase considerably moving from \$23 million to \$50 million, but as one Senator indicated, I do not think you can look at it in isolation, and having noted that increase, we will then have to recognise that the disposable income had increased also.

Now in the 1980 budget the Minister of Finance had indicated that it was estimated that the effect which his budget would have on the cost of living would be a one shot increase between three quarters of one percent and one percent which as he said was not an unreasonable price to pay for certain reductions in the income tax and so forth. What I think would be of interest is an analysis or an evaluation of the situation to ascertain or to estimate to what extent the increases in the cost of living were the result of consumption tax.

To put it a little better, what effect on the cost of living the Consumption Tax had. I think that is a piece of information, Sir, that would be perhaps very valuable. In other words, we could know whether it was within this range and if it was not, how far outside that range it was because people go to the Supermarket and we hear that prices are up and so forth and then automatically such increases in prices are related to Consumption Tax.

I am saying I do not know what is the effect the Consumption Tax had on that cost of living or the increase in prices and bearing in mind the statement that is expected that the Budgetary proposals in 1980 should have had no more than 1% effect, it would be interesting to know whether in fact what the effect was. Not only to me, Sir, but I think to those obviously in control of the Government finances because I would assume that they, too, would not want to learn that the tax, in fact, has caused an increase greater than what was expected.

Continuing on the Consumption Tax, Sir, and noting that that tax, broadly speaking, is not a tax on essentials, food, drugs and so forth, although one sees the tax appearing in some construction items and the question there as far as the construction, what element the increased cost in consumption is that Consumption Tax, but the point I really wanted to make is that obviously items which are subjected to that tax, in my opinion, should be monitored periodically, and I would assume this is done, because what may be construed as a non-essential today would be construed as an essential tomorrow. As our level and standards rise, what we construe today as luxuries or non-essentials tomorrow will become essentials and I would think that the general policy would be that the Consumption Tax would not be on what may be construed as essential goods.

Now, Sir, I think it might be appropriate now to touch on one or two items as far as Income Tax is concerned, specifics now rather than overall concept. One thing I must remark about the Income Tax situation, Sir, is that the legislation embodying the 1979 Budget came before this Senate on the last day of the 1980

Estimates. It was not only an inordinately long time between the Budget and the legislation coming before the Senate but the legislation came immediately after the Estimates when everybody was tired talking and listening and therefore little notice in fact was given to the debate, if one could call it a debate, to that legislation. That was legislation embodying the 1979 Budgetary Proposals.

We cannot criticize the bringing of the legislation embodying the 1980 Budgetary Proposals, I cannot accuse the powers that be of bringing it at the same time as the Estimates because they have not brought it as yet. Sir, this is a difficult situation where one has to file income tax for 1980 but we do not have the legislation which indicate what the amendments to the Act are, the amendments flowing from the 1980 Budgetary Proposals.

It is pretty difficult really to advise a client based on the Budget. It is true it is a printed document, or based on some explanatory material put out by the Department. I must say that the Revenue Department has, in fact, put out certain explanatory material either in the format of circulars or notices in the Press but obviously it is not good enough. It is known that there will be changes every year and therefore I do not think that it is too much to ask that that legislation that embodies the changes stemming from the Budget Speech, that that legislation should come before both Houses of Parliament long before the end of the particular year. In other words, the one for 1980 should have come before December, 1980.

Now, Sir, in spite of certain increases in allowances and what not, I still think that there are one or two areas in which better could be done and I think that in looking at some of these areas one should not just instinctively react that here is someone making a case for himself and so on but really try to put it in perspective.

Take for argument's sake the situation with respect to pension. Self-employed is allowed, if I remember correctly, an allowance of about \$1,500 per annum and if one tried to determine what that \$1,500 per annum could purchase by way of a pension one would see that it is a pretty small amount. As a matter of fact, I think that a person at age 40 purchasing a pension, \$1,500 in premiums per year, would purchase, let us say, a pension aged 65 and onwards of about \$580 a month and a fellow at age 40 will reach 65 twenty-five years from now and one could try to estimate the value of that \$540 twenty-five years down the line so when one sort of suggest that that is an allowance which could be increased, one should not just look at it solely that the individual is looking to have an extra dollar disposable income. The other aspects of that are, one, that the individual is seeking to make some reasonable provision for his old age and hence to that extent would be a lesser burden on the community at that time.

The second thing to note in an area like insurance and pension, that to the extent more and more people do take out insurance to that extent, you have an increasing pool of funds for investment purposes. So, it is not just a straightforward situation of giving an additional dollar, or having an additional dollar of disposable income or whatever. In an area like that, you also have the other considerations of people providing for old age therefore being less of a burden to the society of that time and secondly, at the same time providing a pool, or increasing pool of funds which could form the source of funds for investments.

Sir, in one of the recent amendments to the Act, there is a situation there where an amount of one thousand dollars is permitted as an allowance, or an amount up to one thousand dollars is permitted as an allowance if that thousand dollars instead of being received in cash for bonus were in fact received in shares of the employer company. Sir, whereas I do support any encouragement given to the broad population of Barbados to become more involved in the economic activity of the country by way of purchasing shares, or by way of other investments, I certainly cannot see the reason for the limitation placed on this aspect. In other words, what this amendment says in fact is that only if an employee invests the thousand dollars in the employer company would that employee benefit from the thousand dollars allowance.

What is the rationale of forcing someone to invest in a particular company namely his employer company? There is not every company that is worth investing in. I may be working for company A and I may prefer to invest in company B. If there is a policy of encouraging investment why not give me the encouragement to invest full stop? If there is to be a limiting factor Sir, I would suggest that the limiting factor should be in the area of investment. In other words, if one wants to channel investment in a particular direction, one may then say, I will give you the allowance if you invest in a particular activity, the production of shoes, or agriculture, or whatever have you. But not if you invest in a particular company especially where that company may not be worth investing in.

The other thing of note here is that not only does it limit the individual to his employer company, but the incentive is removed from a large section of the working population. Take the whole Civil Service, school teachers and so forth, that incentive is not open to them. Why? Where is the logic? If you want to encourage investment, sort of indicate the area of desirable investment and then say, that to the extent that one is prepared to invest in that area, whatever the productive sector may be that we will permit the allowance. In fact, the better type of investment may not be in shares at all, it may in say national development bonds, or something like that. In that case, if I may shift slightly, the National Development Bonds and so forth, the incentive there is just the tax free situation of the dividends. So one must have the

thousand dollars first to invest, and then you get the interest income. You do not get the relief on the principle in the first place.

I feel Sir, that in this area, you are more or less on the right track, but somehow deviating slightly. The idea of encouraging investment is a good one, but the restrictions embodied in this particular aspect, I cannot see the reason for it. If somebody could explain the reason, perhaps I would support it, but as it stands, I cannot see the reason for how it is worded.

Sir, with the situation with the limitation of interest payments on dwelling houses to \$6 000, I think in the last Budget Speech, the Rt. Hon. Minister of Finance alluded to that point and indicated that he would look into it he did not say he would increase it — whether or not it would merit an increase bearing in mind the increase in building costs, I do not think that we could ask for any more. If he looks into it and does not increase it, so be it, but I really think as a minimum, it should be looked into. Building costs have escalated and perhaps a limit in the vicinity of \$10 000 may be more reasonable.

Again, in looking at this type of suggestion one should not just say, "well, it is going to benefit the person in the upper income group" because how does one get the expensive house in the first place? The expensive house it is true is a content of expensive materials, but then it is also a content of expensive labour, that labour by and large being local labour. So again, there are two sides of the coin not only the relief perhaps to someone in the upper income level, but the thing to note is that to the extent such houses are built, one is providing very worthwhile employment opportunities to a large section of the population.

Sir, there was a report recently that consideration was being given to having a minimum wage for domestics. I believe Sir that some Honourable Senators will recall that there was a Resolution, I do not remember the exact wording of the Resolution, but it was a Resolution coming from I think Senator MacKenzie to the effect or calling in Government to consider making the wage paid to a domestic as deductible for tax purposes. Sir, there was a Resolution calling for that for domestics. I think that Senator Trotman remembers that very well. In response to that Resolution, there was a lot of emotional outburst.

Again, the first reaction was that somebody was looking for something for themselves. Senator Trotman in the peak of emotion asked if we want to make this country a country of domestics. Somehow seeing the difference of someone working in a domestic atmosphere, in other words when I say that, in a private house, from someone working let us say in a hotel, the nature of the job by and large would be similar.

It was all right for an individual to provide these services in a hotel, and for that hotel or the company owner to be permitted the wage as a deduction for calculating his profits, but somehow now when that person is doing a similar thing in the house of an individual, there is a stigma on the type of work, number one, and somehow the person should not be allowed the allowance. Anyhow, the allowance was not given in spite of the fact that the motion was carried. Mr. President, I think you will remember it, because the motion was carried, I think, because of your support of the measure. Not so much perhaps that you supported the principle, but I think because you felt that the thing was calling on Government to look at it and therefore there could be nothing wrong in that. Anyhow, for reason or another the salary paid to a domestic has never been permitted as an income tax deduction, but last year, or year before last, amounts paid to gardeners up to a certain amount were permitted, and I somehow could not understand the logic of permitting amounts paid to gardeners to be deductible but not amounts paid to domestics.

My point in supporting the call for permitting that salary as an allowance, my main point was that it was my opinion that by doing that the employer would then be in a position to pay a greater wage to the domestic without any increased burden on himself, and at the same time would be effecting what I would suggest is a direct redistribution of the funds. In other words, for ease of arithmetic, a person in a 50% bracket who was then paying \$50 a week to a domestic would have been able — I am using these figures merely for arithmetic and not to indicate what is a good or bad wage or anything like that — a person in the 50% bracket would be able to pay the individual \$100 without any additional expense. All that would be happening is that instead of paying \$50 in taxes or the equivalent of \$50 in taxes per week, that person would be paying the \$50 to the domestic.

It is true that the argument would be that there would be no guarantee that in fact that would happen. I would suggest that although it might not happen in all cases, yet the mere fact that people would be more able to pay is in my opinion that gradually over a period of time it would lead to a better wage for the domestic. That was my main reason for supporting the measure, and the point I am making now is that I feel that having gone halfway on this road — the halfway point being permitting the amount paid to gardeners to be tax deductible up to a maximum amount — perhaps the next step is to make the amount payable to domestics up to a particular amount as also a deduction for tax purposes.

I do not think we should look at it that just solely that here again is someone in a particular income level benefiting from a tax deduction. I think one should look at it as enabling someone to pay a better wage to another person, who in fact is in need of that better wage. As I said, this was my main reason for supporting that Resolution. The idea of its leading to greater employ-

ment I did not necessarily support, I was fifty-fifty on that, but I definitely feel that it would enable people to pay a better wage and it would be more or less a direct distribution to a sector of the population who could do with some more cash in their hands.

Sir, I would just like to make two other pretty short points in the area of income tax. One has to do with the filing date for companies. Let us choose 1980 as an example. A company with a year end any time in 1980, whether it is January 1980 or December 1980, has to file returns by March 15 of the following year. It means that a company with a year end in January has something like 13 or 14 months to file their returns, whereas a company with a year end December 31 would have two and a half months. To me that is a ridiculous situation. Number one, there is a little bottleneck where everything is coming on the Department at the same time, all tax returns from companies flowing into the Department at the same time around March 15, and secondly it puts a lot of stress and strain on the accounting resources in the island, which resources at present are relatively small in relation to the demand.

It is my opinion, as is done elsewhere — this is nothing new or original — that a more sensible approach, both from the point of view of the Revenue Department and also from the point of view of practitioners and taxpayers that a company should be allowed or should be compelled to file six months after its year end, so that if the year end is January, you file six months after that, if the year end is December you file six months after that. Somehow it seems to me that that would put a more even flow of the returns coming into the Revenue and it would also even out the work flow of professionals and so on. I think right now you have a whole host of requests going into Revenue for extensions, and if one chose the six months or whatever particular period, I think it would tend to smoothen out accounts.

On the question of late filing, as we all know, there are certain penalties for individuals and companies who file their income tax returns late, and to the extent that you owe the Revenue money then there is a penalty for late filing and there is also an interest element for that late filing. The reverse, however, is not true. In other words, when the Revenue owes you a refund, whether that refund is paid six months, twelve months, fourteen months after, there is no interest factor. Now, I feel that in fairness to the taxpayer there should be some type of interest factor after having held that refund for a certain period of time. The period of time might be six months, it might be eight months, but I think one should determine what is a reasonable time within which a refund should be made, and having determined that, any time the refund is made outside that period then there should be some interest factor for the taxpayer.

Sir, one final point, and this is to do with the question of prices again and price control. I do not know

if I was getting the points made in the debate on this subject well, I think a point coming from one quarter was that in light of seemingly rapid increase in prices on certain consumer goods, food items for example, that there could be something to say for the monitoring of these prices through a Prices Control Commission, for argument's sake.

The response to that seems to have been that when that type of practice was made by the previous regime, it led to certain shortages and so forth. Now my query is this: was it because of the conceptual idea of having a prices control body itself which led to the shortages or whether in fact the way how it was effected? In other words, was it the system or was it the way people tried to apply the rules? If it was just the way that the rules were applied as distinct from the system itself, I feel it would do no harm considering having a similar body, call it what you may, which in fact may monitor prices and control markups. I think that a lot of people will feel happier to know that in fact that type of control was being effected. Perhaps the monitoring system is being carried out in a different way. If that is so, fair enough; but the argument that because when this system was followed previously it led to shortages, I am not so sure that it was the system rather than the way the system was worked.

Sir, yesterday a few Senators in ending off their speeches really sounded as though they were bidding farewell and what not, pointing out what a good experience it was to have been involved in the workings of Parliament over the past four and a half to five years. I would merely like to echo the sentiments in that respect. I have enjoyed it, I have enjoyed working with fellow Senators and under your chairmanship and to me really it has been a wonderful experience. Thank you, Sir.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. PRESIDENT: There seems to be a feeling, hon. members, that a short break might be welcome. Let us make it as brief as possible.

This sitting will be suspended for fifteen minutes.

On resumption:

Mr. PRESIDENT: This sitting is resumed.

SENATOR Miss M. BLACKMAN: Mr. President, I really cannot make any comment on the question of public financing because I am not competent, but I would say that there are a number of Barbadians expressing a lot of concern about the high level of borrowing. I remember one comment that one of these mornings we will wake up and find that this country does not belong to us. The comment was made by somebody who is not perhaps familiar with too much finances, but I would think that if

Government is entirely happy about the level of borrowing, then perhaps it would be worthwhile to do the sort of education programme that helps the average citizen to understand and feel a little bit more comfortable with it.

There has been a comment too, about the high level of savings which remains not invested, and this has been an area of concern for people like myself who feel that there is need to have the sort of scheme that helps the small man see how he can make meaningful and profitable investment in areas where his money is safe. With Government schemes I think the average man in Barbados is fairly comfortable. I know that during the last year there has been some attempt to encourage people in this sort of investment by Government, but whatever it was has not been entirely satisfactory and has not met the needs of a number of small people. As a matter of fact, I know for a positive fact that several people who took up money from deposits, broke their deposits, lost their interest and the cheques were subsequently returned to them, so they neither got the interest from deposits nor were they able to do the investment in Government bonds that they had intended to try. So, Sir, it seems that there is need for us to devise a scheme that helps the small man see how he can meaningfully get into this question of investment without feeling that there is risk of losing what interest he is already earning.

Sir, of particular concern to me is the social trend, the dropouts in our society. I am very aware that it would be difficult to see just from the figure how Government is attempting to cope with this, but this, is one of the very disturbing things. We do not know of a definite scheme either through the Ministry of Education or any other agency (a) to slow down the flow of dropouts and (b) to pick up the ones who have already dropped out and see what we can do with them. This is not an easy matter. I am not suggesting that the problem of the Rastas such as it is is a matter which can be dealt with with five minutes of thought. I am aware of the fact that we need to do a proper indepth survey as to these aspects of life in Barbados today. It is not good enough for us to take what has happened in other countries and say that this refers to us. I am very confident that it is time that we attempt to do this for ourselves and to decide how we are going to tackle this problem and how we are going to cope with it.

In the whole education system I have been concerned for some time that we do not appear to be making enough provision for the last starter, for the person who has not made proper use of the opportunity provided in the normal education system from the time he was five years old. In the system as we have it today, a person who suddenly wakes up at 14 and 16 and decides that he wants to make use of the education scheme or make use of the system to place himself in the society as he would wish has a very difficult time.

I am not suggesting that it is easy for us to do what has been done in developed countries and to have all of the facilities which have enabled many Barbadians who have gone abroad to get into a professional line at a late stage in life but, Sir, I wonder if we have not gone backwards instead of forwards because many years ago we had the Evening Institute functioning at a lot of rural centres which gave people in the areas opportunities to start late. Today, this is largely concentrated in the Bridgetown area and I am not entirely happy that opportunities enough are provided in the country areas for people to be able to start or re-enter the educational system and place themselves in our society as they would wish.

As I said, Sir, I realize that we do not have all of the money like some other countries have, nevertheless, I just wonder if we could not be more aware of the total spectrum of our population, the whole life span and whether we are not putting all of our concentration on the youth of this country. I do not think that it is really fair to the older people of this country that there should be so limited opportunity for them and yet the money that they have paid in taxes, yes, it is their children, but they might also want to make use of some of it to help themselves to be in a better position so that their own children might not be looking at them down their noses because the children would have had better opportunities than they had themselves. If we hope to move forward, Sir, I think this is one of the areas that we will have to pay a great deal of attention to.

Sir, I look, too, at the question of the vote for the Family Planning Association. I am pleased to see that there is an increase of \$97,000 but, again, years ago, the Family Planning Association employed workers who worked in rural areas. They went from house to house and village to village in rural areas helping people to understand and to become familiar with the use of contraceptives.

I do not think that we can argue that these people or such a plan is no longer needed. If we look at the high incidence of abortion cases entering the Hospital and if we realize that the ones entering the Hospital are cases that have just gone wrong, then we know that we do have a problem which we need to cope with. As to whether the Family Planning Association is able to do it through its field workers I really would not wish to say that that is the only thing we should be looking at but this is something which we should be bearing in mind. With reference to the Community Development Division, Sir I cannot help feeling that they must have had major problems when I see that in fact they have spent about half of the money available to them for maintenance of property and roughly half or a little more than half, \$76,000 out of \$104,000, I think, for operating expenses but are we entirely happy that the community does not need the services from this Division in helping them develop programmes and projects for themselves.

I can quite see that the question of maintenance of property might well tie in with reference to what Senator Hewitt said when he questioned whether in fact the amount of money available for Capital Expenditure was not more than we could in fact use, whether we had the facility to be able to use this amount of money in things like the Construction Industry, and, Sir, if we recognise this as a problem, this, perhaps, is an area where we can pay more attention to the numbers of unemployed and the unemployed women in this country. There is absolutely no reason why the women in this country cannot get into the Construction Industry and work for wages in it.

I think, Sir, that this would be one of the areas which would be helpful when we recognise that the Economic Report has pointed out that the whole incidence of unemployment generally is lower in the community, nevertheless, the incidence of unemployment among women is higher than it had been previously. This, perhaps, may sound strange to some Barbadian ears but there are some countries in which women have gone into the industry and in which they are doing very effective jobs. (*Asides*). Not only Russia, even here in the West Indies in some areas or in the Caribbean in some areas women are doing effective work in the Construction Industry.

Sir, I look quickly at my Income Tax Return and this is a matter which I have mentioned. In the Income Tax Return, and this would concern the Inland Revenue Department, I know, there is a Section in which widows and widowers are allowed to claim for a housekeeper. It does not bear any relation to their having children to take care of. It says that if you are a widow or a widower then you can have a housekeeper. In a community in which 77% I think it is of the children being born are not being born to married people, I cannot see why there should be this discrimination in favour of a wedding ring, because that is all it is.

The woman who has 10 children and is not married is not a widow. She cannot claim. The woman who has one child and was married can claim under this. The other thing it would seem to me is that this is a rank case of discrimination because if a widow has no children, she can claim so that you have a widow who goes out to work to support herself and can claim for a housekeeper. The single woman who goes out to work for herself cannot claim a housekeeper so this is really something that needs to be looked at quite seriously. (*Asides*)

In spite of what Senator Lynch says, get married, but in spite of what Senator Lynch says, there are a lot of people who would not wish to take that way out of it with all due deference.

Sir, we have had two Senators talking about the fact that our Police need a boost. Yes, our Police certainly need a boost. We hope that when the scheme

or when the revision is looked at which gives our Police Establishment a boost, that somehow they will find it possible to look at the Transport Section of the Police as carefully as they look at the Transport Board and give the taxpayers money a boost by having fewer of these vehicles destroyed in so short a time, and this may not be a popular thing to say at this stage but really I think it is one that all of us who drive along the streets of this country cannot help feeling and are more uncomfortable about.

The one other thing that I would mention and I know that I would not be able to find it in the Estimates but Senator Truss did assure us some time ago that the question of a public facility for Bridgetown which I raised when I first came in here, the need for a proper public facility in the Bridgetown area.

But, the question of a public facility for Bridgetown which I raised when I first came in here, the need for a proper public facility in the Bridgetown area. This, I was assured was receiving immediate attention. I would wish to be assured at this stage that there are two stones one on top of the other in the building of this facility because I see no trace of it, I hear nothing about it and Sir, it really is a disgrace that in 1981 we still do not have a proper public facility in Bridgetown. I know Sir, that I have been picking out small, particular items and as I said earlier, I do not feel myself in any way competent to deal with the question of public accounts.

I have said that there are several people who are concerned with the high level of borrowing. I have expressed my wish that Government would perhaps recognise the need to do a programme which helps the common man understand what is happening in this area and I would also hope that the education programmes which are being done for promotion when tax time comes to tell us how to fill out income tax forms could be used in other areas. I do sincerely hope that we would make a serious attempt to get the issue of women's employment in this country really looked at and as I said, the construction area might be one of them, there are other areas. I do really hope that Government will find a way of tackling the problem of women's unemployment in the country because it is a serious matter. As long as you have unemployed women in this country, you are likely to have children not well looked after and if you have children not well looked after you must not be surprised. If you have young people in the community, young adults who are rejecting the various social norms in our society and this is one way we certainly will find trouble, unless we tackle the problem meaningfully.

Thank you, Sir.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Enid Lynch.

SENATOR Mrs. E. M. LYNCH: Mr. President, I think I may boldly follow where the others have led, in attempting to talk about things of which I know little, so I would begin by making a comment about Agriculture.

It would seem to me, that in the fight against inflation, one of the solutions is to produce more. Formerly, Barbados was a place where every single plot of land was cultivated. I remember the time when my own family on the spot where I now live would have called themselves perhaps part-time mixed farmers. Now, nothing grows there and this is a general picture in a village where everyone grew something, where now, you find that there is less food available in those little villages where everybody produced a little something not for sale necessarily, but we exchanged with each other and there was more food in the village.

Now, I wonder whether any bright person interested in Agriculture can come up with some suggestion, as to how we can get more of those small plots of land back into cultivation. We will have the problem now, which we did not have before of fencing because of larceny, but it does seem to me, that we have let too many of these bits of land go out of cultivation. The cost of having a small bit of land turned up would be something like \$14 to \$16 a day and so, if you are a small family, not producing for sale, it seems hardly worthwhile to expend the money necessary for cultivation of land. But, it makes me sad when I see so many small bits of land producing nothing, while at the same time, we are complaining about the price of food and I think that perhaps larceny would decline a bit more, if one could acquire food a little more cheaply. Now, I have not got a solution, but I do not think that we should have so many bits of waste land around.

The other thing about which I want to make a point is transport. I do not think that I am brighter than the Director, or whatever he is of Transport, but it seems to me, that if we provide enough buses for a complete 24 hour service, that fleet is only going to be fully used at peak time and then for the rest of the day, you would have stock and men not fully occupied and so, although we look at the minibus as a situation which is not a very clear one, it seems to me, that perhaps the Transport Board could concentrate on either normal 24 hours service and that the minibus operators would be required to concentrate on peak periods and the Transport Board would not have to get the additional buses which are used only at peak time. Take the slack up with the minibuses and it seems to me that this would be a very good combination. It may be a bit bold of me to be suggesting something of this sort. I am not without some daring.

Now, we have heard a lot about our finances and it is generally admitted that taking everything into

consideration, Barbados has been able to do a good job with our finances. But, the Honourable Leader of the Senate pointed out that a very high proportion, I think about 45% of our available funds are going into Social Services. Now, warnings are coming out from all over the world, where there are well-established welfare states, Britain, Sweden, to some extent, New York City, that welfare states are getting into difficulties, England particularly with her health services and so on and I think that we should learn from what is happening in these places and not let ourselves fall into the same trap. It is obvious that we will need to produce the wealth first before we promise further expansions of social services. That was the line followed. I think, in West Germany. So, that the wealth is there before we begin to promise, in fact I look forward to the day when we would have an election campaign in which there is nothing to be promised.

But, in addition to the organisation you have of finance and planning, I think that we also need some kind of definite planning group to meet what I would call the development of the social aspect of the society. I think we need to have some clearly defined social goals with which our young people can identify. You can tell them your country needs you in these ways. Very often, when I was consulting children, I could not really predict what the country would be looking like say, five years ahead. Of course, I was fortunate at that time because they were taking teachers with one or two subjects and I would give what was a touching oration of the needs of the primary school and I hope I reached a good many teachers in that way.

I think we need this sort of social planning group. After all, we have people at the West Indian University, we have a pool of sociologists and economists, and I think people of this sort should be applying themselves to the problems of the day. We have the problems of what we call the Rastafarians, I do not think they are any genuine Rastafarians, I think that they are young people doing what young people have always done, getting into a group. If you live in a home where there are lots of boys all the boys in the district gather at that house and they remain there perhaps a whole day playing and doing all sorts of things. It is this love of adventure and this desire to be together in a communal group, away from people who are going to ask you what you are doing and why you are doing it, and because in adolescence youngsters tend to get little friction with older people, and now that there are communal groups into which they can run instead of just threatening to run away, or feeling that they might run away from home, which happens to a lot of young people, they do really have somewhere to run to. I think if we follow them closely we will find that there are some who go into this movement and come back out again, as if they are passing through a sort of special phase.

The one thing that is different from normal adolescent love of camping out — and I still share that

love, I still like camping out, I would still go and live out of doors and all those things, and nobody would call me a Rastafarian — but the thing that is different is the drug attraction. I think they come together because they have a little bit of privacy in the obtaining and sharing and use of the drug which they would not have at home. But I feel that we have not really investigated, as Miss Blackman says, what our problem is. I do not think the Barbadian Rastafarian is the Jamaican Rastafarian, this is a different something. We have some playing football in their flowing locks, and we have some who during the hurricane turned out and were very useful. Now, this could suggest that we should not be entirely hopeless and that we should address ourselves to learning more about them and of engaging in preventive work, in trying to see if we are making school life sufficiently adventurous, sufficiently challenging perhaps for the ones who are not so bright, because we had this phenomenon just at the time when we are erecting very large schools, and one wonders whether some of these children are not the product of perhaps a little lack of the kind of individual concern which they formerly got in their little all age village schools where everybody knew them, their mothers, their fathers, their sisters and brothers, so I would really like to see a group of this sort.

The compassionate and erudite Minister of Labour and Youth Affairs would probably have some more thoughts in this direction, but I think we ought to be planning our social life just as we plan our financial life.

Now, we are fortunate perhaps in the fact that although we have a two party system, they both have an "L" in the middle of their names, and so when we change one party for the other we do not get the kind of stop-go effect which we find, for example, in Britain, and this is particularly noticeable in the field of education. It is interesting how little controversy there is in the Other Place about matters having to do with education. It seems to be one of those areas in which there is a certain amount of agreement as to the general direction in which we should be going, even if we differ in detail or in the method of doing it, but I think that we have reason to have some satisfaction with the general trends in education over the last five years.

We had that very bold step, what was a very bold step at the time, when the Minister of Education said "by Monday morning I want all the 14 year olds back into school". It looked like a tremendous task, it looked a difficult thing to do, but it was done. We do not hear much about the results, but I kept in touch because I was associated with Dr. Shorey who was helping with the training of the first teachers for that scheme, and the children did respond, because for the first time, you see, the teachers in their sectors belong to them, the teachers were concentrating on them, they were important, they were the centre of the stage, they were no longer little groups of people just kind of rejects of the school, and

although the materials and perhaps sometimes the building might not have been perfect, I still think that many of those children benefited in a feeling of personal esteem by having gone through that little course, and I feel that we ought not just to wipe those centres off. I think we ought to look to see whether this kind of special centre has not got a place for people, for example, the kind of student who is a continual truant. We might have a centre where you have an understanding teacher who is somewhat of a social worker and who is able to give the child rather more adult treatment than at school, the sort of halfway between school and the outside world. We might have children who would do better in a centre of this sort rather than being at school and not fitting properly, so I think we should look at the centre idea and see if that experience that we gained with the 14 plus children is not something that we have a use for in the system.

I noticed with very great pleasure the considerable sums of money being spent in the building and reconditioning of primary schools, and in addition to the improvement of physical plant there is the new project which I think comes under the aegis of USAID and the University of the West Indies, and which is directed by Dr. Leonard Shorey, where they are collaborating to improve the materials and resources for use in the primary schools. A lot of what they do will be duplicated and distributed to other schools, and we hope that this will help a great deal in upgrading the materials available to the primary schools.

There have been some complaints in recent years that they did not have enough books, but I think that that is receiving attention now. I am also very much pleased to see the kind of co-operation between teachers and the Ministry of Education and the National Curriculum Development Council. That National Curriculum Development Council is one of the things which I was thinking of when I said that our two parties seem able to avoid the stop-go effect, because that National Curriculum Development Council began, I think, under Mr. Sandiford, the then Minister of Education, and it has continued and teachers have been producing syllabuses and curriculum guides, they have produced a philosophy for the primary school and they are now at work on the philosophy for the secondary school.

I hope that as the secondary schools gradually reach the end of their expansion period that there will be an increased number of trained teachers available for the primary schools. Teacher training is of course central at a time when there are so many changes taking place in education, and in this connection we should note that Erdiston has been expanded to cater to an increased number of teachers. I myself regret somewhat that it is no longer a fully residential college. There are some residents, and I think that the question of whether it should be residential or non-residential is still being looked at. We have to be

aware of costs and food is a very high cost when you have a residential institution, but I would hope that it could be made partially residential in that students might be required to spend perhaps three weeks in residence each term or perhaps one month a year as fully resident students so that they will have more time with their tutors and with each other and develop a stronger corporate sense in the profession.

I mentioned some time ago the fact that teachers and the Ministry of Education seem to be getting together rather more in discussing matters of policy, and I understand that with the new Education Act there has been a great deal of consultation with teachers, and I hope that they will be happy with the result of that Act. There have been very steady efforts to improve the facilities of newer secondary schools so as to bring nearer to reality the concept of equality of opportunity in education; but the most important factor is going to be whether we are able to improve the quality of our teachers at the same time that we have had to expand their numbers so greatly, and whether the society itself is moving in the direction which will accommodate the schools of this Island because the education system does not exist in a vacuum. It caters to a particular society and where we have the unselected schools catering successfully to the society, that society is likely to be an egalitarian society, so that I hope we do not fall into the trap of establishing a system of education which the community at large does not really accept, and therefore we find inside the schools that what is happening there is not really what we thought was happening there.

The teachers have to have faith in the worthwhileness of the task which they perform so far as the less intelligent children are concerned. We have had a system in which we have had very good success with bright children and year after year when the Barbados scholarship results come up, the reaction of the community is that if the examination results are good for the Barbados scholarships we feel nothing too wrong is happening in the system, look we got thirteen Barbados scholars, and we fail to realise that they represent only a very small proportion of the community, and that in fact what is happening to the very large number of children at the bottom of the school is also very important. They after all are going to form a majority of voters and they may vote in one of themselves to be Prime Minister, and then the Barbados scholars would be outside, and the people who did not take their learning would be the Ministers of the Cabinet telling us what to do, because it is a democracy and anybody can be Prime Minister. So I think we ought to realise that we cannot neglect any section of the society.

Teachers are also very much involved of course in the work of the Caribbean Examinations Council and I

think this is helping forward the development of teachers a very great deal.

Now I know that there was some mention of school meals. Whenever you begin to talk about education, somehow school meals creep up and I was surprised at the sort of comment that was made on the Opposition side. I happen to live very near to schools and I gather that the school meals are better now than they were a few years ago, and that the children eat the school meals, and not only the children but the teachers can pay 60 cents and have a meal. Now my theory is that when I do not have any confidence in meals given to children that the big people do not eat. Now so long as teachers buy these meals and eat them, you may be reasonably certain that they are of a satisfactory standard, because if they were not, the teachers would not eat them and this would be a sign to us that something is wrong. I like to be specific, I do not like to make general statements, but I understand that on Mondays — I do not know if this happens in every area or if there are variations in the preparations and so on — you may not get your fruit or vegetables, and I think that may be a question of shopping over the week-end, but I understand that Monday is the day when you may not get your vegetables or fruit; but the vegetables are important because children very often do not like to eat green vegetables and this is a valuable part of their training.

I have always been timid about mass feeding particularly of children because children are very individualistic when it comes to food. If you run a family yourself and there are six people there, each one of them has something that they would be telling you that they do not like this and they do not like that, and if you minded them you would be cooking six different things for the family. If you are firm you would say you have to eat what you do not like today and you have to eat what you don't like tomorrow and so on, but doubtless there are children who will only eat what they are accustomed to eating at home, and therefore they refuse quite good food because that is not what mummy gives them or this is not what they see. So you have to realise you are dealing with children and you will get these difficulties, but I can't help thinking how daring we are that in a place like Britain the cost of school lunches has gone up at the same time that ours was made free. It is a tremendous undertaking and instead of picking holes in these things, we ought to look at ourselves with admiration and say look what little Barbados is doing, look what little Barbados is trying to do. I doubt there is any country in the Commonwealth with our size and resources which is doing for their school children what we are attempting to do for ours, and here and there if there are little failures I think that whether we are Opposition or Government, after all the Opposition began the scheme and this Government continued it, that again is a tribute to the good sense of our country that we do not throw

things out of the window because the party that did it has gone out of power.

We cannot afford that waste and so we continued what was good that the Dems began and perhaps later on they would get the chance to continue some of the good things that have been done by this Government. Barbadians are sensible people. We cannot waste our food yet so that is what happened about the School Meals. There is not much wrong about the School Meals, I gather, so you can rest assured that I inquired about it.

I am still concerned very much about truancy despite the figures published by the Ministry of Education. They told us that they had 80% attendance and so forth but you see when you have 20% absent you do not know whether it is 20% continually absent, the same children or whether there are a lot of children having bits of absence. What I do know is that there is no way of knowing whether all the children in Barbados are in school. I suspect that what we are up against is that we have a number of children who have never gone to school, who are not registered and since they are not registered you cannot include them in any absentee calculation.

It is also true that if they have just come to school for a term their names are taken off the Register so those who are registered and missed a term you do not have any record of them either so I accept the figures as being right for the children who are in school but what nobody can tell us is how many children are not in school at all and I feel we do have some people who have come from other Islands who are accustomed to very rural conditions who may be finding it difficult settling in; perhaps who are even here illegally and do not wish to draw attention to themselves and we will have some of these children around.

I feel that every adult should challenge any child they meet during school hours and ask them why they are not in school. Now I understand that we are promised School Attendance Officers. I hope we do not have School Attendance Officers who write letters to ask the parents why they have not sent their children to school. We have always done that. What we want is somebody who would go and see the conditions where the home is, why the child is not at school and the child at school often leads you to very difficult and important social problems that you did not suspect.

This is one of the important things about School Attendants, not merely the education but it affords opportunities to deal with handicap and social problems very early because parents are always deeply involved with their small children and therefore as you start to deal with a small child it takes you straight back to the family home which is usually the base of all the

problems so I look forward to these School Attendance Officers and hope to see us solve this problem of truancy because the street for our children is not now so innocently a place as it used to be.

Our former colleague in the Senate whom I recognise with much pleasure in the Gallery wrote a very touching article. I cannot remember the title of the article but he told us about a child sitting outside Nelson Street while the mother was inside or somebody relating to the child was inside playing the One Armed Bandit and the woman outside nearby he described very charmingly as behaving like a Greek Chorus and while the child wailed and said he was tired and wanted to go home, the woman, like a Greek Chorus, was just making some sort of comment and he wondered what sort of a person this little neglected boy who could not get to bed who was sitting at the side of the street by a gambling den, what kind of a boy he was going to be. He might be one of our future Rastafarians.

I saw that article and I read it and I was deeply touched and though I did not hear the voice of the Senator in here I thought I heard his voice echoing through the room when I read that story.

One of the things I am a bit concerned about is the newer schools that we are having is the size of the school. Now we are a small community and our children come from the most part from a small village school. The Primary Schools now are very small, 100 odd or perhaps 200 and then you land these children into schools with 1,400. They came from little village schools where everybody knew them and you land them in a school with 1,400 children and these 1,400 are not even drawn from the same geographical area. They come from all about and I think this is something that we should be aware of.

We need a new organisation of the schools to make certain that there is accountability for every child and we do not have people just roaming about or going through the system and this is what we are going to have to be careful about when we remove the much discussed Common Entrance Exam. I have never found out why people have been so worked up about the Common Entrance Exam. There is nothing mystical about the Common Entrance Exam. It was just a way of locating places which we had in schools because there were not enough and it is obvious that the Examination becomes less and less fearsome as there are more and more school places because we are soon going to reach the stage where if you get nought you will still get in.

It is reaching a stage now where you do not have to make any terrific score to get into a school. What caused the tension and the stress was that some people

wanted to get into a particular school. That was the stress, not getting into a school. It was never very difficult getting into a school but everybody wanted to get into a school which perhaps was only recruiting 60 children or so, so therefore you get the tension but after the child gets in somewhere else and settles in and so on, they are quite happy and eventually gets where they wanted to go before and perhaps were Barbados Scholarship winners like everybody else so I really do not see why people are so worked up about it.

When that Examination is removed, the problem which you are going to have will be the problem of allocation. The problem is not the passing or the failing of the examination. The problem is the problem of allocation, how you are going to get to allocate the children. This is what we have to think out very carefully and the other thing we have got to be careful about is how are we going to be sure that when they get to the end of their primary school system that they have really acquired what they ought to acquire.

If we remove the Common Entrance Exam we will have to implement some kind of monitoring system to ensure that children are not just drifting through the system. This is what bigger countries than ourselves have found. They have people going up to the University and they could not write their notes, they could not write their essays and all those things.

Do not let us follow in that same trend. Let us realise that there is some kind of assessment of the child moving through school and I think that there must be an assessment when the child moves on to Secondary School so that if it lacks certain basic essentials you will know that you have to make special provision for remedial work for that child so do not let us feel that the Common Entrance Examination will pass and they would just go through school and so on.

Assessment and testing at age seven is even more essential than at the age of eleven because at the age of seven, you are better able to correct what it lacks, than if you wait until eleven because by that time, it starts to respond. I want to echo what Miss Blackman said about continuing education. I do not want to say about late developers because if we have continuing education, these late developers are not likely to be too tardy. There are always going to be people who will not learn too much academically, but they will learn other things. They have to learn to live, no matter how little intelligence you have, you have to learn to cope with life and this is education too.

You have to move away from this concept that if you do not have enough French, Latin and Spanish and

so on you are not educated. That is one form of education, there are other things. You may not be able to handle gym equipment and stand up on your head, but you can swim. That is a survival skill. It is far more useful to be able to swim, than to be able to stand up on his head. It is more important to be able to dance, than to be able to do a backward summersault because you are only going to be able to do those things until you are 30, or so, but you can dance and swim even when you are my age. We have to think of education for life. We have not merely to try to do better the things we are doing, but ask ourselves whether we ought to be doing these things at all.

For example, I have seldom come across any school where there was sufficient effort to prepare the child for life in a democratic society. If you go to most schools you come through those schools and when you come out, you will know of little if anything about the society in which you live. It is amazing how much information just passes over children's heads. You start questioning them about something which happened last week and they have not even noticed it and I think it is because they are so pressurised, they are so busy learning, learning and so, that they do not have enough time to chat with their teachers.

I spent a lot of time chatting with my teacher when she came to give a lesson and when she started talking the lesson was not what was in the book at all. This is much more condemned in modern educational practise. But these were very educating things. You could always read something in the book, but the things which she told us about were of more use to us eventually growing up, than this lesson in the book, which some lecturer from the School of Education gives for teaching. So, I feel that we do need to think carefully, how do we prepare children for living in our society? When they come out of school, they do not know anything about it.

They are a bit luckier than I because they have done West Indian History. When I was young, it was regarded almost as sinful to be seen studying West Indian History. You could not, you were starting an insurrection, you were reminding people of slavery, encouraging bad feelings. We have come a long way from that, but I still feel that things like Current Affairs, things like the Annual Budget, a child can get some useful lessons on economics from the Annual Budget, especially when the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister gives his background explanation, his little text on which to base the Budget. I think that children should be learning to take notice of these things, they should be learning about their society and should be encouraged to include in their ambition for life, included in the things they want to do, they would say, I want to be a doctor, I want to be a lawyer, a hairdresser or something, they should know something about the stage their society is at and what

their society needs and that child should go out of school having made up his mind in what area he is going to give free service to his society.

We talk about communism, but every member of the communist party gives voluntary service to his country. We might not like communism, but learn from them the things that you can learn from them. That is one, every member of the communist party — I do not belong to it — gives free voluntary service to his country.

Now, we have people who go to the Community College for two years and then to the University of the West Indies for three, or four years. The community is without their use during the years in which they are most idealistic, in which they are likely to say the impossible because when you are young, you feel nothing is impossible because you always have people attempting and achieving what seems impossible. In a community as poor as ours we are allowing these people to be out of use to the society. People who go to the Community College and the University should realise that the youth organisations in the country do not have leaders and this is why I think we should have a committee which looks at social development.

When they removed the tops of those organised groups and I am always saying that, we did not realise what an important social change we were making in our neighbourhoods. Now, formerly, nearly all those organised groups had Old Scholars' Associations for children between the ages of 14 to 18. It meant that the teacher went on having a hand in those children for about four more years after they left school. So, when we took away the tops, we therefore destroyed a considerable segment of youth service in the island because that is one of the main segments of youth service, that is why we have fewer youth clubs today. We have fewer today than we had in the 1940's and 1950's and so forth because they were attached to all age primary schools and the people who ran them were teachers, so we had a fairly high calibre of leadership.

Now, we have youth clubs, largely sports clubs and when we think of the number of sports clubs we have, the number of track suits you see and so on, we ought not to be having the problems which we are having and the thing is that those groups are often very poorly led, or have no stable leadership. So, I think that we should be inviting some of our young people in tertiary institutions to give at least one afternoon a week to lend a hand, or something like that to a youth organisation, or something like that. They have their time to do carnival.

I think some of our younger people, when they go there, sometimes they are lost to doing that kind of thing. They drop out of any youth organisation to

which they belong and lose contact with the simple folk in the district. So, I really feel that this question of preventative work with young people and looking and saying, "oh dear, the delinquency rate is going up" and all this sort of thing, when we know that we have to do preventative work. It is better to do, it is easier and more effective to save the children before they get to that stage because rehabilitation, building more Dodds, and more prisons, building institutions of any kind is tremendously expensive.

I feel that more people in the society, ordinary folk, after all there are more educated people today in Barbados than there ever were. I do not think they have ever such a well educated House of Assembly than what we have today. There are a lot of educated people in Barbados, what are they doing? Just as we think about exploitation, we talk about exploitation, how the merchant exploits people, the intellectual of our type exploit people too. They exploit them intellectually, they do not tell them what is true and they do not help young people to think. When you read some of the articles sometimes, you say "Goodness, I hope young people are not reading this." They are so lacking in objectivity, so misleading to the young people, in short, we talk a lot about physical captivity. Some people are very ashamed of slavery, they talk about physical captivity. What we are seeing very often now is the enslaving of men's minds, and that is terrible, because that is man's chief glory, and therefore our educated young people, especially the ones that take to politics, have to realise that the politician now is really the folk hero of the community, and what a politician does and says has a profound effect on young people. It is a solemn responsibility, and I am saying it now because I know elections are around the corner. I do not know how far around the corner, because I am not in a position to know, but please remember all politicians, when you get out there in the glare of the floodlights, that young people are listening to what you are saying and they are watching, and they are going to copy you. Do not let them get disenchanted with politics, because what happens when people become disenchanted with politics, they do not vote for your party that helped to get them disenchanted, they do not vote at all, they vote for nobody, they stay home and you get a democratic community which is not democratic because the people are not participating. They are not participating because they are disillusioned, they have lost faith, and it must be our particular task at this time in the Caribbean to see that we produce politicians in whom young people can have faith, and our schools should be giving them the kind of training which enables them to change the system when they want to change it, to feel that they know how to go about it in a democratic society to change the system if they want to change it.

What causes terrorism and upset and all these things in these big communities is that the individual feels helpless when he is coming up against the big economic combines, the big political combines. Do you know how much money it takes to run a campaign, Mr. President, in the United States of America? A poor man cannot run that, but the point is that we do not have that problem, our community is small, we can change it. One person, a small group working hard enough can make an impact on our society, and this is what we have to tell young people to prevent them from feeling that they have to run off in the woods and buy a wig and put on their head or something in order to receive attention.

Let us be careful about these factory-like institutions that we are setting up for schools. I notice that we are going to have Counsellors. I was looking in the Notes to see if I saw the money, but I did not see the money, so I hope that it is really true that the Counsellors are coming. But in addition to providing the kind of living experiences that children should have in school, and a lot of this you get in extra curricular activities, and I notice that the more highly qualified the teachers are in a school the fewer extra curricular activities you seem to get. Once upon a time you used to pass and after school 3.00 — 4.00 o'clock, and something was going on, now you pass by the school and if you pass by ten minutes past three the school is shut tight, you do not see anything going on there, and that is a bad sign. The level of relationships within a school usually reflects the kind of association that teachers and children have willingly. When you stay to have an extra curricular activity, or the teacher stays to have an extra curricular activity, that is a free thing, that is free will, you want to do that, and the teacher sees the children at close quarters and get to know them better, especially if you take them to camp. I love camp and camp is an important thing. You have better teachers, better educated teachers, they have more letters behind their names but they have less time to spend with the children.

Now, the Counsellors. One Counsellor to 1400 children. I understand you will probably get a Counsellor to a school. To my mind those schools should not be over a thousand, I do not feel that any secondary school in Barbados should be over a thousand. We may not be able to change this now, but I think we should think about it. Nearly 900 is now considered the ideal, and this is coming from countries that have experimented with these schools for some time, and they are telling you — Scotland particularly — they are telling you they do not want these very, very big schools.

I do not know what the World Bank would say, they would probably say you should have 2,000, I do not know, but I am talking about our society. You might have one Counsellor and I think we have to be careful

about this, because from the way I hear it being talked about, I think people have the notion that a Counsellor is for bad children. When you have problem children you send them to the Counsellor. Every child needs counselling in growing up, all, all need counselling in growing up, so where your Counsellor is a specialist every teacher should have the basic training, the basic principles of counselling, because every teacher is going to be a Form Master or Form Mistress to teach the children a number of periods a week and should know that group of children. The bigger the school is the more important that you should have small units, a team of people who know those particular children, who maintain contact with them for about three years or more. So every teacher is a Counsellor and every teacher should have the basic principles of counselling, and every teacher should be able to handle the problems of learning and discipline in her class, and then you may seek the assistance of the specialist when perhaps there are circumstances more than you can handle, and sometimes if the Counsellor is sensible, or the Head is sensible, the best thing to do is to advise that teacher and send her back to try and handle the problem herself. (ASIDE). Or him, it is usually him.

If you do not do that, what you are going to find is that, every teacher that gets a simple disciplinary problem that she should be able to handle, says send her to the Counsellor, and then the Counsellor has this tremendous case load that she cannot possibly handle. So I hope that this counselling business is going to be handled wisely and that the Counsellor too will realise that a school can only do a certain amount.

As soon as it comes to having to make regular visits to the child's home and handling a family situation, that is the task for a trained social worker, and I hope that my erudite Minister will ask for some more trained social workers who can back up the schools because I used to use them. I found that when it involved visiting, I turned it over to a trained welfare officer who could go into the home and she would look after the child in the home situation and I would tackle it in the school. We have to remember that school education is an essential area; it coordinates all the services we have for children, so people who say "I do not want to be a teacher" do not realise the tremendous importance of the school as the central service coordinating all the work we do for children. So long as a child goes to school you can see if it is handicapped, you can see if something is wrong with its speech, you can see if it is not properly fed and you can direct it to the correct social agency which would give it the help it needs. Do not wait until it gets to Dodds and then start to wring your hands; the time to do the job is before it reaches that stage.

The climate of the whole school is important; it is the whole ethos of the school that supports and encourages the child, and very often when that child

looks as if it is going wrong, and the traditions of that school, the whole way in which that school is managed allows the child to find somebody to whom it can turn. A school ought to be ashamed to be told that a child committed suicide or attempted to commit suicide last night and nobody knew that that child had a problem. Something is wrong because the child ought to have felt that there was an adult to whom it could turn, and every child needs to have a good adult friend besides its parents and that adult friend is very often the teacher or youth leader. You have to take the building of our community seriously. People feel that being independent means praise God you've got a job you could not get before, you've got a motor car, you've got a fridge, all sorts of things, and then we wring our hands at the social problems at our very doorsteps which we individually could do something about to help.

Going back to co-education, let me warn you it is no panacea. Some people feel that because you have co-education the boys should behave well; they are counting on the girls and that the girls will make them behave well, but let me tell you, you have another thought coming. You would be surprised to see what the girls do when they get together with the boys. You get a different alchemy. In short when you have this co-education situation you have a more complex institution to time-table for and to arrange for, it calls for more sensible supervision, it calls for a more sensible attitude, it calls for people who understand the differences in the development of boys and girls. You have boys and girls in the same class and you hear "you don't see the girls beating you!". All that happens is that he is at a different stage of development although he is the same age as the girl and the girl goes ahead, and the teacher has to be aware all the time.

I went to a meeting with some ladies once who were pressing this co-education and they told me that boys and girls are exactly the same. I said you are contradicting the Almighty; they are not the same, and you need to understand the differences in their physical development and you need to understand too the society in which they are coming. We have to be careful about not making girls or women competitive where men are concerned because the personality of the West Indian male has been so battered and we have to build his ego; we have to make him feel good, make him feel important, That is good medicine for him, and then you would get all the cooperation you want. So the thing we have to stress is not competition of the boys and girls, but learning how to understand, learning how to cooperate, learning how when you have a school play you are glad enough to see a boy getting up there and putting the curtains up and taking them back down, and they learn to work together. I do hope that out of this co-education we will get this better understanding between males and females that we need.

I remember Miss Blackman, don't mind my referring to her because we worked together a lot, and she showed me an enquiry she had. It was a questionnaire and it was sent to boys and girls of schools. The answers to the questionnaire I looked at came from boys and girls in schools next door to each other; they could not be closer; but you know the answers to these questions were so different, the opinions expressed were so opposed on important issues and social questions that you could not imagine that they had come out from next door to each other. They were entirely different, and that more than anything else converted me that perhaps we should give co-education a try. It shocked me to think that these children who were with each other every day and seeing each other were thinking so differently about each other. You should read the opinions they had of one another; they were thinking so differently about each other and so differently about social questions. So I don't think we should just sit down and say "ah, we have co-education". Co-education is an opportunity to do a particular, specific, social task to see that the boys and girls are ready to build a much better family life. This weak family life is at the base of all our social problems.

I noticed a picture in the newspaper some months ago with children standing up because they did not have school furniture, and a teacher said to me "you see that, it would not happen at Harrison College; a Harrison College boy would not be standing up without furniture, but we do not have furniture." Now I really feel you can carry this business about Central Purchasing too far. I feel there are certain types of purchases which should be done by the specific school. The person up there in Central Purchasing cannot always visualise what it is you are sending for. You send for a stove for a domestic science class which four children will use, with four holes. You want something family size and they send you something that would cook for a garrison because it is a big school, so they send a big stove. And then you want a chair to put in a little flat that you want the girls to practise, and you send for chairs for a flat and they send you some chairs that you could use in the kitchen or something like this or the class room because a chair is a chair so far as they are concerned.

I will give you an example. When we ordered beds for Dodds, they sent double beds. When you send for single beds, they send single beds and double beds. I said "my gracious me, what is this now! There is going to be another problem!" What I am trying to say is that the person on the spot knows what the school requires and I think that there might be certain large purchases and so on that perhaps you do through Central Purchasing, but when it comes to furniture, if you are going to maintain the school furniture, you have got to be repairing it almost every day. Now what happened is that you would see those boys in the picture standing up and there was

probably a room full of broken furniture that had not yet been repaired, because they are waiting for the building officer to pass around and inspect them and then to go and find a carpenter to do them. What used to happen in the older secondary schools is that the Head had control of the vote for repairs.

What you do is that you look for a good village carpenter whose daughter or son attends school and you get all your furniture repaired even though you do not have time. I had a village carpenter and a village joiner and my furniture was always in shape so use the local community around the school if you have them there. You have a Secretary/Treasurer who can supervise the use of the vote and if you put more responsibility on the teacher himself you get the furniture better maintained, more instantly repaired and you do not have this nonsense about not having furniture plus the fact that children have to be told that they have to take care of the furniture in the schools as they take care of the furniture in their own homes.

I know that my much admired Senator Cox does not like to hear about Education much. I think he likes to hear about Communications and Works. Is that your speciality, Mr. President.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Order, Order.

SENATOR ENID LYNCH: I just want to mention Dodds. I am sorry that Senator Boxill is not here because he is very fond of Dodds. I have read a lot that people have said who seems to me to know very little about Dodds. The last thing I read was something that looked like an attempt on the history of Dodds and it stopped at the year 1936 which meant it omitted the most meaningful years of that Institution, that is, between 1947 and 1968.

That was the era of reform at Dodds. That came after a report on the young offenders which I think Mr. Adams was the name signed to the Report and it was after that Report that the Plantation was separated from the school and a Board of Visitors was appointed. That was about 1948 and I was on that Board of Visitors so it means that I had been associated with Dodds for over 30 years.

I did not do anything to get there. I was put on the Board of Visitors. Now the purpose of that Board of Visitors was to keep the Institution in touch with the outside community. There were always people going in there to look around and see what was happening and we had the power to report, to say when we met at Quarterly Meetings what we saw and heard but very soon after our appointment we lost a very important task which had been originally assigned to us which was to assist in the selection of staff.

We had at that time the duty to appoint a small Committee to interview applicants for posts at Dodds and to recommend those we thought suitable for appointment. Now, we were all people who were either professional social workers or voluntary social workers and we knew the kind of thing to look for in somebody that was going into Dodds. Now, we lost that right so that the appointments to Dodds were done somewhat differently.

We also did not see the Annual Estimates and that was important because the Annual Estimates would have told us if the Principal was ordering the things which we heard him complained that he wanted and so on and we had no control of the Estimates but we did visit the Institution and we did comment, and suggest. In fact, I have a document dated 1972 which was sent up to the Ministry and from time to time we made these Reports.

Now the real picture about Dodds is this that at one time there were not many Children's Homes. You know the children would be in the Almshouses and then you had the Nightengale's Home so little boys who committed fairly trivial offences because they did not have somebody to look after them and so on, they were sent to Dodds and there were times when Dodds had in over 100 boys, maybe 120, but a lot of these children were not criminals. They were care and protection cases really and in today's setting they would not have gone there at all.

Now, that type of child goes to a Children's Home. He is not going to Dodds but the boy who gets to Dodds has had the Probation Officer trying everything that he could possibly think of before he is committed to Dodds. You will find that before the boy got there a lot of effort was gone into trying to help him and he only gets to Dodds after a lot of people have tried with him so that you have what I would call a harder core.

The dear little boys who were there because they stole a penny from their grandmother, they are not up there now. They are at the Nightengale's Home or Farris. The boys who are there are very experienced in their wrong doings no matter what their age may be. You had a tougher type of child, you had changes of staff and there was gradual deterioration. It accelerated within the last two or three years but you can believe me that from about much earlier than that, I would say from the time the older Mr. Ken Simmons who was the last Principal left, you saw a gradual change. If you knew what to look for you saw that things were not going as they should.

Now, you do not wish to go into the past history and go over that but I will tell you something about these sensational things. You have to remember that if you are writing about the Prisons or you are writing about Juvenile Institutions, they are open Institutions.

Children can walk out. As a matter of fact it was so open that other people walked in. Not only did they go out but other people came in. It was really very, very opened and it has got to be remembered that children read the things that are in the news.

It is the same thing with the prisoners and when you are writing about that type of Institution you must bear in mind that the inmates at the Institutions can read and have access to the papers. They can read and therefore you have to be responsible and careful in what is written.

But what struck me was that when all the crocodile tears had been shed I might mention that I remained in contact with the schools during the difficult times and I might add, that the Girl's School, Summervale, was very well run. It only got into difficulties because it got so to speak drawn into the problems of the Boy's School and I would recommend that never again should that Girl's School be under the Principal of the Boy's School. I believe that the Girls's School should have their own Principal and make its own mistakes and be led by their own Principal.

It was really like a family. Summervale was like a family home with nice little table cloths, good meals. I cannot understand how the boys had these bad meals when the food was ordered at the same time. The girls had good meals and they were well trained. I am not saying that they were perfect, but they were well trained. I want to tell you, I kept in touch right through and that those boys, please do not think that they are inhuman and beyond redemption and so, but they are always pleased to meet you. In fact, I was shocked that there was that aggression there because they were always very pleased to meet you and were very pleasant, very cheerful. I thought, when I talked to them on the last occasion that I saw them, they were laughing at the big people who thought that they were being ill treated. I thought they were having a big joke. They were very amused. So, we have to be responsible in this sort of situation.

Now there is somebody there who knows about juvenile delinquency and the Government has spent some money on the place and there is great improvement, but the people who wrung their hands and cried their crocodile tears, I did not see any of them around there going to visit the boys, going to ask the principal if there is anything they can do. Two days before Christmas, when I went up there, at that time I felt very sad, that with all the emotion that had been stirred up, not a single organisation, or other person, up to that time had even been to see them. I am saying that this feeling and this sensation is all very well, but when we have a problem, what do we do? People just wring their hands and shake their heads

and so on. It does not occur to them that the people who have that problem to face every day, the people who have those boys and girls to deal with every day are very encouraged when people from the society come to say, is there anything that I can do? Would you like my group to give the boys a concert? Would you like it to put on a play? Is there anything we can do? The community just stays off.

I would have been glad if the articles would have produced somebody to say, if you have a boy who is reasonably honest, when he comes out, I will give him a job to sweep the newspaper office. Do you not trust him enough to give him a job when he comes out? I want to say not to feel despondent about Dodds. Do not feel that because things are a bit calm, and people are now managing, that you now leave the teachers to struggle alone. Let them feel that they have the support of the Ministry, that you understand their problems, that you grant them the money that they need to keep the boys occupied.

I would like to think that groups in the society would ask to be allowed to go and visit the boys sometimes, so that they feel that the community has not forgotten them.

I think that it is time, Mr. President, that I cease my flight of operation, my contribution. Thank you. (APPLAUSE).

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Rocheford.

SENATOR H. F. G. ROCHEFORD: Mr. President, it takes temerity for someone to get up, after Senator Lynch made such a powerful speech to make a contribution, particularly when my contribution is going to be so slight. I remember I was sitting here and I discussed with Senator Lynch whether she was going to speak in this debate and she indicated that her pitch was not prepared yet. I think that if she had had the pitch prepared that we would have been in for some record breaking scores. I only have Mr. President, a couple of points which I did want to make, in relation to things that are included in these Estimates.

First, before I go to what I intend talking about, I just want to say that I think we are a bit defensive about the whole matter of the Defence Force because a lot of people talked about it and they have been so defensive about it. I think that there are a lot of positive things that we can say about the Defence Force. I am happy that when we had the debate recently on the Defence Force, I commented that I thought that the Defence Force was a useful institution. People who had served time

in the Defence Force have an opportunity of being trained not only in discipline, but also in skills, so that when they come out, they can be useful people of the society.

I am very happy to see that this is the approach which has been taken in our Defence Force. I would be very happy if we could in a short time establish a national service in Barbados, where all of our youngsters could definitely be involved somewhere, or the other, spend some time within the ambit of that Defence Force to get some training because we do need young people to be trained and that brings me to one of the points which I want to make and that is the question of the attitude which some of our people have to the whole question of our environment. People have talked and talked and talked and every day, you pass along the streets and see the tremendous mess being made and even our Sanitation Service is not making this effort to cope with the problem. This is my opinion.

I know that a lot has been done in recent times to provide the Sanitation Services with new Headquarters and new, up-to-date equipment, but until our people themselves begin to get within themselves attitudes of respect for their own environment, the Sanitation Services will be fighting a losing battle all the time. When you pass the streets and see the garbage that is thrown about the streets, you see the careless way in which the Sanitation workers pick up the garbage, what garbage they do get a chance to pick up. We see the indifference of householders in putting out garbage, we have to consider what is going to happen in a few years' time, as the amount of garbage increases and the population increases.

I think we need to have some education campaign mounted to try to get something done about this. I notice also in the Estimates capital expenses being provided for improvement in the bus stands and I would hope that there is real improvement. I do not know if that amount of money which is allocated in this year's Estimates is enough because it looks to me that a major attention would have to be paid to bus stands in Barbados because what goes on now is chaotic. It gives opportunity for people to develop into brilliant pick pockets, it helps breed indiscipline among our people because youngsters have no respect for old people, they push them, they treat them as badly as ever. The mini bus operators have no respect for anybody else, the bus drivers have no respect for themselves, or the buses which cost the taxpayers a lot of money and I would like to think that some major attention is done. It cannot be done just by saying it, it has to be properly co-ordinated and attention being paid to the transport and bus stands which we have. Perhaps we have to move the bus stands out of central Bridgetown.

The other two issues, one which I have probably talked about before. As you know Mr. President, I have

always been complaining about the debates of the House and the Senate and the presentations that we get here of the Official Gazette. It is deplorable what goes on for publication of debates. I do not remember offhand what is the last issue of the debates of the Senate that have come to hand. We are in 1981.

I have been talking many a time about this and not about the lack of publication of debates, but also about the carelessness with which these debates are edited and printed.

It is amazing to me to see some of the gross grammatical errors and what goes down for English, or whatever you call it, in these debates which are put out for the public to read. It is very regrettable to me, and once again, Sir, I would like to comment on it and to implore the Debates Committee of this Parliament to look seriously at improving what is going on in this thing.

Mr. President, the last comment which I have is about CBC. I know that we have always been hearing that there has been improvement and all that sort of thing, but in the last few weeks I am not so sure that the record of improvements have gone over to the public. My impression is that a lot of the equipment and what not at CBC is by now obsolete, and I was looking to see whether in the Estimates there was any provision for getting equipment and that sort of thing for CBC. I do not know if the fact that it is not in the Estimates indicates that CBC is right now so well off that they are buying their own equipment and running their own affairs without reference to the Government, but I would like to know what is the position there myself, and since in the debate on the Estimates in the Other Place, the way that that debate went no information was available on what is happening at that institution, and since in this House we happen to have the benefit of having the Minister of Information under whose portfolio CBC comes here with us, we would hope that somewhere along the line some information is available to us about CBC. Thank you.

SENATOR Miss ADEL LYNCH: Mr. President, Senator Enid has given us a pretty long run on many of the things that I thought of speaking about, but then I bow to her, she is far more experienced in the same field in which I venture than I could ever be. I only hope that I can learn something more from her from time to time.

At any rate, she made some little comment about co-education, and in this respect I think I have a little bit more experience, because I happen to have been a student at the Alleyne School, which was co-educational — at least in my first few years of secondary education — and Senator Enid need not be too afraid of what the girls learn from the boys or any such thing. We took it all in our stride and I do not think it made for worse. I would

like to assure her that we all benefited from the exchange.

Senator Enid also spoke about the Common Entrance Examination, and she did not think it was so terrible. I do not think it is so terrible myself, but the only point is that I do not think that you should be sitting the examination at any specific age, I do not think that all students are more capable at 11 than they are at 9 or 10. I myself went to the Alleyne School when I was not quite 10, and I entered the form with people who had been 13 and what's not, and I did not feel at a disadvantage in any way. What we need to be concerned about with this examination is not the age, in fact I believe that it should be open to students who are capable, not old enough, because what I have discovered is that many students are wasting time between the ages of 9 and 11, they are just marking time. Many of them have achieved that necessary level but have not achieved the age and are wasting those few years in school.

A lot of attention is given to children. If a child starts school at age 4, by the time he is 9 or so he or she could have reached that sort of stage for entering the school. What results too from the fact that these children enter secondary schools at 11 and over is that there is a mad rush into this education to get up to the fifth form, and one is not able to sort of take in that broader syllabus and get the broader base of education in the early years. Once we were allowed to go in the Lower First, and then First, and what's not, and you had more time to appreciate education, to get that broader base which was essential. The specialisation is coming much too early.

I happen to see students who have never done Geography. They tell you they did not do Geography, they did History and all sorts of things like that. They must be open to a much wider syllabus in the first few years and then be allowed to specialise further up, and if they were allowed to go into the secondary schools at age 9 and 10, then they would have more time to do the broader syllabus without rushing to get up to the fifth form by age 16 or what have you, and I think it would certainly redound to the good of their total education.

Another thing about this examination is that it has got to be decided once and for all whether it is an aptitude test of an achievement test, and this is important. Do we want to find out whether the child is capable of taking in the education, or do we expect the child at this age to have learnt X, Y or Z. If it is an aptitude test, all well and good. If it is an achievement test, then it would mean that you must have a certain standardised syllabus or something farther down in the primary schools, so that you say that when a child has come to Third Standard or Fourth

Standard he should have been able to do fractions, decimals, whatever, so that you know when you are taking this child in that he or she knows certain basics, and then you know where you are going from, and this goes right up in fact through the schools. Because I find myself dealing with students who come from various schools, having come from various fifth forms and you can never be too certain that they have done this in that school or that in the other school. There are some schools in which children are much further ahead and then they feel that they are being kept back when you are trying to bring up the other ones, but you do not have a clue, you cannot say that a student who has passed "O" Level does know X, Y or Z even then, and this is the sort of thing.

We have got to standardise the syllabus and curriculum, if you are just letting them go right through, so you know what to expect from students at this age, that age, or the other age, and that is the point which I wish to make about that.

In the area of Education, of course I am quite satisfied with the efforts that are being made to accommodate those people who are not strong academically, or in the traditional academic subjects. This is all for the good, and we would not like people to feel that they are left out of the society because they are not brilliant mathematicians or linguists or what's not. We all have our part to play and we do not all have to do it in the same particular field.

Now Senator Enid Lynch did mention something about her talking a lot before the lesson and sometimes not even getting to the lesson in the book with her headmistress, but I can assure her that you would not risk it in certain schools now because you would find that you would be reported for having wasted the students' time because some of them are bold enough to think that anything that is not taught from the book is not education, and some are encouraged to make these types of complaints against teachers, and you would never believe that people in administration cannot see that education is much wider than what is written in the text. I am sure that Senator Lynch learned far more at times from the discussions than she learned from the text books because at least she could have learnt that from the text-books outside any time, but the things about life that the teachers can give from personal experience are the valuable things. I too have had classes in which very little of what was in the text was discussed, but then of course I was not encouraged to complain either in school or at home. Very few of us would have dared complain against a teacher either in school or at home. At home you got flogged. I know I would get flogged and I believe many of the others would have been flogged too. You would have had to apologise for being rude enough to them that you could complain for a teacher, and all of this gives the

teacher a sense of responsibility for the students, a sort of liking. I know that I am responsible for my students, but nowadays there are people in positions of authority in schools, boards and what not who make teachers become day's work people, people who go to work for the hour, do their bit and leave, and Senator Lynch remarked that she has seen very few people hanging around the schools after hours. It is because you are made to feel that you are there to do a job from this hour to the other hour.

Mr. President, one has got to be careful because you cannot get the best out of teachers who do not feel comfortable, who do not feel free to give of themselves to their students in a relaxed atmosphere, who are sort of monitored and who have their students questioned about what is done and what is not done, and have other people who should be educated, who call themselves educators taking this sort of line and peeping and dodging behind teachers and so on. You cannot get the best out of a teacher who is disgruntled.

Another point is that you cannot get the best out of a teacher who feels that there is no room for upward mobility in the institution as well. There are some boards and so on who are making it extremely difficult for certain members of certain staffs to get on and make progress. How can a teacher say to a student "well if you do your best you will be able to succeed, you will be able to move on", and then the student can turn and say to you "how long were you whatever you are now". How long were you an assistant anything and you say ten years. Then the student would assume that you weren't really doing very well if you cannot get on when other people who have been there for three years or something are flying ahead. Moreover I am warning that there are people on certain boards who are making Barbadians feel that the worse thing they could ever be is to be a Barbadian and to want to get ahead. People are becoming uneasy in certain places and there are things which every politician or every Minister will not know about and will not hear about, and people would do well to listen and watch and feel the pulse of people who have to work at certain institutions, because the time will come when people who are normally very docile will turn and then everybody is going to be surprised.

You know in 1969 when the teachers went on strike in May, everybody in Barbados was shocked, was scandalised that teachers could go on strike. Teachers can strike; teachers are aware of their worth to the community and they are not going to settle down and hope for any kingdom hereafter or any benefits in the life to come. They have to feel that their efforts are appreciated and rewarded, particularly when other people can come along from other countries and move up without any obvious superior contribution to the institution. When a Barbadian wants to give service to his or her country in the way he or she considers it best, that

person should be encouraged. It is all right for the fly by night people who come in and want to get up to the top fast, because as soon as things don't suit them, they will move to somewhere else, but Barbadians do not like the idea of moving about from Barbados. We want to stay here and do our best for our country which has done its best for us, but we want people to understand that we have a right to get to the top, particularly when we are qualified to do it. It is not a question of patronage or anything like that. We are talking about people who are qualified, sometimes better qualified, and then you have people coming from outside who are riding rough shod and you are sitting down. Of course in some places it takes some trouble-makers to rock the boat a little bit because some others do not have enough spine; they wait one-side. You push the door and they slip through and sometimes you do not even get the chance to hold it open long enough for yourself to get through. Of course I am one of those who will push the door, I will rock the boat any time. Let them pass, I don't mind because something has got to be done. Teachers have got to be given a fair break and they have got to know that their efforts are rewarded, and that you do not just have to be a foreigner in certain institutions in order to make progress. Barbadians must live in Barbados and they must get the best of Barbados, and that is my contention at any time. The others have all places to go; we have nowhere but here. This is our heaven and we have to enjoy it. Thanks to anybody else who makes a contribution; you pay them and you recognise their efforts, but we must have a chance. I say now and I will say it anywhere else because some people are not getting a fair break, and a strike in certain places would not be the best thing for any Government at this time; so I am just sounding a little warning. Let him that hath ears to hear hear now and act.

You know I do have to get around to languages at times. I noticed something about Spanish in some particular programme and I did not see any other language. Well I do not know if they have forgotten Le Francais, l'Allemande or any other, you know, French and German and the others. I think that a bit too much emphasis is being put on Spanish alone. What we need in Barbados is a kind of multi-lingual society to grapple with our particular business of tourism and what not, not Spanish. I did not speak any Spanish to the Chinese gentleman who came down here who had been Ambassador to Guinea. I had to speak French to him. I did not speak Chinese, I was not able; but we were still able to converse in French. I did not speak Spanish to the Canadians who came down here on the parliamentary visit either. So we have got to establish some sort of balance in our programmes for languages.

You do not need any one language apart from English. Of course you need English. We have forgotten that. Some people do not speak it and a lot do not write

it and I know it because I teach French and I also see people writing something that is supposed to be English. English needs to be taught in some of these Schools. People are making a lot of sport about this and saying if you read enough you will be able to write but I do not know what you would write. You just do not read, read and learn.

You have got to learn certain Languages, the rules of Grammar and so on and when you hear those sort of Authorities in Education getting up sometimes with the little Southern "Neither he nor she do this and that sort of thing" — This is a quotation please. This is not my English, for the Reporter's benefit. When you see these people speaking up in their spekey-spokey things and making that sort of mistake then you wonder. The young people are going to understand that and they are going to like that.

You cannot depend on any Newspaper to give anybody any lessons in Standard English. That is a joke, or the Radio for that matter because when you see those hanging participial phrases and that sort of thing. "Being unavailable for so-and-so the weather was something or the other" as though the weather had been unavailable for something. You get that sort of English knocking about on all the Media but then we have to pay attention to all of these things. People cannot just understand English. English is far too intricate for you to leave it to people to learn it just like that. They may be able to make them understand but not much more than that so we need to teach English but we need to cater to all the other Languages of the people who speak other Languages, the people with whom we have relations at International and so on and other levels.

We have places in Brussels and what's not. We have relation with the people in West Germany and so on. We need people to speak another language other than English in order to make their lives a little bit easier and so that we can get the tourist dollar and whatever else we think we want with a little bit more ease because one does not need headaches in order to spend hard earned money.

When you go on a holiday you do not need to be saying "Oh dear how am I going to tell those people in English that I want to see that sweater over there." Forget about it. They really do not need the sweater they would buy it if you could tell them in their language if they wanted a sweater but they really do not need the headaches to get rid of the few dollars that they have so we have to make to get it out of them and this same language thing is coming right back now to the CARIFESTA bit.

I am sure that everybody coming to this CARIFESTA thing is not going to be speaking Spanish and if people had heeded my call for the development of

languages, I do not think there would be this mad rush now for everybody to be running and registering to do crash courses at the Community College. Everything would have been more or less in stride by now. I only hope that for the benefit of Barbados everything would go right.

I am not going to join up but I am going to help in my own little way when the time comes and I know that they are responsible Barbadians who would never want to see Barbados let down and they are going to do their bit.

Another thing about this CARIFESTA, if I may go on, is this. Far too many people in certain Organisations become accustomed to certain names and they ask the same people over and over again to do this, to do that and to do the other. There are others who are willing and sometimes able who are never asked and who may not be pushy enough to come forward but there is a whole score of goodwill among Barbadians and they are Barbadians who can do their little bit and who are just willing to do it if they are asked or given the opportunity.

Not everybody would have put on something for NIFCA. Not everybody would have helped to do this and to do that and the other. I doubt that they are any people who would know that I have made costumes over and over again for little Plays and so on and so forth because my name is not in that sort of thing so they are going to ask the people who are burdened with these things already about them and they are not going to say "Adel, I would like you to run up these few seams for me" which I would be able to do but you get accustomed to the names.

Not everybody likes to come forward but please let the people out there understand that you would accept help, help in simple things so that the big names and experts can get ahead with the more intrinsic things which the rest of us may think we cannot do but we are willing because Barbadians always like to see Barbados on top and this is no exception. We are going to pull our weight 100%. CARIFESTA must not be CARIFIASCO.

I must compliment the Minister responsible. I believe it is the Hon. member, Senator Don for the Childrens' Home and the Nightengale Garden. I have noticed the Family Life Project and believe me in my little wanderings in the Black Rock area from time to time. You must realise that is an area in which I have lived for all my life. Not on that side of the wall but on the other side so I do revisit the old ground from time to time and I have all the admiration for the kind of Programme that I see going on over there and the children seem extremely happy with the kind of life that they have.

In fact, it would be a good example to some people who live in other homes. I mean total families because I see the little boys pulling the leaves. I see the little girls hanging things on the lines and so on and doing their gardens and what not and it is a very, very good example for people in Barbados, all the families. We lack this Family Life in Barbados. Too many people have become accustomed to this business of running in and running out, but these families, I do not think they have any fathers but I think there is still a sense of direction so let us not blame it on the absence of fathers. We have been able to get along without those. At least some families have been able to get along without those in Barbados. We become accustomed to the male presence when it is necessary, absolutely necessary. That is not all the time. Certainly not all the time.

Perhaps I have not learnt from Senator Enid Lynch to feed the male ego but Senator Marjorie Blackman has assured me that we do not need to get into that. We do not have to be Widows. We can be just old maids or whatever you will call us. However, I do compliment the Minister really for this and the real families. I mean the ones with fathers and mothers and wedding rings included with the other rings, can take a leaf out of that book.

The children are given responsibilities. That is lacking in so many homes, you see children who wake up in the morning and they want breakfast, they want this, they drift out and they come back in and they want something to eat. There is absolutely no sense of my having to make my little bed, this person having to look after the chickens, this person having to look after anything, this person sweeping a room or doing anything and then, we are surprised that we have irresponsible grown-ups, but parents are themselves irresponsible because they do not insist on the children doing certain tasks. No matter how many servants you can pay, your child has got to be taught that there are things that must be done in the house. You cannot know that the servant is doing something properly, or correctly if you cannot do it too. How are you going to tell the servant about making cou-cou when you do not know if you have to put in the okras before, or after the meal, or if you just serve them on the side. No matter what you are training up for, you have to know certain basics yourself and this is what I am getting at. We need to have people responsible.

To be quite honest, one has spoken a lot about Dodds, but there are more delinquent parents than children and it is the parents that you have to get at. Put them anywhere, you do not have to put them in Dodds, but make them understand that they have a responsibility. When you bring someone into this world, or when you cause someone to be brought into this world, you have a responsibility. If you did not wish that, you also have a responsibility to go to the Family

Planning, or whatever else. If you do not want the responsibility, do not go in for this sort of risk that would result in your having these things on your hand.

Sometimes I wonder what happened to that Law about the under sixteen mothers and all that. It does not seem to be in existence, I do not remember our having scrapped it from the Law books. There are too many teenaged mothers in Barbados and something has got to be done, but it is because there are too many slack parents of teenagers, who do not insist on certain virtues and who do not keep a check on the children's activities. I am surprised at times at a child of twelve, or fourteen who can say, "I am going to something tomorrow" and does not say "if it is alright with mother". They are going, they make plans. The parent may, or may not know where the child is going. Ask all of the mothers in Barbados tonight at 10.00 o'clock where their children are, boys and girls and 80% may know but there is a 20% that will not have a clue.

When you have people leaving home, drifting about and letting children be burnt up in fires, it is not that these parents are always going to work, some of these children that are burnt up in houses are not burnt up because their parents were at work. The parents are all about, they are just as delinquent as the children, or more so and they do not care. They get children, they lose them in the fire, you feel sorry, I feel sorry, but they do not care, they will get some more. A lot of them do not care and we have to check up and tighten up on this type of thing.

What we need in Barbados now, most of all is responsible parenthood and let me re-emphasise in education, take care of the children by all means, but there is no education, if there are no teachers. So, look after the teachers too. A comfortable teacher will be a good educator, a teacher with hope can do anything for a child and a hopeless teacher will do nothing.

Thank you. (APPLAUSE)

SUSPENSION

Mr. PRESIDENT: Just before I suspend the Sitting, I wish to draw the attention of Honourable Members to the two Resolutions of which the Honourable Minister has given notice and which have been circulated to Honourable Members. The Honourable Minister would like Honourable Members to agree to consider these items in due course along with the other items which are already on the Agenda.

This Sitting is now suspended, until 11.00 o'clock tomorrow morning, 27th March, 1981.

On Resumption

Friday, 27th March, 1981.

Mr. PRESIDENT: This sitting is resumed.

SENATOR H. R. LINTON: Mr. President, last Wednesday night on my way home from the Senate I gave a lift to a resident of the parish of St. Philip and in discussion about the Estimates he said to me that he could not see the relevance of the debates on the Estimates. His view was based on the fact that he felt that since this money had to be spent anyway and since a large part of it comprised salaries and wages and the other part had to be spent quite naturally for the development of the country that we were just blowing hot air both in this place and the next place, we were putting on a show for the good of the country. My retort to him was "how would you like it if 90% of the revenue collected in the country was spent on things that did not directly or perhaps indirectly touch and concern you and only 10% was left to be spent on salaries, wages and things that touch and concern you directly?" He said that in the nature of things he did not think that would ever happen. I asked him why he thought in the nature of things that could never happen and he said that the Government is not a foolish Government. I said to him "which Government?" Well it then occurred to him that he was talking about this particular incumbent Government; he was saying this particular Government is not a foolish Government. Well that prompted me to ask him "suppose the previous Government had done that?" and he said, well I can see the reason for the debates on the Estimates; and I do not think I need to enlarge on that any further.

That, Sir, led me to give further thought to the Estimates as they have been presented to Parliament for 1981-82. Whereas in previous years in my contribution on this debate I have been partly if not largely subjective in my overall assessment of the Estimates and indeed in my contribution, I propose this year to be less subjective, that is, to take a slightly more objective view of the Estimates as they have been presented. I will, Sir, of necessity have to examine the application of the Estimates to particular constituencies, especially as such application would affect a certain constituency in which I may have an interest, and in so doing I am likely to make certain suggestions which I hope will be taken in the spirit in which they are made and which I have no doubt will be implemented.

In taking up that gentleman's discussion, Sir, I had a look at the revenue for 1980-81 that flowed from taxes on income and profits and I need not at this point say more than that it represents less, I think, than one-third of the total revenue for that period. I have no doubt that the Minister will have a look at that next Tuesday, and therefore I propose to confine my comments to the question of the expenditure.

When I look at that, and it is properly set out on page 2 of the Estimates, I note Sir, that personal emoluments represent roughly 40% of the total expenditure for the period under consideration, and therefore that the

rest is devoted to other charges to be spent on other projects, and that led me to think, Mr. President, that our concern is primarily how best we as a Government ought to allocate this sum of scarce resources among competing interests, because when we look at this whole question not as one of criticising individual departments or not as one of debating one's pet subjects but when we look at it in the context of the national interest, it comes down to how much money will be spent in the City, how much money will be spent in each parish in this Island and further how much money will be spent in each electoral constituency of this Island.

We of course examine it under Heads and sub-heads as they are set out under various departments, but if one views it politically, one is looking strictly from the point of view of how much money will be spent in a particular electoral constituency and when these sums are taken together, how do they benefit the country as a whole? Sir, against this background of the need to ensure that every parish indeed every electoral constituency must receive its fair share of the development infrastructurally and otherwise, we have to see how the relevant Minister sought to achieve his objective of seeking to bring to bear upon the final result by utilising all of his financial genius, his social knowledge, his political acumen. We have to look to see how he has brought these to bear upon the final result.

My submission, Sir, is that we can only do it by looking at how the various departments set out to enable each electoral constituency to benefit materially and otherwise from the preparation and submission of the various Estimates. I have no doubt, Sir, that in preparing and submitting Estimates the various Ministers at times will be required to be cautious, perhaps over-cautious, sometimes they may be required to throw caution to the wind, sometimes they will be required to be cognisant of the need of accurately assessing priorities and sometimes of course they will have to subject priorities to the national interest as a whole. If therefore, Mr. President, we in this Chamber are to make a sensible and constructive criticism, be it critical or otherwise, to the composition of the Estimates as they are prepared and presented, then we need to be aware of all the social, economic, financial and political developments which are taking place around us.

Against that background, Mr. President, I have examined the previous debates in this Chamber on the Estimates and I have taken the opportunity to compare these debates with the debates as they unfolded in respect of the present Estimates which we are considering.

I have noticed, Sir, that for the first time perhaps in five years, debate centred largely around four particular Ministries and when those Ministries were examined in

detail by the various speakers, debates centred around particular aspect of those Ministries.

These Ministries I find were the Ministry of Finance, Communications and Works, Agriculture and Education. Community Services came in for a little treatment as well but I do not think that it was as exhaustive as the four first mentioned and when I analysed those contributions of other speakers I observed, Sir, that even their debate was centred around the particular Ministers. They were so confined to certain specific aspects of the Ministries then debated as to show that when all was said and done, and taking the overall view of the Ministries thus debated, that the Ministries could not be described as functioning otherwise than properly and efficiently.

Let me give you an example, Sir. For the first time in five years the Ministry of Finance has come in for exhaustive treatment in this Chamber by Hon. Senators and even then, the only aspect of a very, very large Ministry that was treated exhaustively and sometimes at all was the Department known as Defence and Security.

Nobody concerned himself with the economy as a whole. Nobody concerned himself with planning. Nobody concerned himself with the methods of taxation. Almost every speaker who treated that subject, treated it from the standpoint of the Ministry of Defence and Security. It needs therefore to be put into a proper perspective because when one look through the Estimates of the Ministry of Finance, one see there several and several large Departments. Yet, if Senators can only find one arm of that Ministry to complain about, what that tells me, Sir, is that the Ministry as a whole is functioning efficiently and effectively and that is terribly important.

It must not get around that because this Chamber finds it necessary to debate a particular Department of a certain Ministry that that Ministry as a whole is not functioning well. I do not say, Sir, that that would be deliberate or the intention of members contributing to the debate under that particular Head but if you are not careful that is how it has to come over to the public at large particularly so as the Media is unable to publish all the views of all Senators and, therefore, if this debate is taken out of context one is in danger of being left with the idea that the Ministry as a whole is not functioning properly.

Let me give you another example, Sir, the Ministry of Education. That again is a Department with one of the larger, if not indeed the largest allocation under the Estimates. I believe it might be the largest allocation. Yet, when it received treatment in this Chamber the treatment it received was confined largely to not even a Department, Sir, it was confined to a School falling

within a Department that School being, of course, Dodds, the Government Industrial School popularly known as Dodds and so much debate was centred around Dodds that here again if one is not sitting in the Senate or one does not read the Senate Debates and of course, there are about three years behind hand, and, of course, the Media is unable to report the proceedings in their entirety, then one is in great danger of construing this to mean that the Ministry of Education is not functioning efficiently and effectively but that is not the case because as I said, Dodds utilises a very small part of the Budget of the Ministry of Education. What happened with the whole Section? This is the whole Debate and I have no doubt that when the relevant Ministers are replying they will seek to put the whole debate into its proper perspective and in the manner that I have set out.

Let me give you another example. Take the Ministry of Communications and Works and the fact that I had been given an opportunity to speak relatively late in this debate has also given me the chance to assess and analyse the contributions made by previous speakers. Let us take the Ministry of Communications and Works. This Ministry again has a very, very large allocation both Current and Capital under these Estimates.

Here again this is one of the Ministries that came in for fairly exhaustive treatment but what aspects of the Ministry of Communications and Works were treated in this exhaustive fashion? So far as my recollection goes there were Transport Board and one or two other remarks about pot holes in the roads. Not a mention, Mr. President, was made about the good work that the Ministry of Communications and Works is doing. Not a mention has been made about that.

Now I readily conceive that it is not the duty of the Opposition to highlight the good points of the Government and in fact, Mr. President, the job of defending its own position, of formulating its own public relations fall squarely and fairly upon the shoulders of the Government but in this Chamber one has come to expect, particularly prior to January, 1981 a fairly high and balanced level of debate.

I remember our former colleague, the then Senator Connell, not only criticising the Government but giving the Government bouquets where bouquets were due and the other former colleague Senator Hunte was also of that mode. Indeed, I cannot remember a debate only if even in passing both Mr. Connell and Mr. Hunte, then Senator Connell and Senator Hunte, of course did not remark upon some achievement of the Government.

The whole trend of debate today, Sir, has shown in my humble view a sad lack of appreciation of good work that has been done by the Government. I do not

proposed to stand up here and praise the Government or defend it at all. I will defend it elsewhere.

I propose today to be fairly objective. I will leave the job of defending it, of rectifying to those whose job it is to reply. My function here at the moment is to draw the attention of the Honourable Ministers to this glaring omission from the debates so far, the fact that so much has been done, but the praises have been left unsung, as compared to the comments regarding what has been done, or what they think had been done, or what had not been done.

Ministry of Communications and Works. Only transport and roads have come in for any criticism. Only two weeks ago, Mr. Connell writing in the Nation's weekly column remarked upon the beautiful work that has been done at the Halls Road roundabout. I do not think that anyone in this Honourable Chamber, or outside would disagree with him that it is a wonderful job, the work is superb. It is a pleasure to pass there and I am not here commenting specifically, or otherwise on the gardening that the Parks and Beaches Commission has done on the roundabout at all. I do not want to take any praise myself for Parks and Beaches, I am talking about the general aesthetics of the area. For the first time in the developmental history of Barbados, so far as it relates to the construction of roads and roundabouts have we seen a complete and thorough job taking into account not only the fact of having a proper road on which we should travel, but also it shows that great thought that was put into the environmental changes that have taken place around the Halls Road roundabout. Soon, of course, we will be noticing a similar development on the Spring Garden project.

I of course, must seize this opportunity to express the hope that when the roundabout is constructed at Six Cross Roads in St. Philip equal attention will be paid to the aesthetics of the area and I hope that that time will not be far away Mr. President and I do not necessarily require a reply on that score from the Honourable Minister today.

If I should give you another example, I have dealt with Finance, MCW, take Agriculture. I do not think that any specific area of the Ministry of Agriculture was singled out for any kind of exhaustive treatment. The general consensus appeared to be that agriculture probably as a whole needs some kind of rethinking, but even so, the absence of specifics tells me that certain things which are benefitting this country are taking place in the Ministry of Agriculture. I heard only a part of the speech of my colleague Senator Brathwaite yesterday. I gather that he was remarking on the fact that the person who has not observed certain agricultural developments would be a person who has just come from Italy, got off

at the airport taken a helicopter, flown high above the land and landed in the Senate. I do not know if I quoted him correctly, but if that is what he said I agree with him.

As a matter of fact Sir, today may be the most appropriate time for us to reconsider the whole question of agriculture because I do not think any one of us, particularly someone who like me lives in the country could go out there this evening and make a speech to those agricultural labourers, that we hope we will see the day when there would not see a cane blade in Barbados, not today and I think that you should know why you could not say that today, Sir, because when I go home this evening so many cane cutters, loaders and what have you are going to be offering me a drink because of the same cane blades that I do not see a man with the heart who could go and tell them that he does not want to see a cane blade here. They certainly want to see it because they are benefitting materially from these cane blades. The whole question of back money still means a lot to these workers.

So that, when I compare the contributions in debate on the Estimates of former years to the contributions this year Mr. President, I am left with the feeling, well the Government has done so well, there is not much to criticise, so let us criticise what little we think there is to criticise and let us leave the praises unsung. Let us not mention at all the great achievements of this Government particularly as it may benefit the Government in an Election year. That is the trend of the debate as I picked it up. I do not think it was done in a manner of seeking to deprive the Government of its rightly won laurels. I think it was a question of one thinking that one had to come here and say something and not really setting out to bring a balanced view to the whole debate.

What I now invite the Honourable Chamber to reflect upon Sir are the many achievements of the Government to date. When those are compared with what may generally be thought as the deficiencies one would come to no other conclusion than that the Government has done a very good job. What I now wish to do therefore, Sir is to give my own point of view about matters that have so far been raised. I will start with the Ministry of Finance specifically the department of Defence and Security. I feel Mr. President that the debate on this whole matter has not followed a logical course at all. I have not seen any report of the debate in the Other Place, where any Honourable Member debated speaking against it has made logical deductions and come to logical conclusions and with great respect, I have followed most of the arguments in here regarding the same item and I am unable to say that those making contributions on this aspect, speaking particularly against it have made logical deductions, or come to logical conclusions, or indeed

started at the beginning because most of the debate surrounding this department started with the question, "Are we spending too much on Defence and Security?"

I think Sir that that is the wrong place to begin a debate on an item such as this. If indeed we begin the debate on that item by asking the question, "Are we spending too much on Defence and Security?" What would happen if we begin debate on an area like the Ministry of Health in the same fashion, or indeed on Education, or indeed on the Judiciary, or indeed on Parliament? In treating the other Heads, I have not heard the debate begun in that fashion. Persons debating these Heads always start by asking the question, "Is this particular thing really necessary?" Will it benefit the island as a whole" and the debate progresses from there. If it is a necessity and it benefits the island as a whole, then one goes on to consider what size it should take. How should it be taken in the context of a National Budget? What social, economic and financial areas it should occupy? Then and only then, finally what would be a fair and reasonable allocation under this particular Head? So that, when contributors to the debate are discussing the Ministry of Education for example, the first question they also ask is are these schools necessary? Do we want these schools? Do we want more primary schools? Do we have enough places in our secondary schools? Do we need a university? Having come to a positive conclusion in that regard, the debate progresses, "How much should we spend on it?" How much can we afford to spend on it? Similarly, with the Ministry of Communications and Works, similarly with the Ministry of Agriculture. But, when we come to the department of Defence and Security, the debate begins, they are taking the cow by its tail, "you are spending too much on it."

Well, certain inferences can be drawn from the manner in which the debate under that Item begins. The first inference that can be drawn, Mr. President, is this, that most of us, if indeed not all of us, are satisfied beyond a reasonable doubt that a Defence Force of some kind is necessary. If that is accepted, then well and good, I can see us going on to debate the question of the quantum of the allocation, if we accept that is necessary, but there is another inference that can be drawn. The other inference is that it may not be necessary, but in so far as we have it, or in so far as we cannot avoid having it, let us control the amount of expenditure that is allocated to it.

If the latter is the case, then I think the debate should rightly begin with the merits or demerits of having a Defence Force in the first place. It would be unfair, unreasonable and illogical to begin the debate by seeking to castigate the Ministry for allocating certain sums to it, sums which one may think are over and above reasonable expectations. One should, if one wants to be honest, begin by debating whether or not we can in fact avoid a

Defence Force. If one begins in that fashion, Mr. President, one would have to ask certain questions. What is the primary function, for example, of a Defence Force? I have not heard this debated yet, Sir. Everybody who says we are spending too much money on it avoids asking whether or not there is an actual need for it here. They will excuse themselves by saying they do not believe in Sydney Burnett-Alleyne, like if somebody is bringing the Defence Force for Sydney Burnett-Alleyne. So far as the history of Barbados is concerned, he is more interested in mercantile banks, and we should be thinking about banks when we think about him, but we are not developing a Defence Force simply to control Sydney Burnett-Alleyne.

One has to ask oneself what is the primary function of the Defence Force, and if the answer to that is that the primary function is to defend one's country against external attacks, then immediately the conclusion to be drawn would be that a Defence Force would be unnecessary in this country, because we can never have one big enough to defend ourselves from an external attack, except of course it comes from Patrick John, but that is not the only function of the Defence Force. That may be one of the primary functions of the Defence Force.

In looking at this whole subject I have also had a look at the functions of the Defence Force in England, and I have found that the Army, the Navy and the Air Force in Britain perform more duties of an internal nature than they perform of an external nature. In other words, they are equally as useful, if not more useful, as agencies, institutions, call them what you wish, for protecting civil liberties and certain other aspects of our democratic life within the country as they are for protecting it without, and this is an aspect of Defence and Security that has never ever received exhaustive treatment in this country at all. Senator Rocheford yesterday gave certain insights into this. He said that we were too defensive about it. He was speaking against the clock when I believe he thought that debate on this Bill would have ended last night at 7.30, but I have no doubt that had he been given the opportunity, as I have been given, he would have developed this argument to the conclusion that I hope to develop mine, because he started to set out the real benefits of a Defence Force. These are the arguments I want to see, because if we come to the conclusion that the country is yet to benefit from the provision of the Defence Force, and more than that, from the provision of a properly equipped Defence Force, then we can have no justification at all for arguing against the allocation, even though it may be slightly large in comparison to certain other civil allocations.

Now, I cited Britain. I was in Canada last year and I noted while I was there that the Army in Canada is also used quite a lot in internal matters. I further noticed from the various arms of the Canadian Defence Force — the Navy, Air Force and Army — that it provides a useful

reserve of skills which are not only used in normal times, but more importantly, which skills are used in times of emergency. I need not indeed have gone to Canada to observe that, because I am proud to say that after Hurricane Allen our own Defence Force, even with the limited skills at its disposal, was immediately brought into use. I know personally of work that was done by the Defence Force, and even though that could and should only be regarded as a start, it should be enough to put us and the country on notice that there are uses to be obtained from the establishment of the Defence Force other than to protect the country from external attack.

This reserve of skills is of material importance. In some of our most important industries and utilities in Barbados, Mr. President, we do not have standby key men, as they are called, there are certain workers in places like Light and Power and Telephone, certain of the essential utility services in this country, and even out there in private industry, who if they go sick and something goes wrong you have to telephone them at home to ask them how to correct it. You think about it, think that if we have something serious going wrong with our key personnel in key industries and utility services that we have to wait until we can send to Canada for a suitable Barbadian or a suitable expatriate, or to England, and see what will happen.

There is a strong argument for having high level, resourceful and skilled personnel in the Defence Force, and I will not entertain any counter argument that is a use of resources to just have them there, because you do not have to just have them there, Mr. President. You can use them, and I believe they are being used under the Skills Training Programme. You can use them to teach people in the community, to teach such skills to certain people in the community. There is no harm in opening the doors of the Drill Hall to people off the street so they can go up there and learn electrical wiring, plumbing and things of this sort; no harm whatsoever. There need be no absolute rigidity that those people being taught trades by the Defence personnel will have to be Defence personnel themselves. I do not think that is a requirement at the moment, but if anybody thinks it should be, then there is no good argument why it should be. They can be used, and I am reliably informed that they are being used at the moment. That is another very strong argument.

In Britain certain Barbadians joined the Army around 1962. They joined up here and went to Britain, and a lot of them have come out, have been demobbed, as you call it, I believe, as skilled men. We have people who learnt various skills, trades and professions in the British Army who have never fought at all. I have a friend who all he did was stay in the kitchen, and now he is a big time chef. When he cooks a meal for you it makes your hair curl, Mr. President. He would never

have acquired that skill had he been around Barbados, he learnt it in the Army in Britain and he has never fought a day. I doubt he could slope arms as well as I can, and I did not even manage to get a stripe in the Cadets. They did not consider me for a stripe at all.

He can cook beautifully. There is nothing wrong with that. I think he is at La Toc in St. Lucia. That is the last place I heard he was. He is a good chef. The army also, Mr. President, provides certain employment opportunities for a large number of persons in this country, particularly persons who are vulnerable to rapid social development which sometimes they find difficult to unravel and to understand, and if anyone states that an army ought not to be used for the purpose of employing persons, I will say he is wrong or she is wrong. I see nothing ill at all about having a defence force that employs a large number of persons of a certain age group who perhaps would otherwise find it difficult to obtain a job. They do not have to sign up in the defence force for life. I do not even have to advocate a compulsory programme of national training, but it should be made attractive enough, the salaries and wages and what have you should be good enough, the terms of employment or whatever you call them in the army should be attractive enough to encourage persons of a certain age group who would normally find it difficult to obtain employment to join up, and I see nothing wrong with that at all. In fact I can well foresee that if conditions are attractive and favourable enough, persons may wish to do a couple of years in the defence force before they go on to University or before they go into the normal working system, and I am not guessing this because in my day when only certain of the older secondary schools as they were then called had cadet corps a lot of my friends who were not fortunate enough to be admitted to these schools used to go and join the Regiment simply to get the training.

It is still an attractive thing for people, particularly males, — I notice quite a lot of females in the Defence Force here now at the Garrison — it is still a very attractive thing for them to put on uniforms, do drilling, be carrying arms and to be taking part in ceremonial parades, and I see nothing wrong with that socially, culturally or economically. I do not see any argument against that. It should be encouraged. I am not going to advocate a compulsory system. Even if it becomes necessary I would not be the one to advocate it, but I am stating and I want to state it most forcefully that the conditions should be made so attractive and advertised that young people would be encouraged to join. That is another benefit of the Defence Force, and make no mockery of its benefits as a body that takes part in ceremonial parades and things of that sort, because whether you like it or not, whether it is an indigenous African trait or not, whether it is European or not, the ceremonial aspect of a defence force is much liked and enjoyed by all and sundry.

Mr. President, you only have to have a parade and you will see people thronging wherever the parade is to watch it. The last parade that I attended I heard a parent tell a child "when you grow up you have to go into the Cadet Corps." She did not say "the cadet corps"; she said "the Cadet Force and then if they accept you, you have to go in that; I like it." Of course the days when parents could persuade children to join up because they liked it are all but gone, but that just shows the type of impact that these ceremonial parades have on the populace at large and we ought not to scorn or sniff at the benefits to be derived from that. I do not want to be too historical, but certain countries that lack economic resources have made use of parades to keep their people happy. Indeed in Africa people kept themselves happy by and large by playing music, beating drums and dancing. In the midst of poverty, they still found a little oasis of happiness and they did it by playing the drums and that sort of thing. Having an army and having ceremonial parades is just a development of that sort of thing. It is a military development and there is nothing at all wrong with a country providing such a cultural aspect for its nation albeit one that is largely associated with European culture. I see nothing wrong at all with the benefits to be derived from the ceremonial aspect of the Defence Force.

Mr. President, when I was a boy scouting had a lot of practical and physical aspects to it. You could see the physical contributions of the scouting movement to the Island. The Girl Guides, even the Church Lads' and the Church Girls' Brigade were productive in a sense when I was a boy. Nowadays these organisations are largely ceremonial. You certainly do not have bob-a-job week. I think they have something called "Job-a-Day" or something like that, but I do not see any scouts coming around on job-a-day because I would be glad to give one or two a job. They like the dressing up in uniform and there is nothing wrong with that. It helps to instil a certain amount of discipline and that is the benefit to be derived. There is absolutely nothing wrong in dressing up just for a ceremony. That is what carnival is all about; it is a cultural explosion. I do not see anything productive about carnival except its benefit in terms of tourist dollars which it brings in. Culturally it is beneficial and it is another form of dressing up and parading. Look at Kadooment down here in Barbados! Look how many people we never thought would go into the streets and jump up were jumping up! I am developing this argument to emphasise the benefits which can and do in fact derive from the ceremonial aspect of a Defence Force, and they are not to be scoffed at; they are beneficial to the country at large. I do not say we ought to spend \$13 million on the Defence Force simply for certain cultural benefits to accrue to us, but all the same, we are not so spending \$13 million. Of course the great and universally accepted benefit of any defence force is the discipline it instils, and here I would like Mr. President,

to compare it with the church as an institution. I would like really and seriously to compare the Defence Force in the manner of discipline in its members and ultimately in the community at large with the church as an institution in at least instilling moral if not religious discipline, because the church used to be the bedrock on which certain disciplines were based in this country. I know they are doing their best and I trust it will not be long before those responsible pull it up by its bootstrings and restore it to the former position which it enjoyed in the society because it is people of our class — and note Mr. President, four years ago I used to regard myself as being a young man comparatively speaking, but I am now speaking in the context of the Senate as a whole. Now I am saying "we"; I am placing myself on that plane among other Senators. I have now gone over the age of 35 and am not now legally entitled to regard myself as a young man anymore, so I am speaking about "we", Mr. President. In our day the Church was responsible by and large for instilling in us certain disciplines.

Now if you compare the Defence Force, there is no doubt, there is no argument, there is no question at all that its strongest point, its strongest civil merit is that the Defence Force serves as a useful body for advising, creating, instilling and maintaining certain patterns of behaviour in its members, and why should those members pass on those disciplines so instilled in their offspring and right down through the line?

It follows therefore that if we have a large enough Defence Force we may just manage to instil enough discipline into the people that it will filter right through the society and who knows that perhaps we may either have no need whatsoever in this Island for the development of Rastafarianism or at the very midst it may someday, some how, be regarded as some separate discipline under the aegis of the Defence Force. I would not go so far as to advocate that we put prisoners in the Defence Force. I think that idea is probably absurd and going a bit too far but I believe that it has spread its tentacles to such an extent that it might embody what we now regard as certain extreme sections of this society and that is a positive benefit of the Defence Force.

Now if we accept that those are just some of the benefits of a Defence Force *per se*. What are we then left with? We are left with the question of the cost of running the Defence Force. Not only the cost of running it *per se* but also the cost of running it in the context of National Development. That is when you compare with the requirements of the Ministry of Community Services, the Ministry of Health, etc. To put it in economic terms I think the Economist would say that the opportunity costs that the Defence Force has, are the other things you have to forego so that you are back to square one.

What you have to do now is that if you say that the opportunity cost of running the Defence Force, for example, the Community Centre that you had to forego, we have to look and see if that Community Centre is a priority or if we can forego it now in preference to the Defence Force and bring the Community Centre later. It becomes an economic question then and if it becomes an economic question we also have to look at the cost of acquiring Capital now in bulk as against the cost of acquiring it gradually and ultimately against the cost of acquiring it *in toto* at a former date, perhaps much further in the future. Those are the things we have to look at when we are considering the economic cost of running the Defence Force.

My humble suggestion, Mr. President, is that we either have a Defence Force or we do not have a Defence Force. I hate pretence. We should not pretend that we are having a Defence Force so if we are going to have it let us stock it now. Let us buy the equipment that it is necessary to have now. Even though it may mean having to forego a Community Centre here and there. Even though it may mean having to forego a School here and there. Even though it may mean having to forego a Health Centre here and there. Let us have it now.

While criticism will come if the Budget of the Defence Force in succeeding years continues to exceed Budgets in other essential Ministries. If next year, for example, the ratio of money being spent on Defence and Security far exceeds the amount of money still being spent on Housing then that should give some rise for concern. If a year after the allocation for Defence and Security is not reduced below the allocation for Housing, that is a small amount going for Defence and Security than for Housing, then we should all stand up here and protest and protest as loudly as we can but now, Mr. President, with great respect is not the time for great protest.

I am sure that when certain projects were started in this Island, certain projects that were not regarded as essential projects as others a bigger allocation was made in respect of those projects than was made in respect of those that were non-essential but it was regarded as a necessity to make the allocation then in order to get the thing off the ground, make it then and be finished with it and the benefits would accrue later on.

When it was decided to build the Deep Water Harbour no one could say that that was as profitable as giving the people food although it allows us to bring in food more quickly but you must have large allocations with new projects. What we have to do is to be weary in the future so as the Jamaican would say that the debate on the question of the allocation for Defence and Security as

it proceeded particularly from the lips of the Opposition Senator was previous. I think they were a year or two in advance. They should have waited.

They have not stated that we do not need a Defence Force and the moment they accepted implicitly or otherwise that a Defence Force is or can be useful when they have to accept as a corollary to that that we must spend some kind of Capital in getting it off the ground and in any event, in the final analysis, Mr. President, it will be the public that would determine two questions, (a) The question of the necessity of the Defence Force and (b), the cost.

I think that this Government has rightly analysed the mood of the public in this regard. The public is with the Government underneath for a Defence Force. I think that once it is treated properly the public will also accept the arguments of the Government that the opportunity cost of having the Defence Force is well worth it. When it reaches the situation that the public thinks that too much is being spent on Defence and Security *per se*, and they think that too much is being spent when compared with other items of Expenditure, the public at large will rebel and the Government will be thrown out on that alone. At the moment, as I said, the arguments are previous.

Let me therefore move on to the next item that was a slow point which gave rise to much debate, the question of Transport under the Ministry of Communications and Works. Here again, the subject was treated in the fashion not that the Transport Board is totally useless. I think it was generally accepted that it performed a useful function. The consensus seems to have been that the Transport Board could be improved as Senator Franklin said whether by Management, expertise or resources. He thought it could be improved so that no one is saying get rid of the Transport Board. Give it off. Do like Mrs. Thatcher in England. Give it back to Private Concessionaires. I think that idea was mooted in the Other House but not so in here.

In here the debate proceeded along the basis that the Transport Board could be a more useful Institution to this Island and in discussing the question of the Transport Board speakers touched also on the question of mini-buses, a subject which is dear to my heart if for no other reason that I was involved in the present Organisation of the mini-buses practically from its inception when the illegal operators, as they were then called, kept their first Meeting at the Globe Cinema. They invited me to address them to speak with them and then they hardly in a professional capacity and I was involved with them from that point. I conducted a lot of negotiations on their behalf. I made certain suggestions of their observations that I am now happy to see have been implemented.

I have detected a feeling that if it gives momentum may not lead to the demise of the mini buses, but may severely restrict their operations. A lot of people use the fact that they crowd the Fairchild Street Market as an argument that the operation should be severely restricted. I do not subscribe to that at all and my notice will be, hands off the mini-buses. It will be necessary to control the numbers, it will be necessary to control the operations, but not to so severely restrict them that they find it uneconomical to operate. In particular, if those restrictions are primarily designed to make sure that the Transport Board makes a profit.

About three years ago, I asked in this Honourable Chamber that mini-buses be allowed to run so that they drive the Transport Board to the maximum efficiency. Shortly after, provision was made in the Budgetary Proposals for giving legitimacy to the operations of what was then regarded as the illegal operators and I am grateful that that was done. I am happy to say that on the routes where they operate, there is a greater amount of efficiency than on the routes where they do not operate. I still think that the mini-buses can be used to drive the Transport Board to maximum efficiency and it is no answer to ban them from the Fairchild Street Market at all. It is no answer to restrict them in a corner where commuters cannot reach them except by walking long distances. The answer is to accommodate them and integrate them fully within the transport system of this island and I am going to be relentless in my pursuit of this objective. I want to see those mini-buses accommodated and integrated within our transport system.

I suggested in another place at another time that some of them could and should be made to run the uneconomic routes. There was a large measure of agreement among the operators of the mini buses that if they were asked to run the uneconomic routes, they would only require one of them to run an uneconomic route probably for one day every week and they could afford to do that. That is an avenue that has to be explored and if possible exploited. I see no reason why one who has been given permission to run Grazettes should not be asked one day a week to run the Route 10 to Bayfield, St. Philip even if they lose money on that trip. What he loses there, he will gain on the roundabouts. I know, I have worked for the mini bus men and I know their potential and they can afford to run one of the uneconomical routes at least one day a week and in fact about 95% have said to me, I have it in writing that they would be prepared to run the uneconomic routes because that is one of their problems. The poor Transport Board has to ply all the uneconomic routes, up to Bayfield and back, down to Pie Corner and back. No wonder we find that the service falls down in those areas sometimes. On the short routes, the mini bus men make the money.

The answer is to accommodate and integrate them, bring in legislation that will compel them to run the uneconomic route one day a week and the penalties for not complying could be simple. You have not run the uneconomic route this week and you have not asked one of your partners to do it, you will not be allowed to run next week, and you clap a sign on the bus, "Not allowed to run" and the penalty for breaking that sign \$5 000 or \$10 000. That is what you have to do, it can be done, but they must be integrated and they must be accommodated, I do not know where we can put them, apart from the Fairchild Street bus stand. I have been looking around myself and I know that several mini bus men have been looking around, but I know that for the parishes on my side of the island, they will need to be near the Fairchild Street bus stand and for the areas on the northern side of the island, there will need to be some other place perhaps, but it cannot be beyond the ingenuity of this Government to find some place near the heart of the city to accommodate them. I am anxiously awaiting the day when they are fully accommodated. In passing, I want to compliment the Honourable Minister for giving them some limited, but welcomed accommodation in the market square and the Fairchild Street market. It shows that he has his finger on the pulse, he is aware of the problems and he is seeking to rectify them. Problems such as there are have never been rectified in one day.

Now, apart from the congestion that it is alleged they cause, the other cause for complaint Mr. President is that these mini buses take certain revenue that otherwise goes to the Transport Board. My answer to that Sir is that the charges they pay in terms of permits and things of that sort ought to be paid directly to the Transport Board. Do not have it paid to the Ministry of Communications and Works because it gets lost in the general revenue account. Pay it to the Transport Board, so that it will help subsidise the uneconomic routes which the Transport Board is called upon to run. Work out a sensible figure, so that when all is said and done the Transport Board does not come out the loser on uneconomic routes, either take a percentage of each fare, that may call for a lot of policing. I have not thought it out to its logical conclusion, or in detail yet, it could be done though. But, we can insist that the mini buses pay a certain amount of money directly to the Transport Board which said money could be used to buy rolling stock for the uneconomic routes of the Transport Board, permits, tax and this sort of thing.

If you have to provide parking area for them, let them pay to park so that you recover the cost of the parking area and you can also recover the cost of the upkeep of the parking area and you are also getting some revenue which can go into the Transport Board. Place the parking areas under the direct control of the Transport Board and let them pay to park. I am not here

setting out to penalise the mini buses. I was probably the first person to argue for their existence and I am still here arguing that they should be accommodated and integrated. I want that to be reported properly and accurately. But what I am saying is that if they must be integrated and accommodated, there are certain duties that they must perform. No one ever gets a right, except upon you is placed a corresponding duty and the mini bus men in this regard would be no exception. They must appreciate that if I am to argue for certain rights on their behalf, they have to discharge certain duties as well. They have to pay for parking, I will charge a fee for parking not every trip they do, it could be weekly, monthly, or yearly. You do not have to have a man out there who takes ten cents every time you come in with a trip, that would be nonsense. Let all that revenue go to the Transport Board, all of this spin-off revenue could go to the Transport Board.

I daresay, Sir that several of the drivers need a lot of training and I am not confining myself to training as drivers. They need training in how they conduct themselves, how they dress themselves, this sort of thing, how they use the roads, they need to be taught how to respect other people's rights. Some of them behave like the taxi men in England. You are driving behind a mini bus now and all of a sudden, bam, he stops like that, he is moving off, he thinks that he has got a right to stick his hand out when he is moving off, he does not know that that only tells the driver behind that he intends to move off that does not give him a right to move off. He cannot move off until it is clear. You are driving behind him, you stop, you overtake him, then he sticks out his hand and he moves. He needs discipline, he needs training.

Develop a training course at the Transport Board make it compulsory for them to go through a period of training every now and then, do not stop the training. They do two months of training spread over eight different months during the year and if they do not get their certificate of training, they are not allowed to drive the mini buses. Pay the money for training into the Transport Board. These spin-off benefits can accrue to the Transport Board. The task of testing the brakes and things like this to make sure that they are in good order do it more than once a year. It is a public service vehicle, it is running the route every day, make sure that they are tested about once a month. Again, utilise the mechanics at the Transport Board and let them pay the money to the Transport Board. Let them run according to properly drawn up schedules and timetables. Let those schedules and timetables be prepared by the Transport Board, Mr. President.

More than that, Mr. President, give the Transport Board a fleet of minibuses. I see no valid argument against that. I do not even want to hear the Minister's

reply on that, I think there is no rebuttal to it. There is no logical reason why the Transport Board should not have its own minibuses — economic, personnel, social, there is no reason at all — and I do not even want to hear the Minister's reply on that particular point that I made. Let him not jot it down, Sir. I want to see the Transport Board have its own minibuses so that they can operate on a competitive basis, even if you have to pay the drivers a commission in addition to salary. It is not beyond the ingenuity of the Workers' Union and the Transport Board to come to some suitable arrangement regarding that.

I am getting a signal, Sir, that it is getting a bit late, and I am going to get ahead.

The next thing, of course, that attracted some measure of treatment was the question of potholes in the road. For a long time now I have seen these potholes in the road. It is probably because the previous Government changed with some degree of rapidity from Mr. Smith to Mr. Sandiford to Dr. Caddle and back to Mr. Sandiford again in terms of the Ministry. They did not allow any one Minister to come to terms with the problem. I remember very well the incumbent Minister referring to Mr. Smith as the Minister of Tar Roads. I think he could more appropriately have been referred to then as the Minister of Potholes. This is not a new thing and that does not justify it.

What I really want to say on this point is this. I do not understand if the allocation in the Ministry of Communications and Works in respect of roads is divided into two or not. If it is not, I would like to suggest that this allocation be divided into a certain sum for what we call main roads, and a certain sum for tenantry roads. I do not mind a pothole or two in a main road, once it is not so bad as to cause your car to break up when you drive, but I want to know that when the doctor is called to people in Harlington, St. Philip, when the doctor is called to people in Gemswick, St. Philip, when the doctor is called to people in Diamond Valley, St. Philip and Marchfield, St. Philip that the doctor can get in and get out, and you, Sir, you are a doctor and you would know the difficulty when doctors used to visit with more regularity than they do today. I want to know that the doctor can get in and get out. When rain falls there is no way, you have to send a stretcher into the house for the people to take them to the doctor. I want to know that the money is divided into two so that we can concentrate in larger measure on tenantry roads.

Now, I know of the achievement of the present Minister in this regard. I know he has managed to construct and/or repair a larger percentage of miles of tenantry roads than previous Ministers. I am not saying he has not done a good job, because as I said earlier, the debate is proceeding in this Chamber as though the Gov-

ernment or the individual Ministers have done nothing worthwhile. He has an achievement to his credit and you can see the large number of tenantry roads that have been repaired, especially if you go through the back roads in St. Joseph. That is neither here nor there. He has done a very very good job on some tenantry roads, but what I want to see is a separate allocation. We do not have Local Government, but I would like to know that we have X number of dollars for Six Cross Roads, we have a certain amount for Harlington, Gemswick, Diamond Valley, Long Bay and these areas. That is what I want to see, so that the representative for the constituency can ring or write the Minister and say, this road is bad, you have X number of dollars, could we have it repaired. Right now when you ring the Minister the Minister is in a difficulty, because no particular set of money is earmarked for any particular area, and the money runs out.

I want to see our money set aside and see if it will operate better that way. I have no doubt, however, that a study may have gone into it, and that is a point perhaps if the Minister has an opportunity he can check later. I will check it myself with the Minister anyway.

I am going on to Agriculture, Mr. President. The only point I wish to make about Agriculture at this present time, even though I am being paid to stop talking, concerns the BMC, Sir.

Mr. PRESIDENT: We have up to Monday.

SENATOR H. R. LINTON: Thank you, Sir. In any event, Sir, in the days when lawyers had a little pouch at the back this would not have been enough. One cent is not enough.

I want to talk about the BMC, Sir. For about three years I have been asking for the construction of a BMC Depot at Six Cross Roads in St. Philip. I am going to ask for more today, Sir, I am going to impose upon the Minister of Community Development, and I will forewarn him that if a letter is not on his desk at the moment from me, he will be getting it by 3 o'clock this afternoon, so he need not say that I have not spoken to him personally, I am going to forewarn him. Because I am not only today asking for the construction of a BMC Depot at Six Cross Roads, St. Philip, I am going to go on and ask for the construction of a community centre, but when I deal with community centres in a short while I will deal with that.

I think St. Philip needs a point where small farmers, like my former colleague, (Senator) John Connell, could dispose of their produce. If you only have 100 pounds of carrots, 50 heads of cabbage and this sort of thing, you do not want to be driving to town in order to dispose of them, or to drive around to every supermarket. (ASIDE). The BMC will purchase them, yes, I am not criticising

them in that regard, but you have to hire a vehicle and drive to town with them. Put one at Six Roads. More than that, I have compared the prices at BMC supermarket with certain prices prevailing elsewhere, and I am satisfied that quite a lot of the prices are lower than prices elsewhere, but St. Philip people are not going to pay 45 cents down and 45 cents up, then buy a lunch for four or five dollars, a snowcone and a package of nuts simply to save seven dollars on a basket of groceries. Put the depot for the supermarket at Six Cross Roads, St. Philip. I have been saying for three years that we have a market that does not function, put the depot up there. I did not know at the time, but we sat down and allowed a private concern to buy the old Telephone Exchange and now it is a thriving supermarket. I am happy for the proprietor, he is my good friend and I would be a fool not to be happy for him, but I think that is an opportunity the Government lost to purchase a suitable building at a suitable location at which to place the BMC Depot. My next suggestion is that they purchase the existing market, and here again I have a letter going off to the Minister of Agriculture and the Chairman of the BMC. We could in fact do it, there is a lot of room up there in the building, and we want these things up there for the small people. St. Philip's people are poor, particularly those living in St. Philip South, and they want these things up there so that they will benefit like everybody else too, and this apparently is falling on deaf ears, except that recently I heard the Chairman of the BMC speaking at a meeting stating that he was aware of the request and that he was giving it some kind of consideration. That in my view means that it has been put on some file and stowed away. I do not want that, Sir, I want to see a depot, preferably before June this year, that will please me greatly, Sir. (ASIDES).

I am going away in June, Sir. I want to let the Minister know in terms of community centres that I have a long letter coming to him, because I have considered all the areas in St. Philip, all the parishes in the island and of all the parishes St. Philip is the most poorly placed in terms of community facilities. For example, I do not think that one could pinpoint a Government community facility in the area of St. Philip South, and I have discussed this with the Minister before.

I have discussed this with the Minister before and he pointed out to me Chapel, Kings Park and those areas, and I told him that whereas they are on the border, they are not in St. Philip South, but Six Cross Roads concerns me largely because the only meeting point up to about four or five weeks ago for the residents of Marchfield, Six Roads, Four Roads and the Farm Housing area was the snackette in Six Roads, and now that has been closed down. If you pass through there you will see large groups of people around the two petrol stations or on the street itself. There is no meeting point. The youth group from that area recently wanted to hold a meeting and they

had to ask me to write a letter to the Ministry of Education and one to the Headmaster requesting the use of the school. That is a priority, Mr. President, and I hope that the Minister will say in his reply that of the money allocated to his department he proposed to construct a centre. He will probably wish to tell me first that he has to wait on the Ministry of Lands to acquire the land. I would like it just above the Esso petrol station. Everybody knows Six Roads, and I would like him to acquire the area of land immediately to the left of the Esso petrol station for the purpose of constructing a Community Centre at Six Cross Roads in St. Philip.

Of course I am going to require these centres in places like Gemswick, St. Martins, and areas that are too far from Kings Park. Only Sunday I was in the Crane and I was flabbergasted to find that young people have to walk from the Crane to Kings Park, a distance of about four miles in order to play football. It is true that the Parks and Beaches have made Kings Park a very pleasant place to be, but that is no reason why people should have to walk four miles in order to play a game of football, and I am now in the process of identifying an area of land where I hope to have the Minister construct a little pavilion and a playing field to service the Crane, Rices, Pounders, Cave Land and an area like that. St. Philip South needs to receive some kind of priority in terms of community development, and I know that the Minister has promised me that when I have spoken to him in greater detail he will give it active consideration, and I forewarn him now that there is no need to reply unless he is going to tell me that Six Roads can get its community centre before June. If he is not going to say that, then he can discuss it with me privately. I just want it in the record that I have asked for those things.

Just to refer to two small points; one in respect of health made by Senator Franklin and one in respect of the meeting of the courts at night made by Senator Boxill. On the question of health and the trucks dropping off debris before they reach the dump at Mangrove in St. Philip, that is a sore point with me. Not only do I want the trucks discharging rubbish before they reach the dump, I do not even want them discharging the rubbish at the dump. I think it is hazardous to the health of the people of St. Philip, particularly the people in the immediate environs of the dump itself, and I want it removed. I have served notice on the Minister of Health that this is a sore point with the people of St. Philip and it must be closed off. I was glad, not from a political standpoint, but from a personal and parochial standpoint that the National Union of Public Workers shut it down, but it turned out that they had acted illegally. I was glad that they shut it down. I wish they had the power to shut it down for good to tell you the truth, because I do not want it in St. Philip. I was the most unhappy man when it turned out that the police had the right to go up there and move the rock stones

that they had put there to block the entrance to it. We do not want it in St. Philip; we want it shut down, and when the fill has settled and it is possible to construct a building thereon, I want a building constructed without any delay whatever. I think it is a great place, a good point for a community centre in that part of St. Philip. Technical difficulties may prevent the construction of a building for a year or two, but I want to see the filling in completed and a proper community centre erected at that point. That would remove the question of trucks dumping their debris on the roads.

The final point I want to mention, Mr. President, relates to the point raised by Senator Boxill when he said that he would like to see the courts meeting at night. I do not think, Sir, that he gave full thought to the question at all. Lest it attracts national attention, let me here and now nip it in the bud. I do not see how it would work at all. Senator Boxill obviously did not give thought to the supporting personnel, because to have the courts work at night there is the question of transportation for personnel, the question probably of the Registry being open at night, all the supporting infrastructure must be open to accommodate the courts, and I do not understand why Senator Boxill wants the judges to work at night. He obviously does not recognise that like a doctor it is necessary for a lawyer even more so to do a lot of research, and most of us use.....(Asides) I do not want to say much more in deference to the President, but since I have been goaded into saying much more, I will be guided by the Leader of the Senate in his asides. We need some time to prepare, not to talk about having the Registry open and this sort of thing and the difficulty of security and protecting important prisoners, perhaps all prisoners at night. It is just not workable. In any event, the entire world except for certain areas of industry where it is deemed imperative, is moving towards a system where we confine our working activities to the daylight hours, except I repeat it is imperative in a particular industry or you want 24 hours' use of machinery that would otherwise be left idle. There is not any great mechanisation in the courts of Barbados. There is practically no need for it and consequently there is no need to save these resources. I do not think the idea is workable at this point in time.

Perhaps, Mr. President, it is a good time for me to state how much I have enjoyed the debates on the Estimates in this August Chamber and although I do not envisage sitting in this Chamber for another term, one way or another, I think that if I do not get the chance to sit elsewhere I can look back some years from now and be very thankful to yourself and my colleagues for allowing me an easy passage as a green recruit into a life such as this. Thank you, Sir.

SENATOR O' B. TROTMAN: Mr. President, I am not going to follow the lead given by Senator Linton. One

thing that struck me about his speech was the strange kind of friend he is. He finished by saying that he was not going to be in this Chamber for another five years and I thought that since he came from the same parish as one of his friends from the other corner who is going to be here for another five years that he would want to stay and keep his company, but apparently he is going to abandon his parochial friends and go somewhere else.

Now it is very distressing, Mr. President, to find that the Opposition is not represented in terms of large numbers in the Senate. I mean on paper they do not have big numbers, and then they come to what must be the most important debate of the year, ask long parliamentary questions in place of speeches, ramble about the place and then walk out. So whereas we could have all gone home last night, we encouraged busy business people to come here today to do the replies to the Opposition to find that they do not take their business seriously and they are not seated.

Their presence in this Chamber, Sir, reminds me a bit of a cricketing matter of a few years ago when Kerry Packer started his World Series Cricket and teamed off all the test stars of the Australian Team. The Australian selectors decided they would have to get a new team of promising youngsters to be led by an outstanding veteran. The Leader of the Opposition apparently wanted to follow this example. He found then, Sir, that he had no promising youngsters nor an outstanding veteran and so we will find what we have.

Now Senator Boxill, Sir, spoke about the need for Price Controls in Barbados again. He does not seem to understand, Sir, that the people of Barbados are finished with that foolishness. They made their point clear in 1976. The Price Control Board writing orders everyday. One day the price of Corned beef, it is X, the next day it is X+1, the third day you write a new Order on the price of Cheese. That foolishness has come to an end and in spite of the message that the electors of Barbados gave his Party, he still comes back in here talking about Price Controls.

His Party is one of Price Controls and when his Party was at its height of price controls, prices rose in Barbados at a pace which we had never seen before or since and when the consumers complained about rising prices during 1973 to 1975 in Barbados, the answer which the then Minister of Trade had was that it was due to the Oil Crisis.

I have taken time, Sir, to check the increases in prices in other countries during the period 1973 to 1975 when there were doing all the great Price Controls in Barbados and just for reference, Sir, let me say that the information I got came from the United Nations Bulletin of Statistics so we do not get into any mischief.

I did a sample, Sir, of 36 countries chosen at random to find that between 1973 and 1975 prices went down in Guatemala by 1%, Nicaragua they rose by 7%, Venezuela 19%, Honduras 19%, the United States of America, one of our trading partners; 21%, Canada, a trading partner by 22%. It goes on, Sir, Australia by 32%; the United Kingdom by 44%; and then we get into the countries that were having difficulties. Jamaica had their problems with IMF. They were at war with IMF and they went up by 40% and then we went into Costa Rica, 52%; Columbia 52%; Brazil 62%; and Barbados 67% in two years, Sir.

That is the kind of Company we were keeping in terms of controlling prices so that out of a sample of 36 countries which I took at random, Sir, Barbados placed 31 out of 36, right at the bottom of the countries which were trying to fight inflation. That must be something which they must learn. The answer to controlling prices in Barbados has nothing to do with a Minister sitting down in his Office and saying you must sell microphones at X dollars. You must sell books at Y dollars. That is a whole set of stupidity which has been abandoned once and for all.

On the local scene, Sir, to be specific, during that Price Control period, between 1971 and 1972 because they won the Election in 1971, the Oil items indexed in Barbados rose by 11.6%; between 1972-73 by 19.4%; 1973 to 1974 by 40%, Sir, and it is important that we see the highest rise was during the time of highest control of prices by the Minister in Barbados but Senator Boxill, I do not think was here at the time. He was somewhere in Canada hearing about Courts opening at nights so he does not understand that the consumers in Barbados were struggling with a 40% increase in 1974.

For the period 1971 to 1976, Sir, five years before they were voted out of Office, prices rose in Barbados according to the Oil Item Index by 128.6% and they, around here quarreling about rising prices everytime there is an indicator that prices in Barbados will go into double figures and tell us that the answer to that is to have more Price Controls.

They tried to say, Sir, that because of the Consumption Tax Food prices would go up and the poor will suffer and they forgot, Sir, that food prices in Barbados between 1971 and 1972 went up by 16%; between 1972 and 1973 by 19%; between 1973 and 1974 by 46%; and between 1974 and 1975 by 20%, a total movement, Sir, for five years of 149%. They almost made 150%.

Now I mentioned, Sir, the question of the Statistics from the United Nations Bulletin and somebody said to me that all of the countries that were doing over 50% were at war with somebody or another. Who were not having internal wars were having some war with some-

body. Even poor Jamaica was having a war with IMF and how it is that Barbados got into that group of countries when we were not having a war but my friend was wrong, Sir. We were having an internal war too. The housewives and the consumers on one side were waging a war against the then Minister of Trade which they won in September, 1976 but Senator Boxill tells us that we must go back to 1974. We must go back to the 40% increase per year in food prices in Barbados.

The rest of the speeches they made, Sir, were really long Parliamentary Questions and I believe, Sir, the only reasons you allowed them was because you knew they were coming to the end of their time and you were being generous otherwise you would have indicated to them that the correct thing to do was to Table Parliamentary Questions and the particular Minister would have replied giving them all the information they wanted because it is not good enough to speak at length in Parliament when one does not know what one is speaking about.

The freshman Senator, Sir, started off by saying — not the ex-Minister, ex-representative, ex-everything else — the freshman. He started his criticism of the Ministry of Agriculture by saying that there was a big downgrading in Agriculture because when he looked through the Estimates he saw the Post of Chief Agricultural Officer not under General Administration but with the professional staff and I would have thought that if that meant anything it would have meant that the place for Technical people would be with the technical people.

But, it is not a matter as simple as that, it has to do with simple budgetary organisation and it is no indication of the authority of the Chief Agricultural Officer, it is no indication as to who has authority over what, as to which goes into the Estimates. The Chief Labour Officer does not show in the personal emoluments schedule next to the Permanent Secretary, but he is still the Chief Labour Officer in Barbados. But that is the sort of big no point which Honourable Senators can feel free to come on the Floor of Parliament and have people report it and then expect not to be here for another five years, but when he is staying here Sir with you, he is not going to have a lot of us with him, he has other places to go to.

Senator Franklin said Sir that one of the big problems in agriculture was that we could not get good quality piglets from the agricultural stations in Barbados anymore. Senator Brathwaite answered that yesterday for him and he could have found out that by calling the Chief Agricultural Officer, who would have told him that there is an ongoing programme of importing stock from Jamaica and St. Vincent for the purpose of upgrading the local stock of pigs in Barbados. That has nothing to do with the former Regime, that is entirely a matter to do with the present Honourable Minister

in his efforts to upgrade pig production in Barbados. But, instead of tabling a proper parliamentary question Sir, he comes in here saying that there are no good quality piglets available and goes on and on.

Then, continuing on his platform of ignorance in the sense that he does not know, he says that Sayers Court is closing down, Haggatts closing down, Bullens closing down, Jerusalem closing down. When I turned to the officer that was here advising on Agriculture, he said to me, but, Haggatts is being strengthened, Bullens is being strengthened, Jerusalem is being strengthened. Again Sir, the Honourable Senator could have stayed at home called the Ministry of Agriculture and got the information. Sayers Court is not closing down. Sayers Court is being handed over to the Ministry of Labour for their Skills Training Programme and it is quite clear Sir, why it is more important to have a Skills Training Programme Centre at Sayers Court, than an agricultural station because when that station was established Silver Sands, Enterprise and Pegwell Boggs used to be an agricultural community. It is no longer that Sir, it is now part of the suburbs of Bridgetown.

I believe that building regulations will not allow housekeepers in Goodland Gardens to keep pigs. There are regulations which will not allow people in Ealing Park to keep cows and the plots are not big enough certainly to grow canes. So, it would be pointless having an agricultural station to advise on agriculture in Sayers Court. There is no more point in having an agricultural station in Sayers Court, than there is for having one in Swan Street.

Senator Boxill said Sir, that this Party accused his Party of taking on persons for electoral purposes and then he went on to charge that somebody in the Ministry of Agriculture was taking on large numbers of persons at Haggatts. One telephone call to Haggatts and I did what he could have done. One telephone call to Haggatts and there is no excuse for not using the telephone because telephone calls are free in Barbados, as long as you pay the standard monthly rates, you could make one hundred telephone calls, it does not matter. One telephone call to Haggatts Sir revealed that fifteen men from Haggatts left Haggatts to go and work in the sugar crop which is normal and in their places nine women were taken on. Fifteen gone to the crop and nine taken on and that is what is interpreted by the expert Senator as taking on large numbers of persons for electoral purposes.

Senator Franklin Sir on Agriculture also spoke of research for research sake, there is no co-ordination of research, the Ministry could not justify research. Would you believe Sir that the only research done by the Ministry of Agriculture was research requested by the farmers of Barbados. Nobody in the Ministry of

Agriculture sits down at Graeme Hall and dreams up some scheme of researching mahogany trees because he likes mahogany wood to make tables and chairs. Research is done only on request and in collaboration with the farmers of Barbados and that has always been the policy of the Ministry of Agriculture. We have this problem Sir of people feeling free to use Parliament to talk strange things which outside they do not do. When he made his only point, he said that there was some decline in cotton production in Barbados.

In Barbados, there has been a decline of cotton production because of diseases to the industry and because of problems in reaping the crop. As a result of problems with pest, the Ministry of Agriculture has sent an officer to study cotton diseases. I understand he is back from his training and he is now having consultations with the ADC who in fact is the largest producer of cotton in Barbados and it is hoped that when he has got himself together properly, he would be able to get us back on the road to cotton production on the marginal lands of Barbados. That might have been a valid Parliamentary Question if it were properly tabled Sir.

Then Senator Franklin drifted on about veterinary services of the Ministry of Agriculture and he suggested that the services were outside the reaches of the farmers, in terms of the farmers having to pay. All of us who know anything about the veterinary services offered by the Ministry of Agriculture know that the services are free. The first time that I heard that farmers cannot afford to pay for something that is free is from Senator Franklin. The Ministry of Agriculture has just completed testing 2,065 cows for tuberculosis using 128 sites all over Barbados carrying their officers to the sites so that farmers would not be inconvenienced, free of cost to farmers. That has only started three years ago, so there cannot be any question of putting down of services.

Then, Senator Franklin tried to suggest to us that there was a crisis in the production of vegetables in Barbados. He chose one, or two items which have been on the decline to try to prove his point. There is a booklet put out Sir, by the Agricultural department, which has six pages and would you believe Sir that Senator Franklin thought that all he had to do is use the one page of six pages which showed that there was some decline in the production of beans. He made a big show, there was a decline in the production of beans, then, there was a decline in the production of vegetables in Barbados, so beans mean vegetables and vegetables mean beans according to Senator Franklin. I took the same booklet because I wanted to see what happened, and I decided to look at it and found that in 1974 Sir, Barbados was producing 281 000 kilograms of beets.

In 1979, the last available figures, Sir, that had gone up from 281,000 kilograms to 830,000 kilograms of

beet, but Senator Franklin would advise us that there is a decline in the production of vegetables in Barbados. In 1974 Barbados produced 953,000 kilograms of carrots and by 1979 that had increased to 2.1 million kilograms of carrots. Senator Franklin says that there is a decline, because if there is a decline in beans there is a decline in vegetables; end of matter. That is the kind of research that corner is capable of producing, and then they do not come back to hear the rest. Cauliflower production went from 4,000 kilograms in 1974 to 19,000 kilograms in 1979, and that is what is described here as a fall off in production. Cucumber production went from 985,000 kilograms to 2 million kilograms between 1974 and 1979, and that is also a fall off in production according to our statistician in the corner. In 1975 there were 36,000 kilograms of eggplant, as compared with 68,000 in 1979, and that is the general pattern, Sir, but because there is a fall off in the production of beans Senator Franklin advises the Senate and the country that there is a crisis in agriculture.

I think Senator Brathwaite handled the poultry question yesterday for his benefit. Purely for information, Sir, Senator Wickham requested some information which I shall give him for the records, in terms of subscriptions to international and regional organisations. He wanted to get a breakdown of certain contributions.

The contribution to the World Meteorological Organisation was \$15,240, Caribbean Meteorological Organisation \$43,209, Caribbean Meteorological Institute \$440,000, Operational Hydrology Institute \$22,000. The other big contribution, Sir, is FAO \$46,000 and the Inter-American Institute for Agricultural Science \$35,000.

Senator Franklin — back down in the corner, Sir — but you see the difference is that Senator Wickham asked for information because he wants information but they create facts and hope to get responses. The black belly sheep programme, which has been run down according to the representatives in the corner, there were 27,000 black belly sheep in Barbados in 1971 and it has gone up to 35,000 in 1980 despite exports of large numbers from Barbados. In addition to the pure breeds, Sir, there is a programme of cross breeding the black belly sheep with other local breeds in an effort to improve the quality of meat, and the reports are encouraging, that some of the meat is now being compared with the lamb which we now import from New Zealand and other places, so that programme despite the lack of information by the Senator is going well.

When Senator Franklin was making his attack on MCW, the other Senator, the ex-representative, or ex-Minister, or whatever was saying that the whole Ministry is bad, and in an undertone he said that the Minister was falling down on roads, he was falling down on transport, they want a new Minister.

One of the other speakers on this side two days ago spoke about the increased passenger movement of the Transport Board, and merely to remind us, Sir, I want to say that the Transport Board has more than doubled the number of passengers it moves around in Barbados since 1976. In a matter of just four years the Transport Board has been able to increase its passenger movement from some 17 to 18 million to 41 to 42 million, and then we say we have a crisis in transport. If there are difficulties in getting buses to get to work, it is not because the Transport Board is inefficient, it is not because the Transport Board is any less efficient than it was before, but if more people are working, and by all indications some 14,000 more people have jobs in Barbados than in 1976, if they have to move around mornings and evenings then they need more buses to do that.

Prior to 1976 the Government of that day had a policy of buying 12 buses per year, and the ex-representative used to be the ex-Minister then too. Since 1976 this Government has bought 48 buses in 1976 after the elections, 67 buses in 1977, 33 in 1978, 36 in 1979, 30 in 1980, and we have another 30 in the Estimates we are debating now, so that whereas the rolling stock at the Transport Board was 147 in 1975, at the end of last year they had 293. We just cannot add the new buses on because we have to take the old ones out of service as well, so that he as an ex-Minister of not buying buses is in no position to come in here and talk about people who should buy buses.

To make sure that there is room on the buses for workers, the Ministry of Communications and Works does not think in terms of the Transport Board as public transport, as Senator Franklin would have us believe, the Ministry believes that the transport system in Barbados is made up of buses, taxis, minibuses, tour coaches and self-drive vehicles, and we need not get excited about the workers not going to work in taxis, because if taxis are available for other people to use, then the workers can use the buses to go to work. If tour coaches are available for the tourists, then the buses are available for workers, and if the self-drive cars are also available for the tourist industry, then the buses are available for the workers.

Since 1976, Sir, because the Ministry is aware of the fact that one has to look at the entire transportation problem and not just the Transport Board, the Ministry has increased the number of taxis operating in Barbados by 290; the mini-buses the problems of which we have heard from the representative of mini-buses, by 30 tour coaches for tourists, and by 2,628 self drive vehicles for tourists to drive around in Barbados, and that takes some of the pressure off the Transport Board.

As I said, we have heard the undertones from Senator Boxill about falling down on roads, and I want

to do some comparison of roads as well. In 1971, Sir, since the then Government had to face an election, it rushed and constructed 3.8 miles of new tenantry roads in Barbados. Having won the election, they went back to their old ways of not building tenantry roads in 1972-73 they built 1.26 miles of road. In 1973-74, an election was far away and they built 0.26 miles of tenantry roads. In 1974-75 moving towards the election again they eased back up to 1.6 miles of tenantry roads and in 1975-76 they managed 7.5 miles of tenantry roads for the election, and they come in here and talk about tenantry roads.

The present Ministry of Communications on the other hand in 1976-77 constructed 6.2 miles of tenantry roads, in 1977-78, 8.3 miles; in 1978-79 11.7 miles of tenantry roads; in 1979-80 10.5 miles of tenantry roads and in 1980-81 10.7 miles, a matter of 49.4 miles in five years compared with 11 miles in four years, and then they have the courage to go on the platforms at night, prevent people from going to sleep early and talk foolishness about road construction in Barbados. They talk a lot of foolishness at night.

In MCW too Sir, the Waterworks Department has been extremely active laying pipes and giving water to houses that never had water before. For Senator Boxill's benefit when he read it in the records, and I hope the records come out before the election so that he would not talk foolishness in St. Thomas, the roads at Allen View and Canefield in St. Thomas alone have been fixed in the last financial year. In terms of water White Hall and Applewhaite his ex constituency got water for the first time, and the Ministry of Communications and Works which is also responsible for Light and Power got lights for the first time in Lewis Village, Lion Castle, Vaucuse Village, White Hall Village and Russia Village all in St. Thomas. Bagatelle got houses, Welchman Hall got hard courts made by MCW, Holy Innocent got hard courts made by MCW and St. Thomas got a new Post Office.

I say all that, Sir, to say that when the hon. member was Minister of Lights, they got no lights, he was Minister of Water, they got no water, he was Minister of Roads, they got no roads; he was Minister of Post Office, they got no post office, and then he gets in here and talks about which Ministries function and which do not function, and when he was Minister of Labour, they got no jobs, and we now have an industrial estate in St. Thomas. Enough for him, Sir.

There are other matters to do with the general question of the national debt and that sort of thing which they talked about, but I am not prepared to go into that since they are absent, but only to repeat that it is unfortunate that they sought not to be here today, and really if the Governor General was advised earlier this

year that two Senators had deserted their duties, there must be an announcement outside the gate of Government House tonight that two more Senators have abandoned their duties in this place and we will have two more for next week's session. Thank you.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. PRESIDENT: I think the sitting will be suspended at this point for 45 minutes.

On Resumption -

Mr. PRESIDENT: The Sitting is resumed. Senator Don Blackman.

SENATOR THE HON. D. BLACKMAN: Thank you, Mr. President. On this occasion the opportunity is afforded Senators or I should say the legislators to discuss social policy in Barbados in a fairly comprehensive way. There is every reason to believe based upon Reports in Hansards and from other media that speakers in the Other Place tend to have little interest in social policy and that is why we are singularly fortunate, Mr. President, to have in this Chamber persons who have had enormous practical experience in social affairs in this country and who can add a new dimension to discussions in the legislature by addressing themselves to questions of social policy and we were fortunate yesterday to be present while Senator Enid Lynch delivered her brilliant *tour de force* followed by the pungent exposition of Senator Adel Lynch interspersed, by the incisive comments made by Senator Marjorie Blackman, another brilliant contributor of social policy questions in this Chamber.

I shall not start on social policy first and in passing I would also share the strictures that Senator O'Brien Trotman made when he criticised the absence of the two Opposition Senators. Senator Franklin in particular is profoundly innocent of social questions and his presence might have afforded him the opportunity to get some enlightenment which would no doubt give some measure of truth and wisdom to any pronouncements which he might make in this Chamber on social questions in the future, but more on that.

I wish to address myself to some of the comments that Senator Boxill made when he sallied forth into the area of external relations where his colleagues in the Other Place, perhaps wiser, never ventured to go. In his rather incoherent presentation on the question of external relations, these few things he could be understood to be saying.

He excoriated the Government for vigorously taking an anti-communist stance even though he himself admits to be an anti-communist and professed to express concern that some figure was not demonstrating in

discussing questions relating to apartheid in South Africa and at the same time to counsel the Government to desist from pursuing a rabid Pro-American line and when he gave voice to the slogan which was supposed to incapitulate the Democratic Labour Party's common policy, namely, "Friends of all and satellites of none". He was supposed to be advising the Government to desist from having a satellite of the United States in America.

What the Opposition Party has never failed to make a mistake about is that a Foreign Policy Statement is not the same thing as a Foreign Policy and Senator Boxill's statement is not even really a statement at all but a mere slogan but even if we imparted the meaning to the slogan that the Barbados Government under the Democratic Labour Party in its external relations was not a satellite of the United States of America, then Senator Boxill will have to explain the following things to this Honourable Chamber and to this country.

Why is it in the face of overwhelming opinion is the Third World which he advises Barbados to rejoin, the Barbados Government under the Democratic Labour Party voted for the omission of China, the most populous country in the World from the United Nations, who do they bring shame and disgrace to Barbados from other Third World Nations by not taking this particular position. A little investigation would reveal that it was a rabidly Pro-American position.

Why was it that the same Government under the Democratic Labour Party stopped Cuban planes from refuelling in Barbados at the time the Cuban troops were assisting Angola in removing the Portuguese imperialism in their country. You will see that it was an order given by the American Government to the Government of Barbados not to co-operate with the Cuban transport to Angola.

Why is it that the Government of Barbados, the then Government of Barbados whose spokesmen are now shedding crocodile tears about Southern Africa refuse to vote for Resolutions condemning Israel's collaborations with Southern Africa?

Why is it that they tolerated a project here called Harp which was designed to further the development of arms and other things in the apartheid country of South Africa? Why is it that the Democratic Labour Party sought to show up the racist South African regime by giving hospitality to such a project in Barbados and I can go on but I do not want to tire Senators to indicate that this kind of advice comes very, very strange from the representative of an administration with that kind of record.

In the simple mind of Senator Boxill, he had difficulties in reconciling Barbados' conversion of totali-

tarian regimes and Barbados trading with such regimes. Our policy in the region is one of ideological pluralism. We believe in this Government in a very democratic society where Governments are chosen by the will of the people and we recognise that they are people who live under other kinds of regimes and to that extent that the people of this country choose and accept that way of life that is entirely their concern and we respect their wishes.

We are for peaceful co-existence with people of a different political persuasion from ourselves. But to say that we subscribe to the principles of peaceful co-existence is not to commit ourselves to a period of perpetual silence in matters of wrong doing involving those countries. In saying that we will live peacefully with all people no matter what their political persuasion, we are not saying that we abandon our obligation to defend the fundamental human rights of all people.

He himself wondered again in a simple analysis why the United States of America criticised the Soviet Union and yet traded with that country. The answer again is that a commitment to peaceful co-existence is not a commitment to perpetual silence. You can trade with people, you can co-operate with them, but you also have an obligation to tell them that they are wrong, especially when their conduct is such as to have practical consequences for your own people. So much for external affairs.

Senator Boxill again essaying into waters that were much too deep for him exhumed the hoary argument about the Cubana airline. He wondered why the Government of Barbados did not see fit to apprehend the people suspected of bombing, or placing bombs on the airliner while at the same time, we could tow Biggs into this country and lock him up. I believe the independent Commission headed by Mr. Justice Williams long ago gave the answer to this question and therefore it seemed very strange to me that Senator Boxill could see fit to resurrect the issue which I long thought was dead. Mr. President I am reminded that Senator Boxill was living in Canada at the time and could not reasonably be expected to know much about what was going on in Barbados at that time, but be that as it may less there were persons impressionable enough to believe that the points that Senator Boxill made in this connection had any validity, it is necessary for me succinctly to restate the facts.

The facts are that the aeroplane went down outside of Barbados' territorial waters which at that time was a distance of three nautical miles from the shore whereas Biggs, contrary to what Senator Boxill said, I believe he said, Mr. President that Biggs was towed in from eighteen miles offshore. I am assured that his yacht was intercepted when it was 3.4 miles off Barbados. Subsequent to the Cubana Airline crash new legislation was introduced which became effective on the 1st January, 1979 to

extend Barbados' territorial waters from three miles to twelve miles offshore. This was done partly as a result of the Cubana Airline crash and partly, it was done to establish uniformity with the provisions of the draft International Convention of the Law of the Sea.

During this time intensive discussions were taking place within the United Nations for the development of a regime of the sea to ensure that its resources were exploited in a way which would bring equitable returns to all the countries. One of the provisions in the draft Convention of the Law of the Sea was that all countries that were not landlocked should extend their territorial waters to twelve miles offshore and to establish an exclusive economic zone, 200 miles away from their shores, except in cases where the distance between several countries were less than 200 miles, where a medium notional line would be drawn to give equal area to both countries. The Government of Barbados therefore had no jurisdiction to try or to seek the extradition for those persons suspected of planting a bomb on the Cubana Airline.

In the same airy-fairy irresponsible manner Mr. President, Senator Boxill proceeded somehow, or other to link the Hyacinth Goring business with the Cubana Airliner crash and the Biggs affair. He wanted to know why Hyacinth Goring was not brought back to Barbados. I do not believe Mr. President that when the explicit answer was given by the Honourable Attorney-General in response to this problem, I do not believe the excuse can be made for Senator Boxill that he was not in Barbados at the time. He was in Barbados at the time and as a person, who is interested once more in seeking the suffrage of the people of Barbados, one would have expected that he would have been aware of the definitive response that came from the Honourable Attorney General at that time.

I summarise it only for the benefit of those who might be misled into thinking that the point made by Senator Boxill had any merit at all. It is that several approaches were made by the Government of Barbados to the Government of the United States of America, in order to secure the person of Hyacinth Goring to give evidence before the Malone Commission.

These were unsuccessful because it is contrary to the law of the United States of America to extradite a person unless that person is convicted of an offence or charged with an offence. The function of charging persons with criminal offences in this country is that of the Director of Public Prosecutions. That is the constitutional authority and responsibility that he exercises. He keeps his own counsel and cannot be instructed by a political head such as the Attorney General to initiate criminal proceedings against anyone. It was felt that in the interest of justice and in the protection of the rights of people of this country from unfair harassment that this office should be insulated from politics.

Whatever one may think of the politics of the Pele' business, I believe that this principle is basically a good one, and that the Attorney General was absolutely correct to withstand the short term pressures of attempting to vitiate this important principle by yielding to political expediency. So much for Senator Boxill.

His colleague exhibited diligence and industriousness. That much I can say for Senator Franklin, that he takes his Senate work seriously and he works hard in order to be able to make his contribution, but unfortunately his mentors are people who subscribe to the credo that impressions but not truth are what is really important in politics, so the protege as a protege of persons who are not committed to the pursuit of truth in politics, it was not surprising therefore that Senator Franklin when he ventured into the area of social policy brought the debate on these questions to a new low.

When social policy is discussed, certainly in this Senate, we have come to expect very high levels of debate, and Senator Franklin, I believe innocently and through no fault of his own, unwittingly dragged the debate down to a new low. He worked hard, he gave of his limited best, and I believe that that is as much as we can expect from a man of integrity. He, however, is influenced by people who operate on principles that are totally at variance with a commitment to truth in politics, and that is precisely why he found himself in such difficulties in discussing social policy.

Mr. President, Senator Franklin adverted to a public display of disgruntled welfare workers that took place in some part of Bay Street a few weeks ago and he made inferences from this public display that the rights — he even had the temerity to use the word "professional" — the professional rights of such persons were being interfered with, presumably by the Minister, and that led to their public display. Mr. President, it is necessary for me to set the record straight.

You will have noted from reading the newspapers that during the period of confusion and the welter of superficial comments that it excited that I chose to keep my peace and not to participate in an altercation with people who are posing as trade unionists. We have in this country today people posing as trade unionists and a situation where boys are being asked to do a man's job. Mr. President, you know the difficulties that arise when boys are sent to do the job of a man, but be that as it may, the problem arose out of a statement I made which was a repetition of several statements concerning the way in which the public in Barbados is treated by welfare officers. This has been a problem, contrary to what the public has been led to believe, that has been discussed within the Ministry of Community Services between the Chief Welfare Officer, the Permanent Secretary and myself. For the past 18 months we have discussed this

problem in the face of mounting complaints brought to me by people who believe that they were discourteously treated or unfairly treated by welfare officers.

One of the statements which I made at that time, Mr. President, is that transfers might be a part of the solution to the problem between welfare officers and the public. I would like to point out that this proposal is not my own, it is the proposal of the Chief Welfare Officer, a proposal which he started to implement last year in one particular case, but that welfare officer was not transferred, because the welfare officer appealed to me on the grounds that such a transfer would cause hardship and I asked the Chief Welfare Officer not to persist with it.

Subsequent to the furore which was raised, the Chief Welfare Officer has taken the initiative without any prompting or advice coming from me to carry out wholesale transfers within the Welfare Department which will take effect from 1st April, and at their meetings which came out of discussions with the Head of the Civil Service, it is my information that the said Welfare Officers who made a public display admitted that all was not well with them in their relation to the public. So much for display.

I will now get to the other serious question about ministerial interference. It is one that has been flung about by people wanting to pillory Ministers with wild abandon. Mr. President, the National Assistance Act confers on me authority for administering all national assistance in Barbados. All national assistance I am responsible for the administration of and I cannot promise anyone that as long as I am Minister of Community Services, responsible for national assistance that I will abdicate those responsibilities in order to please any civil servants. My prior responsibility is to the 28,000 people that the Welfare Department has to deal with every year. My prior responsibility is to the 28,000 members of the public who get national assistance and not to 24 Welfare Officers, and if this greater public is not satisfied with a service for which I have responsibility, then I intend to act. People can kick and scream and villify as they may, but as long as I have this ministerial responsibility, I will act regardless of the consequence.

I have a number of letters in my possession from hurt and insulted old people, defenceless old people, cripples who have complained about the mistreatment that they have got at the hands of our workers. What kind of representative would I be to stand idly by and do nothing in the face of these public protestations? It would be a serious and reprehensible abdication of my duties as a Minister when I solemnly took the oath and swore to carry out my functions in the best public interest. If I do nothing about it to please 24 civil servants, I will never do it. I will never do it no matter what the consequences may be, no matter how people howl and scream,

and Mr. President, I want to put all concerned who do not like my actions on notice that I intend to clean the mess up as long as I have legal responsibility for taking care of this mess. When there are problems in the Welfare Department, the Minister gets blamed. The Minister has to defend expenditure and programmes of the Welfare Department in this Chamber, at parliamentary meetings, at Estimates Committee meetings, in the Cabinet, and I am not going to let anybody reduce me to an administrative eunuch in order to have a peaceful life by formulating policies which are my brainchild, and then seeing them implemented in a way which is contrary to what I want. I am not going to permit this to happen.

Mr. President, a Minister must not be reduced to the level of an administrative eunuch for fear that he will be accused of interfering. A Minister is responsible for policy; he is responsible for their implementation and if they are not being implemented in accordance with his wishes, this Minister will intervene and deal with the situation. As long as this person is Minister, either my policies will be carried out or I will not be Minister anymore; so any person working in the Welfare Department or in any part of my Ministry who is thinking of subverting the policies of this Government cannot expect me to stand quietly by and permit this to be done, nor can they expect the frenetic screams of irresponsible men to stop me from my transcending objective, and that is to ensure that the rights of the people that my Ministry serves, the poor, the oppressed, the dispossessed and the disinherited are recognised. The vulnerable groups with which the Welfare Department deals, the old, the sick, the halt, the lame, the blind, the weak, the faceless, these people cannot defend themselves and I will defend them because it is my responsibility to do this. And if anybody wants to fight me for defending them, well then there will be a fight to the very death. That is my commitment to the poor people of this country, and no political mal content will stop me from executing this commitment.

Quite apart from this, Mr. President, the issue which erupted in this foolish exhibition by welfare officers is a much more fundamental one.

Since I assumed the responsibility for the Ministry of Community Services, I have tried to inject in the philosophical thinking into the delivery and the content of National Assistance. I have moved away from the meaner, baser and more negative aspects of the prevailing philosophy that I am waging an unrelenting war against which I call Welfarism.

Welfarism inculcates in man a poor law mentality. This, perhaps, was the most pathological expression during the days of the so-called Vestry. People who were poor and incapable of feeding themselves were made to feel like mendicants. People were routinely ill treated and

insulted and people were expected to be masochistic enough to adore the people who were ill treating them. What I have tried to do is to expunge from the Departments of National Assistance in this country this pernicious poor law mentality that warps the human spirit and reduce people to the level of animals.

Counter to that has been the Social Development Programme which is aimed at rehabilitating individuals, restoring their dignity and ensuring that they live at minimal levels of material comfort consistent with a civilised society.

One of the first things I found resistance on was a social development as it applied to a Housing Welfare Programme.

In the past when houses were repaired, one or two pieces of boards were thrown on to a old house and the occupant still continued to be exposed to the elements but was supposed to demonstrate tangible gratitude to the politician who requested that two pieces of boards be placed on the house.

The fundamental change was a policy which insisted that repairs ought really to be repaired, that whenever the repairs of a house were completed that that house should be wind and water tight the occupant would still not be placed in a situation where he is cowering from drafts of wind or dodging drops of rain.

The poor law mentality resisted this. The poor law mentality said that it was too expensive and too much money to spend on the house. They could never be too much money to spend on a simple, modest chattel house to ensure that an old man or an old woman is no longer exposed to the elements.

I myself then saw something else that when you had pieces of unpainted raw board next to other pieces of board with fading paint that the result was a monstrosity. We believe that recipients of National Assistance ought to be as proud of the appearance of their homes as other persons in Barbados. Further resistance from those with the poor law mentality came when I implemented as part of the new social development policy, when I ordered that these houses should be painted, every single one of them, the poor law warriors mounted a campaign which was taken into the Ministry of Finance in order to have funds cut to prevent this programme, a humane, civilised programme from being carried out. If we are going to deal with the housing of poor people, we must deal with it properly and when we are finished with their houses, they must be proud of the appearance of their houses.

The third problem came when in accordance with the new social development thrust which has as its central tenet the restoration of the dignity of the dispossessed

and the disinherited that the house must be properly furnished. I was told that the Welfare Department, gave people a bed or a chair but not both, a bed or a stove, but not both and things like that.

I rode rough shod over this parsimonious approach, an approach which keeps people living in a state of indignity. I was accused of spending too much money on poor people but I believe that the very basic things that we can do for the poor people in Housing is to ensure that they are comfortable with these houses. This is a radical departure from poor law administration where you put two boards on a house, you leave the boards unpainted, force the man to take a choice between a bed or a stove but never both, leaving him continuously in a condition of suffering.

National Assistance is designed to ensure that people live at a minimal level of material comfort and not engaged in a Sisyphean struggle of ever trying to reach that minimum but never receiving sufficient help from the sources in Government that are responsible to give him this help and therefore always living at a level that destroys his dignity. This is the very antithesis of social development.

Mr. President, I see that Senator Franklin has arrived. Unfortunately, I cannot repeat what I have said although I told him in a summarised form in the corridor what some aspects of my thinking on this matter were but I will repeat certain things for his benefit.

It is this Sir, I believe you are an honest, well meaning man who.....

Mr. PRESIDENT: Who?

SENATOR THE HON. D. G. BLACKMAN: Mr. President, I believe Senator Franklin is a honest, well meaning man who works industriously and diligently, but there is one basic flaw Mr. President, Senator Franklin's mentors are people who are committed to impression and not the truth and they are therefore sending forward their protege to do battle in which he was not adequately armed, therefore, I am sorry that he has missed the earlier part of my lecture because this presentation is as much for Senator Franklin's enlightenment and education, since fellow Senators would have heard me in two years' presentation on the Estimates go over many of the old things before, but we are so conditioned by the Poor Law mentality that it is necessary to restate time and again what the new philosophy of social development is and how it differs fundamentally from the old Poor Law mentality which the philosophy of welfarism has influenced in the delivery of national assistance in Barbados.

What I am saying is that at the base of what seems to be a dispute dealing with administration within the

Welfare Department is a fundamental, philosophical cleavage between the Minister on one hand and the Welfare Department on the other hand because the Minister, Mr. President is attempting a new, radical, different approach to the delivery of national assistance, whereas within the confines of the Welfare Department, you have Poor Law practices which still continue to prevail and which I believe erode and destroy the dignity of individuals. It is absolutely necessary to understand that there are serious philosophical differences because people find it difficult to adjust to new approaches, especially, new approaches relating to social questions.

I know it to be a fact Mr. President, that when politicians speak, there is a tendency for those who listen to them to dismiss what is said as the empty vapourising of people who speak for effect only, but without any particular meaning. This is why I was particularly gratified when the Association of Social Workers called me up some day last week and asked me if I wanted to see a copy of the minutes of my first meeting with them in which I actually predicted all of the problems that would arise from the implementation of a new philosophical approach to the delivery of national assistance in Barbados.

The process of education has to continue, education is often painful. I do not subscribe to the heathenistic view of education that if you do not feel pleasure in learning that there is something wrong with the teacher. We know that sometimes learning is pleasurable and sometimes it is painful. When one has to make fundamental shifts in thinking, it can be a most uncomfortable operation. So that has to be understood that there are serious philosophical differences in the process of educating people to a new social development theory is often something that causes travail.

Senator Franklin then went on to mouth of course, information which he had received without doubt from Poor Law administrators that there were professionals in the Welfare Department, he read out the categories, I could have told him 24 Welfare Officers and consequently, Child Care, Foster Care and Adoptions should not be put under the National Assistance Board. Mr. President, I have to point out that it is not the intention of this Ministry to put Foster Care and Adoption under the National Assistance Board. Foster Care and Adoption will be placed within the confines of the Child Care Department which operates under the aegis of the Child Care Board and the Child Care Board is a different Statutory Body from the National Assistance Board.

Let me explain for the edification of Senator Franklin why this was done. Prior to my becoming Minister of Community Services, there was a severance of the section that deals with Child Care Services from the Wel-

fare Department and a new Child Care Department was set up. Part of the reason I understand for this was irreconcilable, personal differences between officers in that department. There was serious internecine warfare and there was a fear that the delivery of these services to the public would be seriously impaired by officers fighting with one another. That is one of the reasons why the Child Care Department was called into existence early in 1978.

The Child Care Department deals with all matters relating to child care, except adoption and fostering. When I came into the Ministry, I tried to apply the principles of social development to the structuring of the particular departments and I came to the conclusion that administratively and conceptually, it made sense for the Child Care Department to deal with all aspects of child care that involved delinquency in parenting. The Child Care has under its aegis children's homes of the mass variety, or a smaller group homes and children are placed in this residential care, as a result of the absence of biological parents or having incompetent parents.

The question therefore of child care always has as its genesis some defect in parenting. The necessity therefore for fostering and adoption has the same source, and therefore by parity of reasoning the transfer of foster care services, a new radical, different foster care service, will be implemented under the direction of the Child Care Department as soon as the necessary legislation is passed, as well as the new Adoption Act. That is the rationale for the transfer. We transfer it to where people deal with the same basic problem which is inadequate parenting, and where people have the same kind of specialised background in social work. This is precisely why it was done, it is not transferred to the National Assistance Board, as Senator Franklin claimed.

I will deal with his other comments with respect to the home help service. He claimed that the home help service was taken away from professionals, or was taken out of the way of professionals, and put under the National Assistance Board. Mr. President, Senator Franklin is uninformed. When the concept of home help was developed with particular reference to Barbados by me, I called in the Chief Welfare Officer and told the Chief Welfare Officer that I wanted him to run the programme. The Chief Welfare Officer said that neither he nor anybody else on his staff had any competence in home help and that it would be necessary to send a welfare officer on a training course to the United States of America before we could have a home help service in Barbados. I listened to him and he unfolded a scenario to me which suggested that it would take two years before a home help service could be implemented. I listened and thought, because I too, this Minister too, has had his professional experience in the social area.

For 18 months when I was a university teacher I conducted special rehabilitation programmes for students, for inmates in Ryker's Island prison, and advised the City of New York, the New York Department of Foster Care, so that when people come to me with bogus stories I can easily see whether it is an evasion, an attempt to delay, or whether it is nonsense. The Welfare Officers and the people in the social development area are not dealing with a Minister who is a novice in this area, this is a Minister who in many respects has more experience in the social area than they themselves. This fact must be stated, not boastfully, but it must be made known when people start to fling about the word "professional" which is often used as a term to conceal the fact that people have no argument and there is no clear thinking on a particular matter. There are certain fad words that from time to time we use and abuse, and "professional" is one of them when certain people in certain areas are pressed to explain their actions, the word "professional" is sneaked into the conversation to mystify, to mislead and to confuse.

I ask myself, Mr. President, what was the purpose of a home help programme. The answer is this, in this new social development thrust, the home help programme was going to be devised in order to end the inequitous practice of sending basically healthy people to live in the almshouse. I have come across numerous people who were healthy individuals who have been placed on waiting lists by welfare officers to go into the almshouse. They look at these people who may not be as energetic as any of us in this Chamber and believe that they should be confined to the almshouse. I believe it is an illegal, inhuman practice to send basically healthy people to the almshouse. The home help programme therefore was designed to ensure that community care of a certain kind would keep these people in their own homes in which they could live out the rest of their lives in dignity and not to be subjected to an institutional existence that was degrading, humiliating and disgraceful.

This was the purpose of the home help programme and it represents again another concrete manifestation in the new constructive, progressive theory of social development as distinct from the poor law administration which characterises welfarism and which must be fought and destroyed, root and branch.

Knee jerk social workers look at an old man or an old woman and can think of nothing better to do than to send the person to an almshouse, a social development theorist rejects this categorically. We believe that the person should be restored to a situation of dignity and live in their own homes. The home help service therefore was designed to ensure that the basic material needs of people, old people, were met, that their houses were properly cleaned, because they did not have the energy to do it every day. That those who could not cook on a

regular basis for themselves would have their meals prepared, that their clothes would be washed, that they would be bathed. All of these things are necessary to minimal standards of civilised living. All of these things are absolutely necessary, Mr. President, and it is not necessary to do it in an institution. As a matter of fact, this policy is not only more humane, more dignified, it also costs the taxpayers of Barbados less. It costs the taxpayers of Barbados \$5,000 to keep an old person in an almshouse.

I call them almshouses, Mr. President, I know the euphemism is to describe them as district hospitals, but as long as they serve purposes of lodging old people who are basically healthy, it is a misnomer to describe them as hospitals, because a hospital is by definition a place where sick people are looked after, and where these people are not sick they have no right in such an institution, and such an institution functions as an almshouse and not a district hospital.

It is the declared objective of the Ministry of Community Services, an objective which we are close to attaining, to ensure that the aspirations of the Ministry of Health are fulfilled in making these institutions *bona fide* district hospitals, and very shortly we will have moved every last old person out of the district hospital, who is not sick, and put them in a house properly furnished, properly painted and have the needs of those old people looked after to the tune of \$500 per capita as distinct from \$5,000 which it will cost the taxpayers of this country to keep an old person in an institution.

It is not only more humane, it is less expensive as well. There are some hard-headed financiers who always ask where the money is coming from, but a social development theorist who is committed to rehabilitating individuals and restoring dignity to the poor and dispossessed is also committed to creative solutions, and what I have been trying to instil in the officers of the Ministry is that they must move away from the Pavlovian reaction every time a proposal is made for better services there is the assumption that it necessarily entails more money.

I do not believe that throwing more money at problems necessarily solves those problems, and we social development theorists as distinct from those burdened by the bane of a poor law mentality have demonstrated that you can come up with creative human solutions superior to the solutions of the concept of welfarism and yet not entail any more money. It entails more thought, it entails more activity, more commitment from the Welfare Office, but no more money from the taxpayer.

I asked myself, Mr. President, if it was therefore necessary to send a trained welfare officer to the United States of America to look at their home health programme in order to decide how we are going to or-

ganise a programme which involves looking after the domestic needs of old people. Do Barbadians need to go and be trained as to how to organise a programme which deals with cleaning houses, washing, cooking and so forth? The utter absurdity of the proposal then obtruded on my consciousness when I posed the question in this way, Mr. President, and I pose, Mr. President, to Senator Franklin and ask him if he would accept the kind of professional advice that this Minister was given to send a person to the United States of America to be trained to organise something which involves washing people's clothes, cleaning their houses and cooking for them. I thought not. I thought professionalism in this sense is nothing more than pure and simple obfuscation; that is all professionalism could mean in this sense, and so I used the hardheaded approach of commonsense that has brought Barbados and Barbadians a long way. I said if the professionals believe that extensive and irrelevant training is necessary, then I will have to go with ordinary people until I can do better and by a process of trial and error develop a home help programme that is effective in Barbados, but I was not prepared, Mr. President, to permit any old person to suffer a day longer going without a bath, or being hungry or living in a dirty house, or staying in an almshouse. I was not going to permit that burden on my conscience to be there by bowing to this bogus professional advice.

We therefore set up a home help programme under the National Assistance Board because the National Assistance Board over the years has become emasculated of its powers under the Act which involves advising the Minister on every aspect of national assistance. The members of the National Assistance Board has been intimidated by the professionals into not functioning; they were told that they were political hacks and that they would not be there for very long, and so I found members of the National Assistance Board not performing their statutory responsibilities. Giving them this responsibility not only ensured that the Board functioned as it was required by statute to do, but it also assured the programme of community input.

We started off last year with \$100 000 which was voted for this programme. The success of the programme has been so outstanding that I was able to persuade my colleagues in the Cabinet, and there are some hard-headed financiers in the Cabinet as well, substantially to increase this sum of money, and this year we are now having, I am pleased to report, the allocation of \$380 000 for the home help programme. Last year with our meagre budget we were able to extend this programme to ten parishes in Barbados, caring for 750 old people and in the coming year we expect possibly to treble this in terms of the number of people that it reaches. We do not serve parishes; we serve people.

Another misstatement was made by Senator Franklin that the housing welfare programme was taken from under the central administration of the civil service and put under a statutory board like the National Assistance Board and that the National Assistance Board and Statutory Boards do not run things as tightly and efficiently as central administration. In fact this programme came into existence in 1969 and from 1969 until 1976 it was run by a statutory board. It was run by the National Housing Corporation. Of course in the seven years of its existence they built about fifty houses and repaired about 300, and when I talk about repairs, Mr. President, they are not repaired in the social development sense of repaired; they were repaired in the poor law sense.

On the eve of election lorries laden with lumber would go through districts and throw off two or three pieces of board at an old lady's house as if you were throwing scrap to a dog. It is the humiliation of a programme of welfarism. It is the pernicious thinking of welfarism, the poor law mentality that is a sign that turns people into things, that alienates the old in this country and which dehumanizes the poor.

Do you imagine the scene at Election time, frantic politicians who did not service their constituencies for the 4½ years of 4 years and 9 months in the three month before the Election sending men through a district on trucks throwing pieces of lumber at old people? Do you imagine a more undignified scene than that? That is what I am seeking to rescue the old people of this country from and I am not stopping as long as I have responsibility for this Ministry. I will drag all of those people who resist kicking and screaming into the modern arena of social development as long as I have responsibility for it. Let juveniles scream. I intend to clean the mess up, as long as I have responsibility for it.

Senator Franklin said, Mr. President, that it was then taken from the Welfare Department. It was transferred by this Government to the Central Administration believing, as Senator Franklin believed, that it would be better administered there. It was transferred from a Statutory Body to the Central Administration by his Government.

I believed a score of complaints about unfair practices and the like, and houses not done properly. I believed that it was necessary in a programme such as this to have community input. I therefore transferred it to the National Assistance Board so that that Board could fulfil its statutory functions all the better and since it has been transferred to the National Assistance Board productivity has increased, and there are fewer complaints arising out of unfairness than I have heard when it was under the Central Welfare Administration.

This programme was restarted in 1978 and in two years, Mr. President, we had built 141 houses. We have built 141 houses in two years as opposed to the 50 or so that they built in about seven years and repaired in the social development scheme and the welfare scheme, about four times as many houses and not only did we repair them properly, we have also painted all of them to ensure that people are proud of the appearance of their houses.

Mr. President, I do not know that there is anything else that I need to respond to, I have information, Mr. President, which makes the poor law performance of the Democratic Labour Party even more shameful than I thought it was. The programme was not a programme designed for social development but a naked crudely run political operation. This information says that lumber was taken back from people in St. Thomas when it was discovered that they supported another party. In Christ Church too?

Mr. President, this is what I mean about the poor law mentality.

In conclusion, Mr. President, since I have talked long enough, I really intended to speak only for about half an hour but now that I have looked at the clock, I have gone over that by a little. Mr. President, I really want to say that the Senate Debate, generally, reached its usual height and constructive level on the Estimates this year. There were some low points that I alluded to. The low points reached in Senator Franklin's address, I believe, were not done out of malice. I believe that he brought conscientiousness to the debate but in this Chamber, Sir, conscientiousness is not enough. I believe Sir, that after he has listened to me and I will speak to him outside of the Senate Chambers if he deigns to listen then I believe that he will be better prepared to participate in these debates, especially in the work relating to the Ministry of Labour and Community Services. I think that when you are dealing with the Ministry for which I have responsibility, the first thing you have to recognise is that there is a new philosophy at work. I know that many people believe that theory and philosophy are nebulous airy-fairy things that have no relationship to the concrete.

Senator Franklin rose.

Mr. PRESIDENT: What are you rising on?

SENATOR W. O. FRANKLIN: Just a matter of information from the Honourable Minister.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Are you trying to elucidate something.

SENATOR W. O. FRANKLIN: Yes, Sir. Mr. President, I am sorry I was not here earlier, but I do not know if the Honourable Senator made any mention of the Meals on Wheels programme with the Red Cross, whether he has any plans to incorporate it, or any grants to the programme, or what.

SENATOR THE HON. D.G. BLACKMAN: Mr. President, I have received a request from some officers of the Red Cross to help in any way to expand and improve the service. I received this request some months ago, but unfortunately, I have not been able to meet with them as yet. I propose to do so in the next couple of weeks. One of the reasons why I have not met with them as yet is because I gleaned from the letter that they were interested in some funds as well, which I was in no position to help them with. At the dawn of the new Financial Year, I believe that I would be in a position to help them a little and to harmonise their activities to the extent possible with the activities of the home help service.

Mr. President, I have been informed that I omitted to deal with certain points which Senator Franklin raised relative to housing. I really do not think that I need dwell too long on any of the issues that he raised. I agree with him that the ability to mortgage chattel houses now would increase the already heavy demand for service lots provided by the Ministry of Housing and I want to assure him that a very dynamic sites and services programme is underway and planned for the future. Both underway and planned would be sites and services programme, partly service lots and partly rental at Bonnetts in Britton's Hill, the Ivy, partly rentals and partly sites and services, the Ivy is in my constituency, it is mine — Valerie, Britton's Hill also partly rentals and partly service lots, service lots at Clarke's Land, My Lord's Hill, Zion Hill, Orange Hill, the Glebe and the urban development programme at Bellairs.

I believe that Senator Franklin would be pleased to know that this kind of development with respect to satisfying the demand for service lots which is established in a proper infra-structure is very much in progress and very much in the forefront of the thoughts of persons, who are in the Ministry of Housing and Lands.

Mr. President, I thank you very much for your forbearance. In my enthusiasm, I am inclined to trespass upon your tolerance, somewhat. I thank you very much for your forbearance and the forbearance of other Honourable Senators. (APPLAUSE).

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Barrow.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. President, this debate has been extremely instructive. It is a debate in which I thought I had learnt so much and I was not going to be able to take in any more and then, just

before my colleague sits, I discover that we have an Honourable Senator with a constituency.

However that may be, I am taken back to a few hours Sir to a conversation which two or three of us had. I think it was over tea it might have been over dinner yesterday, in which we were talking about what the Senate was like at the beginning of this Session in 1976 and the fact that some people tended to predominate, or perhaps one might say to dominate the debate and one of the things which gave us a measure of good cheer and a sense of achievement is the fact that we have moved so far from that stage that it can be said and it could certainly have been said with absolute honesty a couple of months ago that almost every contribution made on the Floor of the Senate was a contribution of substance and a contribution of reasonably high standard. So that, it is no longer possible for a couple of us, who came in here with a little bit of parliamentary experience initially which others did not have to behave as though we could do whatever we wanted on the floor of the Senate and get away with it. That Sir to me is something which I can feel comfortable with about. I feel that everybody has worked to try and make this period a success and if this Session should last for another six days, another six weeks, or another six months we will not be able to lose that significant achievement.

But more than anything else Sir, yesterday afternoon I was both extremely gladdened and saddened at the same time. I am going to tell you first why I was saddened. I was saddened because I was predicting that in all that was going on, the coverage which we were getting in the news would bear about as much relation to what went on, as the reason in here for the demand for a life-guard station in St. Thomas, or St. George. As I listened yesterday to one of the most brilliant speeches I have ever heard, a speech made by Senator Enid Lynch on education in which there was compassion, there was wit, there was such a store of knowledge to which we became exposed and the speech had style. She had balance and was relaxed and really for one who was sleepy and who did not keep my eyes too open for a lot of the debate, I found myself sitting forward and not being able to nod not for a moment and speaking for other Honourable Senators, I realise that this was an experience we all truly shared and yet, to hear the news, or to read the news reports, there was absolutely no indication as to what was the real high point of this year's Senate debate.

I believe Senator Lynch will have to take comfort in the fact that her colleagues appreciated what she said and for that reason Sir, I do not propose to take my reply in terms of who made what point first, but I want to take my reply in a point raised by Senator Lynch, in respect of the School Attendance Officers. There were points made yesterday about education and as I recall, apart from this speech of Senator Lynch's which took

into account a point raised by Senator Marjorie Blackman, the other points were made by Senator Franklin in his contribution the previous day.

The point I really want to make is the fantastic contrast between the two speeches, in that I was not sure whether Senator Franklin was being critical or not. I think he sounded as though he wanted to be critical, but then I recognised so much of the subject matter of what he was saying as being a little bit too close to a speech made recently by Minister of Education Tull, which itself was informed by the exclusive provision in the 1966 Manifesto of the Barbados Labour Party advocating zoning, that I was sure that in the end whether he wanted to be critical or not, Senator Franklin was not being critical, but in fact in so far as he was advocating anything he was advocating what is clearly established Barbados Labour Party policy. It is that we must bring the schools up to a certain level, and that when we have brought them up — in other words, it is not a matter of levelling down — but ensuring that all the schools are of a reasonable quality, then we can tell the people about zoning, and if you are going to try to deal with the few equal and the many unequal, then you cannot talk about zoning in any serious sense.

Senator Lynch talked about the role of the School Attendance Officers, and the Ministry of Education has advised me that the new Education Act will no longer give merely an advisory role to the School Attendance Officers, but that these new powers will authorise School Attendance Officers to enter the premises and make such enquiries as might be necessary to determine whether section 39 is being complied with in relation to any child of compulsory school age whom he has reasonable cause to believe to be residing at or employed at the premises. This is where during school hours the School Attendance Officer sees a child on premises outside of school obviously.

Any such child may be detained, once the child appears to be of compulsory age and is not at school. He may ask the child questions concerning his age, his name and address, the school at which he is registered and the reason for his absence from school. If the child does not give a satisfactory reason for his absence, may take the child to his home or to the school and shall report the absence of the child from school to the Chief Education Officer. In other words, the same kinds of things which Senator Lynch advocated so strongly in her speech, I am happy to say have found their way into the minds of the advisers and policy makers in the Ministry of Education.

Since I am dealing with a couple of points raised on the Ministry of Education, let me at this stage dispose of the point which I could not quite understand when Senator Franklin made it. When he talked about the fact

that we are saying that nobody in the Government Service is working for less than \$500 a month and yet there are people working in the School Meals Service for \$5,064 per annum. What Senator Franklin apparently does not know is that these School Meals Servers are not eight hour a day employees, they are working five hours a day, they are working from 10.00 a.m. to 3.00 p.m. during term, and what they earn over the year is \$5,064 per annum. That is a slightly different matter.

In much of Senator Franklin's address he was calling for improvements in the staffing. It is quite clear that as more and more university graduates become available the secondary schools, including the newer secondary schools, will obviously become completely or nearly completely staffed with graduates, but at present there is a graduate to non-graduate ratio of one to two.

Senator Franklin asked about a regrading of the teachers' salaries, and I hope my note is wrong, because I could not understand what he was asking for, since all teachers' salaries had only just been regraded. He is indicating, Sir, that that was not exactly what he meant, but at the time I made the note and I am happy to recognise that he must have made a slip.

Since he is here and Senator Boxill is not here, and since Senator Franklin is here, I really would have wished to have just taken official notice and give a reply to any point which he had made, but it would seem, Sir, that in so far as I have been able to follow him, what he said in relation to Education, give uniforms to those who failed the Common Entrance also, his call for zoning and for the building up of the comprehensive schools, and then he dealt with the School Meals Servers.

The way in which the uniforms have been introduced obviously reflects a planned approach to the thing. We are phasing it in, we will take each crop as we go forward, and as expansion becomes possible school uniforms may become a reality for all school children, but you do not start a scheme by simply operating with every child within the system in every school, all at the same time. I believe Senator Franklin would understand more clearly what I mean if I referred to the fact that the School Meals project was started as a pilot project and indeed for a long time after that scheme did not reach all the schools in Barbados. Even after the scheme had been in operation for nearly 15 years the 10 cents, which would only be a nuisance, because really collecting 10 cents could serve no useful purpose, it still had not been found necessary to remove it. Or we might go to the area of educational broadcasting where a pilot project was set up in the 1960's, which pilot project has remained a pilot project for all time, apparently and which is something I hope the next Labour Party administration will be able to turn its attention to and do something quite positive

about. What is wrong is letting things remain pilot projects, not in starting them as pilots.

The points raised by Senator Boxill about Dodds were disposed of by Senator Lynch, and I do not think there are other points within the area of Education which are really points that merit notice.

I would only like to say one thing, Sir, that within the context of policies relating to whether nationals or non-nationals occupy positions of authority, I think we ought not to allow ourselves to be carried away with any enthusiasm on the point, because while it is clear that national interest will demand that nationals fill available positions where they are qualified to do so, our laws like the laws of other countries recognise that people have spouses for example, recognise that sometimes a person who speaks with an accent may be a Barbadian born outside of Barbados. In other words people who ultimately may make their home here would have to be treated with the same sense of entitlement, and therefore I would caution that before we make the point we, first of all, establish whether we are talking about people who are non-nationals in any true sense. That is merely with regard to one particular point. (Asides) I nearly had another illustration of the point.

I think we just have to be careful because if we are working in a particular institution and we seem to be saying that in that institution there are jobs of any responsibility, any seniority of going to non-nationals, we can in fact result in misleading the public not because we mean to do so but indeed because we have ourselves misinterpreted the situation and misinformed ourselves.

Sir, the next point that I think I shall take in relation to the points raised in this debate is a point which has been dealt with not in great detail but at times at some length by other speakers, and there is very little left for me to say about it, but what I do have to say I believe to be of some significance. It is a point concerning the Defence Force and \$14 million. Senator Boxill and Senator Franklin could have saved us a lot of trouble if they had both got up and at least in respect of this topic spoken at one and the same time and sat back down, because they each of them followed the other and was here when the other was speaking, really said the same thing, and I would like to believe that on our side we would not get up and inflict the same mouthings on this Chamber one after the other. The fact of the matter is that if we are talking about the Defence Force, let us deal with it at the level of credibility. The people who started the Defence Force were the people who went up and down the country criticising the Defence Force, and when it became clear that they had put their credibility on the line, a few months ago they started back tracking particularly after it was seen how helpful the members of

the Defence Force had been to the community after the hurricane.

If you will notice, Sir, as of that time the attitude of the Democratic Labour Party to the Defence Force became a different one, especially since one of the more vocal critics suddenly discovered that in the constituency of St. Lucy which he represents a lot of the membership of the Defence Force happens to come from there. And make no bones about it, Sir, I do not have to stand up here and go over what the Defence Force personnel did at that time. I believe that everybody in Barbados knows; but as of then they have been singing a new tune. Up to then they were even making statements about who was training in what and who was accustomed to shooting down people and all the most slanderous and vicious nonsense. Now when they see the item Defence Force they still seem unable to look at the thing and decide that perhaps the wisest course to follow is to keep my mouth shut. So they get up and they say, and it is one recital — if you listened to them in the Other Place you heard it, if you listen on the platforms you will hear the same thing and now you are getting it in here — “I am not opposed to the Defence Force, but you are spending too much money on it.”

It is a fact, Sir, that the bulk of the allocation for the Defence Force is for the Coast Guard. That is what it is for, and if only for that reason the Opposition should shut up because there is no intention on the part of this Government to build a Coast Guard on the beach. It is also not the intention of this Government to equip the Coast Guard with the kind of boat that if you put it in river water you might do all right. We do not have rivers in Barbados. Ask those who had to come from Grenada on the George Fergusson; ask the people who came up from Grenada; ask Al Gilkes about the ride; sick all the way up. They are not worth it. George Fergusson is not something that we can use. But the problem with the Coast Guard is that the Democratic Labour Party is going to force this Government to reveal to the public what proportion of the money spent by the last administration on the Coast Guard was not wasted. You see, sometimes you talk about not spending so much money, but sometimes then you do not spend enough and what you spend is wasted; so you spend enough, but you spend it badly; the same effect.

There is one thing for which this Government has a good reputation and which it is going to keep a reputation for; it is that we recognise that you cannot do something cheaply, and we try to create savings by managing the project with maximum efficiency. That is what we are in this business about and it is always a costly business. Any aspect of defence is always a costly business and we must not confuse Defence Forces with the policing operation in the sense of people going out and doing a certain kind of patrol. Although there is an

element of policing in a Defence Force, and if so, what we should be looking at is, can we make the kind of provision that is adequate for the policing of our economic zone, the 200 mile limit that we are talking about? There is no point in going and sitting down and talking about Law of the Sea Conferences and talking about conference of significant and economic import and saying that a nation is to be able to enjoy the economic resources available right outside its shore and then not making any provision to police that zone. It just does not make sense. If you are going to be in serious business, you have to put your money where your mouth is.

Others have spoken, Sir, about the skills which people derive. People have talked about the necessity for a Defence Force but I am speaking only against a very limited background. I have defined my area very carefully. They recognise the need for a Defence Force and where they put their thrust was with the Coast Guard. We recognized the need for a Defence Force. Where we put our thrust is also with the Coast Guard but we recognise that if that job is going to be done it would be costly and we therefore had to take a decision whether we would spend that money or not.

You cannot stand up and tell people things which you yourself know possibly you cannot believe and I am sure that if Senator Franklin's advisors would give him a proper briefing he would not come in here and repeat these points because he would not believe them either. I believe that the mistakes which the Senator comes in here and makes are entirely the function of political inference, entirely.

We are aiming to provide the following, Sir. The development of the capability to police the exclusive Economic Zone of some 50,000 sq. miles in order to protect Fisheries and other Marine Resources and to carry out the Air/Sea Rescue Missions as required. That is why you will find that we have to have a patrol boat of a certain kind which costs money. It is true we are borrowing money to buy it, but it costs money. This is why we are getting some kind of aircraft capability and it costs money but if you hear the Opposition, you would believe them to be trying to claim that what you are trying to do is to buy bullets.

Senator Boxill was sitting down there — sorry, Sir, he was not sitting, he was standing and talking about obsolete arms. I mean, Sir, what are we hearing. I believe, Sir, that even if we can excuse Senator Boxill, Senator Franklin at his age cannot afford to be found to saying much the same thing. He cannot. Senator Boxill has no future even in the Senate. I would like to believe that Senator Franklin has a future in the Senate.

If, Sir, we were to look at a little bit at the professional advice on which these decisions were based,

it is necessary and it is our responsibility to ensure the freedom of that area from pollution, by oil and other substances and can you tell me exactly how warlike, you know, gets us back into the men and ammunitions argument, Sir, pollution? I believe, Sir, that everybody in here knows about oil slicks and I believe that everybody in here get concerned sometimes when off the Morgan Lewis Beach there seem to be substances which we are never too sure if there are discharged from an oil tanker or what it comes from but there is from time to time evidence of pollution in that area.

Ever so often and we are not the only people who have that problem. As long as we are an Island people we have to recognise that this is one of the problems and it is one of the expensive things that we have to deal with. Because of our Economic Zone, if meaningful patrols were to be carried out on the perimeter, it would be necessary to buy boats with displacement hull which would be very seaworthy, though slow, or plane boats which would be much longer than the ones currently in use. It was on that advice that the 37.5 metres fast patrol boat which Senator Boxill called a washer, it is on that advice that that boat is being purchased.

In addition, two trawler type boats are being refitted and are expected to be delivered shortly. At first, Sir, I just did not refer to that part of my note because it is my belief, and I am pretty sure that that information has already been made public and it is for people in public life not to know about it and if the Senator is not aware of what is going on, we can advise him of a number of people whom he can go to and get serious information, not coming in here and throwing in things about spending too much money and so on.

Imagine Senator Boxill was a Minister in the last Government. When he sees \$14 million down under Defence and Security, for the first time it dawned on him, Sir, that it could build a Children's Hospital. All the time he was in the House from 1961 to 1971, the DLP was in Government and they did not build a single Hospital. The nearest they came to building a Hospital was when they started at Warrens with the building of a Crematorium and even that did not get off and all of a sudden, he discovers that we should build a Children's Hospital. Are we talking seriously? I understand people who can make criticisms and made proposals that can be taken seriously, but not just standing up and talk, and talk and talk.

You see, Sir, we will have to decide whether we are going to have a Coast Guard with a fast patrol boat and two trawler boats and adequately staffed in the interest of protecting our fishermen, in the interest of policing the Economic Zone or whether we are going to invest in an unseaworthy vessel like the George Fergusson. You know how glad I was when I picked up the Newspaper and saw

something that the George Fergusson had actually done. I was very glad when I saw that it went down to Grenada after the Revolution to pick up the fellows, the same thing they said that Al Gilkes could tell people about. Do you know, Sir, it had to put in at St. Vincent on the way? It could not make the whole trip back to Barbados, and people who could spend money buying foolishness like that, could consider themselves competent to tell you how you should spend money and what is worse, the gentlemen in the course of delivering his words of wisdom also went on to tell us that what we should have done was to keep the North Point.

I thought that it had already been established that the only thing the North Point was good for was to carry shells to South Africa which is the only reason the Harp people offered to lease it or buy it from the Government after 1976 because they obviously had a reasonable expectation that if the Government had not changed they would neither have needed to lease or buy it until they were able to use it for that purpose established, since it has now been so clearly established that that was the real business that Dr. Jerry Bull and his other Harp Colleagues, and Mr. Carlton Brathwaite and so on were in to, close, close friends of the last administration.

I think, Sir, that if Senator Boxill had been here at the time when the Duffus Commission was going on, he would have understood. I am sure. I have known him a long time, Sir and he would have understood what they were really saying about the North Point and I think that somebody is going to have to give him a crash course in order to fill him in with all the information that he missed from the time he went to Canada in the days when they did not consider him good enough to be put in the Senate up to 1977 or so when he came back.

But my caution is really that Senator Franklin must not allow himself to fall into that kind of trap. You see Sir, we may look at the ramblings of Senator Boxill kindly because after all he is retired, I mean I thought so at least in 1971. But, at his age, Senator Franklin cannot regard himself as having retired, even if he does regard himself as being retired, it is going to be difficult for him to get us to regard him as being retired.

Senator Hewitt, Senator MacKenzie and by way of a single sentence, Senator Marjorie Blackman touched on the business of the public debt. Since I am no economist, it should be very clear that I will be speaking merely against a background of advice. The last time that this point came up in here Sir when I was without the benefit of any Public Service advice, what I did was to try to get hold of the Balance of Payments situation, I got some figures and at that point I could see a little bit that made sense to me, although I knew it was not the full picture. The point is Sir that if we are talking about the national

debt, if we are going to express concern, it must be concern as to whether we can continue to service the debt. I believe that nobody considers debt a problem, as long as servicing the debt is not causing any particular difficulty. There are problems of course which can come because you might have more than one loan going and you may have to retire a number of loans at about the same time if you have not planned it well, or if you have not been able to get a proper amortisation scheme.

But generally speaking, if you can plan this so that you do not have these difficult years as in 1974 I believe it was when too much had to retire at one time. Generally speaking, I believe we can look at the level of our debt servicing and look at our old foreign exchange earnings and therefore determine whether there is a problem to face. Mr. President, I am making the point in this way because I believe that even trained economists are not going to speak very positively in relation to this matter, because there are too many variables. In the first place we talk about capacity to service a loan and this must depend to some extent on our ability to read the information and interpret it properly, as to whether our level of exports is likely to keep up. Therefore, there are a number of factors which the economists would take into consideration which might escape the attention of the layman. But it is good enough for me if I can understand that these things need to be qualified. It is good enough for me to accept a shorthand definition of whether everything is O.K. and everything is O.K. according to that shorthand definition, when you are not paying out by way of servicing your debt too high a proportion of your export earnings. You have to export to earn foreign exchange and it is the foreign component of the national debt that really causes the problems.

I know Sir, that in some countries, Caribbean countries too, you find that something like 30% of the earnings from export might have to go to service the foreign debt and what we have found in Barbados is that although the indicators are that even though the tourist industry may not be growing as fast as it grew a couple of years back, there would still be substantial foreign exchange earnings from tourism, although sugar prices are high and therefore, there will be substantial foreign exchange earnings from sugar and although there is a lot of growth activity in the manufacturing sector all of which are good indicators for our exports continuing to grow, still Mr. President, when we talk about a foreign debt of \$500 million today, we are not particularly perturbed because the notable component of that debt is \$332.9 million approximately \$333 million which includes ways and means advances from the Central Bank to the tune of about \$25 million and a foreign debt of \$167.1 million because it is costing us 2.6% of our export earnings to service that foreign debt. Senator Truss had said 2.4% and I am advised that when you are talking about two point something percent, it really

does not matter if you say two point two, or two point eight because you are well within what you can afford to service.

A lot of people looking at the economic indices in Barbados would have not been perturbed if you were spending 10%. We are a more conscious Government however. The point is that we keep way down below the ceiling. So when we are talking about the national debt I believe Sir, that we should recognise that while you have to watch these things very carefully there is really no need to panic.

The other point within this strict financial area to which I have to move is a point which was raised by Senator Franklin. I remember Senator Hewitt's speech particularly Sir because Senator Hewitt went to some length to explain for the benefit of the Chamber that Senator Franklin had absolutely no point, when he said that the shift was taking place from Direct to Indirect Taxation because Senator Hewitt referred to the economic data available to all of us to show that the taxes on incomes and profits expressed as a percentage of total revenue reached the high of 43% in 1974-75 and again in 1976-77 and in 1979-80 the low of 38%, in 1980-81, it was around 41% and so on. In other words, you are talking about a situation which is going up and down between 38% and 43% which cannot support the argument that there has been any such shift and I thought of what Senator Franklin had said because I recognised that if the basis for an argument has been destroyed, then perhaps we should look to see whether this is a peculiar argument in which there was something left standing after the basis had been destroyed.

What I have found, Sir, was that he had in fact made no argument, he had merely made a statement which turned out not to be correct. He went on, and in an unconnected though at the time apparently related — again I discovered it was related only in time — he made a statement that even though the economy seemed to be doing better, and thankfully I must say for him that he did not challenge that point, that the benefits were not flowing on to the people. Sir, that is a very serious statement to make, especially when a man is making the point that the shift is taking place from direct to indirect taxation. I thought when he was saying that that he was going on to speak against the relief in direct taxation which has been given over these years since the Labour Party formed the Government of the country, and that is why I said I was looking to find the point he was making and alas I found no point.

The forecast at the time of the new Consumption Tax Act was that it would have an effect between three quarters of one percent and one per cent on the cost of living index, and as far as I am advised — and I did ask for advice on the point — all the information so far

suggests that the effect is between three quarters of one percent, and one percent. The person who produced this advice goes on to state that there was a reduction of income tax by at least 5% of total income for virtually all taxpayers, so that they should still be better off by 4%, which would tend to nullify the consumption tax.

Now, just let me make the point that I do not quite accept that reasoning as straight as all that, see, but just let me make one point, Sir. In an economy where wages are rising and there is no indexing, if you do not actually by law adjust your income tax rates, every single manjack in the economy who even goes out and works for half day and comes back at some modest wage will soon find himself paying income tax. It is as simple as that. As wages rise the income tax bracket will absorb everybody eventually.

Now, substantial relief has been given in order to reverse this regressive trend which had not merely set in, in fact it had become quite the feature of our situation in Barbados, because not since 1968 had there been income tax concessions. It meant that everybody who was earning a little more had to face the fact that quite a lot of it was being eaten up by inflation, and on top of that he was being forced more and more into a high tax bracket. The effect of the income tax concessions was to restore that purchasing power, knock all those people under a certain amount — if you consider that some of those people qualify in other words for allowances, I think it was more than one third of the tax base — just knock them out, take them off the roll, Sir, for all intents and purposes, and in the face of that with wage increases over these same years, in some instances like the last settlement in some categories as high as 38.3%, generous wage increases taking place over the past few years, how can anybody talk about economic benefits not flowing down to the people, Sir? Senator Franklin would have to come in here and bring a mass of economic data, not just what he calls economic figures, in order to persuade me that in the face of the facts which I have just given him — I know these are facts and everybody else in here knows these are facts — that people are not financially better off today.

There is no way, Sir, that wages can rise substantially, income tax relief be given so substantial that it would have taken more than three tax free months last year to eat up the concession. I am nothing now to do with any benefits which the State is producing or anything, let us just deal with the man going to work, the man getting a bread, the man coming home. It is nothing but economic lunacy to argue that that man is not better off, Sir, and indeed I would make one point. If the Senator doubts what I am saying, what he must do, do not wait for the bell to ring, start now and go in a rum shop or two in St. Philip North and he will find out when he talks to the fellows. Do not wait until election comes, go in now and you will find out that those fellows are a little better off, and in some cases

a lot better off with money. The trouble is, Sir, that my friends tell me that the Senator might not be able to stay in there very long, because it has gone up to brandy now.

The other point of this sort is where Senator Franklin stunned me actually, because he said that either we were in for a recession, which he did not believe, or that the revenue figures were understated. I remember that very well, Sir. It turns out that what Senator Franklin was doing was comparing unlike things. You see, the \$395.1 million for 1980–81 was the original estimate and did not therefore include any budgetary proposals. What you have to compare this year's \$483.7 million with is that \$395.1 million, because that \$483.7 million is also an original estimate, and you will see that something like a 22% increase in revenue is being forecast. What the Senator compared with the \$483.7 million was the \$447.9 million figure, which is the revised revenue figure for 1980–81, not the original estimate. We have to compare original estimates with original estimates.

You can compare a reasonable estimate at the beginning of one year with actual performance at the end of that year so that you can say that you performed by so much better than your estimate, but you cannot pick up a revised figure for one year, take the original estimate for the next year and say that you are not forecasting enough for increase in revenue. You cannot do it. Now if you take these Estimates after Tuesday, then you can start doing a completely different set of economic projections on them because after Tuesday — when is the Opposition's reply to the Budget?

A VOICE: All Fools Day.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Well after Wednesday, Sir. But anyhow, I think I have made the point. You compare like things; you do not compare unlike.

Senator Hewitt has made his usual point and as usual, Sir, I think he has something of a point. He knows the point I am referring to. Every year you come in here Senator Hewitt is down on this Capital Estimate as though he expects you to forecast exactly what you know you can spend. Anyhow, that is another point. The point which the hon. member makes relating to indexing where he suggests you should try and get your income tax rates to a certain point and then index, obviously that is not a point with which we can disagree, because I think it is clear if you look at the old age pensions and the way Government has been treating them, that in so far as we can see what the economic implications are, we are certainly not opposed to the idea. It is a matter of when we can reach the point where we can with confidence start the indexing operation.

Again the hon. member is critical about the incentives given to encourage investment, and if you look at it in that general sense, there is undoubtedly a point. If you look at it in the sense of encouraging some participation by workers in the places where they work, then evidently the aim of that provision is a little different from the wider purpose which Senator Hewitt is really talking about.

I think Senator Trotman dealt pretty firmly with the whole question of price control, and I was going to make a point about them, but just let me reduce my point to this, we operate a society which does not have the same diversity of economic interest as large societies and it does not have the kind of buffers that large societies have, and we have to be extremely careful that we do not talk about operating and implementing a system of price controls just because it sounds good. We have had the experience already of operating limited price controls, operating price controls across a larger area, and we are now back to operating limited price controls; so it is not as though we do not have price controls. There are price controls on a selected number of essential items, but it had been the case that when the price control policy was at its height in terms of implementation and administration in this country, the people who felt the pressure and got forced out of business were the very small shopkeepers. What sort of economy are we running if it were going to revert to a policy that pushes the small man out of business? That is what the Democratic Labour Party must address its mind to, that the price control policy which it followed prior to 1976 drove small people out of business. It also kept unemployment unnecessarily high and it seems therefore a much wiser policy to use the commercial activity of the BMC, to use the consumer information which is made available to the GIS programmes to which the hon. member referred, to use this kind of mechanism in addition to a small number of selected items, and to use whatever moral suasion you can; sometimes what we also use is the threat that if we do not bring down the price, we will put a control on it, and that sometimes brings it down.

Mr. President, it is better to use those methods and let little people stay in business and let people generate a sufficient revenue that they can employ Barbadians. It is not in our interest to see Barbadians walking the streets and standing on the street corner at 10 o'clock in the morning with nothing to do and also Sir, the bulk in the unemployment is among young women. A lot of those same jobs are the jobs that they fill. I cannot see how we can possibly talk about price controls as though there is something sacred about them and as though a case for them has been made after the years of their application.

Mr. President, I have disposed of most of the topics raised. There are a couple of points raised by Senator

Rocheford and by Senator Wickham within the area for which I have responsibility. In relation to Senator Wickham's point, just let me say that we know and understand the problems facing the library. It is not something that we look at and smile, but as he knows, we have set up a Commission to design a national system and I believe that it must have been the Committee that the Senator was on, looked at the existing plan for expansion of the library and felt that any plan for expansion must be harmonised with the architecture already there, in addition to which I am advised that it is the feeling of the Committee that plans for the physical expansion of the library would be more appropriately made after the Commission gives in its report later this year.

When I became Minister responsible for libraries, there was a token provision for expansion of the library, so I mean it is not a point which we now have to go and persuade people. It is unfortunate that it is not something that it was deemed wise to do while you were still trying to work out the implications for the library with the new National Information system.

In relation to the printing of the debates, I have what I regard as good news, because only a month ago you could not even get the *Official Gazette* and we were in serious trouble, because we were in danger of laws being challenged for legal validity.

The Printery became responsible to the Ministry of Information during the month of November. It did not take us too long to establish that the principal problem with the Printery was a Management problem. On the 1st of March a Special Assignments Officer was put in and a number of things he has been able to manage. The 1st of March, he went in there, Sir. Would you believe, Sir, that last week Monday the *Official Gazette* was suddenly up-to-date for the first time in God knows how long, Sir.

There was a printing machine on the floor of the Printery. There were two like it. One was working and the other one we were told could not work. Would you believe, Sir, that we got that working and that is a machine that is vital to the printing of the debates and after it was parked for three years it has suddenly now started to work.

There was a folding machine in the Car Park. This was not there for three years, Sir. This was there from 1977. I believe that is four years. Apparently, Sir, it was there for four years that I know about but apparently it was there for another two that I do not know about. Anyhow, at this level four or six years would not make a lot of difference. There was no space in the Printery although there was equipment condemned and dismantled. You could not get it out. We got out that equipment. We

found some space. We have that in place now and next week we expect that to be working.

Work used to come in and if I was the man in charge of production it would come to me, Sir. If you are handling the first stage it would go to you, Sir, and Senator Wickham if he were handling the second stage it would come back to me, Sir, and then it would go to Senator Wickham. If Senator Hewitt was handling it in its third stage it would come back to me then to Senator Wickham and so on. That has been straightened out. Meetings with the Senior Staff have been started on a weekly basis so that communications within the establishment have been improved.

In the *Official Gazette* which came out on the 25th of March, debates of the Senate Meetings held on the 1st, 20th and 27th June, 1979 and the House of Assembly Debates for the 10th and 17th of June, 1980 appeared. In the *Gazette* due to come out on Monday the 30th of March, the Senate Debates will be brought up to the end of December, 1979 and, Sir, in the *Official Gazette* of the 2nd of April we will find the Senate Debates for the 23rd and 30th of January and March 5th, 1980 and the House Debates for the 1st, 8th and 22nd July, 1980. All of a sudden the Printery under very capable and responsible Management of Mr. Grey Forde a Senior Civil Servant has become very productive.

I can say Sir, that those of us who immediately guessed that what we needed in there was a Senior Officer of competence has turned out to be completely right and we can now confidently look forward in the not too distant future to debates being up-to-date but, Sir, there is a proviso because my Researchers also revealed that the last debates which are to be found in the hands of the Government Printery or the Special Assignment Officer looking after the Printery are the Senate Debates of the 4th February and the House Debates of the 3rd of February and these the Printery received on the 9th of March.

In other words, it takes five weeks for a debate to get from Parliament to the Printery. I know the Printery is a little far. I believe that if the Clerk finds he does not have the staff to deal with it that he had better analyse the position and get some prompt proposal in so that if it is necessary Parliament should appoint an Editor of Hansard but this is the time and place for me to issue the warning but as things are going now the Government Printery is likely to be ahead of the Clerk in relation to the debates. When he get off his backlog, the business of Parliament is to ensure that within a day or two of the conclusion of a debate that debate is to be with the Printer. We would like to see a situation where within 24 hours of a debate it is printed.

If we can get it down to five or six days to start with, we would not have done too badly seeing that we

are accustomed to something like five or six years so if at our end we are going to work full steam on it, I believe that at his end the Clerk is going to have to ensure that he is equipped to work full steam on it.

The other and final point relates to the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation. The Corporation has been in the news again. It is a Corporation that even likes to be in the news or the publishers of news like it to get into the news and in other places people come, serve three or four years, one or two years and go and it does not make the news. In this particular case it is regarded as something which must be made heavy weather of. Just let me make one point, Sir.

The *Nation* Newspaper telephoned me over the recent resignations. I had nothing to tell them and I still have nothing to tell them. However, I have always taken the position that where one was discussing the business of the Corporation in relation to its capacity to perform its public function, that is a different matter but I have no intention of operating at the character assassination level nor of getting into any sort of public scuffles with anybody. I believe, Sir, that anything I have had to tell the people I have stood up and told them to their faces. I will continue like that. I cannot change and I do not intend to try.

Now, Senator Rocheford's question, as I understand it, relates to the change that up until very recently it had appeared as though we would not have been able to televise the Budget Debate which begins on Tuesday. I am happy to say that at the last moment a number of manoeuvres were made, enquiries were made and we were able to locate adequate equipment for the performance of the Budget and with the co-operation between the Ministry and the Corporation — indeed, I think it was last Monday I had a Meeting with Senator Lynch and other members of the Board and after funds were released which made it possible for the Corporation to buy the equipment which had been located and which makes this broadcast possible.

And having said that, just let me make a couple of points Sir. In 1975 the auditors found that there was no inventory of assets and it was not until this time last year that it was possible for an inventory to be compiled and what it does show is that a great deal of the equipment in the corporation is obsolete even though a lot of it is not like the television outside broadcast equipment which is not only obsolete but past utility by this point.

So that, in any redevelopment programme and that is something that I have been urging for some time a redevelopment programme there is going to be a great deal of re-equipping, that is inevitable. But the fact is that people are doing something about it and therefore

I think the corporation has to be borne with while it gets its house in order. After all, it is not the fault of any of the current persons, if for all those years the corporation had not employed the services of a qualified engineer. I do not believe that there has been a qualified engineer in the corporation since about 1961 and you cannot expect to operate in an industry of high technology, where the technology is always moving, always changing and is very expensive, keep apacè with modern developments, unless you have certain resources on the staff which can deal with these matters.

There is a broadcast engineer now, he is on contract, but recently, I think there are two persons who have been recruited with good engineering qualifications and sent out for training and therefore, you can see that steps are being taken for the corporation to equip itself with the necessary resource. These things take time and they take a lot of consistent effort and consistent energy. So I do not think that Senator Rocheford, or any of us need fear that the corporation is going to break down. I hope I am not speaking out of turn.

I think Sir that those are all the points which struck me that I needed to respond to and I see all of my notes have been consumed. Standing Order 59 provides that where there is a money Bill, that we may indeed not necessarily go to Committee and it has been now a practice of the Senate over these years not to go into Committee on the Appropriation Bill.

Accordingly Sir, after the Second Reading, or a motion has been put assuming Sir that it is in the affirmative, I intend to invoke Standing Order 59.

Thank you.

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

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. President, I beg to move that this Bill be not committed.

The question was put to the Senate and agreed to.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. President, I beg to move that this Bill be now read a third time.

The question was put to the Senate and agreed to.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. President, I beg to move that this Bill do now pass.

The question was put to the Senate and agreed to.

SUSPENSION

Mr. PRESIDENT: I am proposing to suspend the Sitting for twenty minutes and then resume with some of the other items on the Agenda. This Sitting is suspended for twenty minutes.

On Resumption:-

Mr. PRESIDENT: The sitting is resumed.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT ORANGE HILL, ST. JAMES FOR THE PROVISION OF RECREATIONAL FACILITIES

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: With your permission, Mr. President, Orders Nos. 3, 4 and 5 which stand in my name are being taken care of by Senator Trotman, and there are two Orders which were circulated yesterday also to do with acquisitions. What I would wish to ask the Hon. Senate is that we take these three and those other two Resolutions before we move back to any Bills.

SENATOR O'BRIEN TROTMAN: Mr. President, I have taken the liberty to circulate the map relating to this acquisition. The land is being acquired as set out in the Schedule to the Resolution, Sir, for the purpose of providing recreational facilities in the Orange Hill area.

In the last couple of months we have gone through this exercise of acquiring various lands for the purpose of establishing community centres and playing fields, and indeed, Sir, I believe that this is the second one which we are doing in relation to an area in St. James so far for 1981. As I understand it, Sir, we acquired some 1,618 hectares or four acres of land which should provide adequate facilities in Orange Hill. There are no difficulties with the owner, so we need not excite ourselves too much, and I do not propose therefore to make a speech on that matter, Sir.

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

SENATOR W. O. FRANKLIN: Mr. President, just a small point. Having a look at the acquisition map that was given me, it appears from the contour layout as if the site could pose some problem in the preparation of a playing field. I do not know if the site immediately south, which I am seeing, was also considered, since the contours are much leaner and from a cost point of view would have been a much better site for the acquisition.

I only raised this to find out from the Senator if the selection of the site was limited due to the difference

of owners or what, because the site just to the east, however you look at it, of the one being acquired is a much nicer site for that type of purpose and would have been much cheaper in preparation for recreational purposes.

SENATOR O'BRIEN TROTMAN: Mr. President, I must confess that I am not aware of the cost of developing the land for playing facilities. I was checking my notes to see if there was any such indication, but there is only a note that the site has been visited, and I would assume that the representatives of the Ministry of Lands would have taken the Senator's point before the recommendation was made.

SENATOR W. O. FRANKLIN: Mr. President, unless there was some peculiar reason why the parcel — and unfortunately this does not even have north and south, but I am familiar with this type of map — unless there is some peculiar reason why the parcel to the south of the portion which it is proposed to acquire was not available, it seems to me to be a very bad selection by the technocrats of this particular site, since looking at the contour, the topography of the site to be acquired, you will notice that there is a ridge that runs right up the centre of the site, and over on the eastern side it falls off quite rapidly there to a ravine. While if you took the site to the south which is bounded on three sides by some type of road structure, the contours are much easier. Looking at it quickly, it looks like a type of fall from the north to the south of about 1 in 40 or so, which should be a lot easier gradient, and in this type of work it could be very expensive grading and preparing for playing fields, and the selection of the site could well mean the difference between a very expensive recreational facility and a cheap recreational facility.

I would invite the Senator to enquire if there is any particular reason why the site to the south was not considered for acquisition.

SENATOR O'B. TROTMAN: Mr. President, I will promise to have the necessary enquiries made in the Ministry of Lands on behalf of the Senator.

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

RESOLUTION TO LEASE LAND AT PRESCOD BOULEVARD, FONTABELLE

The Fourth Order of the Day was called — to move the passing of a Resolution to approve of the lease of land at Prescod Boulevard, Fontabelle, St. Michael, to Bookers Agencies (B'dos) Limited.

SENATOR O'B. TROTMAN: Mr. President, over the last year or so we have been considering Resolutions to

do with the leasing of land at Fontabelle, and we have passed similar Resolutions to do with the leasing of land to other companies, the Nation, the Advocate, N. E. Wilson, Chefette and several other business places, and I suppose Sir, that as the negotiations are completed with the various business places, we shall have to consider this one to be one until the entire area is taken up by commercial business. It does take some time to negotiate the question of rents and conditions, and the Ministry is consistent that on no account must any entrances be made on the Prescod Boulevard, and therefore we are trying to keep the leasing of the land to those existing businesses which have exits and entrances on the other side of the land. There is nothing we can add to this which was not said about the other leasings.

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

SENATOR W. O. FRANKLIN: Mr. President, just for information from the Senator, I wonder if it is the Government's stated policy that the properties in this area would only be leased. The reason why I ask the question is that if my memory serves me rightly, there was an outright sale in the area to Chefette. If this is so, Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator can enlighten me whether the difference in policy in that particular sale is proper at this time, and more so what is now more important, if it is now the policy of the Ministry that lands in this area would only be leased and there would be no further outright sales to any individual or company.

SENATOR J. WICKHAM: Mr. President, just one small question. In the Schedule to the Resolution, condition (2) about the rent payable, presumably that figure represents an annual rent. It does not quite say. It says that "the rent payable would be at the rate of....."

SENATOR O'BRIEN TROTMAN: Mr. President, in reply to Senator Franklin, Sir, the Government has no objection to the sale of the land, but in the case of Chefette they offered to purchase the land. So far none of the other businesses has made such an offer and they seem to be prepared to settle for the question of leasing. The whole policy of the Government releasing itself from the responsibility of maintaining these lands is that if the lands are not properly maintained, they will only probably contribute to the explosion of the rat population in that part of St. Michael, not to mention the problems involving debushing and other environmental problems. It is therefore Government's intention that that area should be kept clean and we are therefore seeking to enter into agreements with business people to have them take the land over mainly for this purpose.

SENATOR W. O. FRANKLIN: Mr. President,.....

Mr. PRESIDENT: Just a minute. The Minister has replied to the debate. Do you want some more information?

SENATOR W. O. FRANKLIN: On a point of elucidation, am I right in thinking that the Senator said, that the Government's policy is that they would sell the parcel of land if an approach was made?

SENATOR O'BRIEN TROTMAN: Yes, that is so.

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

RESOLUTION TO COMPULSORILY ACQUIRE LAND AT BEACHMONT, BATHSHEBA

The Fifth Order of the Day was called — to move the passing of a Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Beachmont, Bathsheba, St. Joseph, for the establishment of a Community Centre.

SENATOR O'BRIEN TROTMAN: Mr. President, now there used to be a community centre in Bathsheba some time ago when this Party was in charge of the Government. Then there came another Government who thought that Bathsheba was not part of Barbados and the Community Centre at Bathsheba was allowed to collapse, and what we are seeking to do is to offer a community centre for yet another time to the residents of the Bathsheba area. I should draw to the attention of the Senate that the Schedule to the Resolution which you are reading is not exactly the same Schedule which was passed in the Other Place. I believe that your Schedule says that the land is estimated to be three hectares or thereabouts and the Resolution which was passed in the Other Place had an area of land of 1,500 square metres.

Mr. PRESIDENT: That is the Resolution I have in front of me.

SENATOR O'BRIEN TROTMAN: I will explain what has happened. The correct Schedule should be three hectares. The owner of the land was approached for the purchase.....

Mr. PRESIDENT: Just a minute. Are you ready to proceed?

SENATOR O'BRIEN TROTMAN: Yes, Mr. President. For the benefit of Senators, Sir, who did not benefit from our private discussion, let me explain. The Resolution in the hands of Senators was prepared because of Government's early intention to acquire part of the property from Miss Charles. The lady made representations to Government that when that portion was acquired the portion of land remaining with her would have been

useless to her and after some negotiations Government decided to acquire the entire property so as to prevent her from being stuck with a portion of land with which she could do nothing.

The Ministry responsible for Community Centres then decided that the entire property could be used and it is now decided that the entire property of three hectares will be acquired. In the meantime the House passed a Resolution with the Schedule as it was written in the original intention and did not take in the amendment. It is my understanding, therefore that this afternoon we have to amend the Schedule and then return the amended Resolution to the House for its concurrence.

Mr. PRESIDENT: I am a little bit worried about that. I have to consult the Clerk. Does this mean in effect that the House passes a Resolution for acquiring a certain amount of land and then presumably that cost a certain amount of money and then the Senate amends a Resolution to acquire more land which would cost more money, is that in order?

SENATOR O'BRIEN TROTMAN: In view of the foregoing therefore Sir, I beg to move that the Schedule as circulated be deleted and the new Schedule which I will read be substituted.

"All that certain piece or parcel of land the property of Winifred M. L. Charles situated at Beachmont, Bathsheba in the parish of St. Joseph in this island containing by estimation three hectares or thereabouts abutting and abounding on the Barbados Government railway line to the North on lands of J. L. Goodman and L. Worrell to the east and the public road to the south and west or however else the same may abut and bound."

I beg to move, Sir, that that be substituted for the Schedule that was circulated and I beg to move, Sir that the Senate do now concur in the Resolution as amended.

Mr. PRESIDENT: It is proposed that the Senate concur in the Resolution as amended. I am advised that the amendment is merely in the description of the parcel of land and does not involve any Constitutional problem as far as the House of Assembly is concerned, but the questions of money and the prices and so on are still to be dealt with by the parties concerned. I am therefore advised that this Amendment is in order. Senator Franklin.

SENATOR W. O. FRANKLIN: Mr. President, I requested to see if possible the original portion of 1 500 square meters which would be about 1 600

square feet which was the intention of the Ministry to acquire in the first instance for the construction of a community centre.

Two things here bother me slightly Mr. President, in this. The first one is that I cannot seem to agree that the taking off of the 1 500 square metres would have affected the property so much by way of severance as to make the remainder useless. Be that as it may, in the amended Schedule, the Schedule reads:

"By estimation three hectares which is approximately 6.6 acres."

The Plan that has been sent to me shows that there is now a balance unless there is some other property of about four acres, two roods the property which is contained in this which is just about two hectares, unless this is not the completed plan, the Schedule was not very accurate.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Barrow.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. President, very briefly the point is that Government prefers where it has legitimate use for a property not to cut off piece of the property and go ahead with that part, especially I think Senator Franklin would be one of the first to realise that depending on what part of a property you take, even though it may just be a small part of a large property, you may substantially reduce the enjoyment of that property. Let us take as an example, property that is very long and very narrow and you go and you take off the beachfront part of that property, I believe Senator Franklin would agree that, that, if it is a good beach would certainly amount to the reduction in charge of the property.

The point about it is that Government could use the whole property and since we can use the whole property and the owner was desirous of dealing with all or none, so to speak then it became a matter of convenience. The second point Sir is again Senator Franklin would also appreciate that at the time when these matters come to Parliament so that it may be able to do all that is necessary legally or to enter for the purposes of surveying it is not absolutely essential at that point for the description to be 100% accurate. It is after the survey that the accuracy becomes the important thing.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Rocheford.

SENATOR H. F. G. ROCHEFORD: I just want Mr. President to enquire whether the building which is on the property still remains in good condition and if the Honourable Senator has any idea whether it is going to be of any use.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Blackman.

SENATOR THE HON. D. G. BLACKMAN: Mr. President, the purpose of the acquisition Resolution and the input from the Ministry of Community Services came as a result of a decision on the part of that Ministry which was approved by the Cabinet and the Planning and Priorities Committee to establish a social centre on a part of the land at Beachmont.

After a considerable amount of delay, my Ministry was informed that a suggestion had been made by the owner of the land that it would be in the interest of the Government to acquire the entire property in view of the expected disfigurement of the area, to use the expression transmitted to me, by the acquisition of a part of the property. To the best of my knowledge there has been no decision made as yet with the Government as to how the rest of the property is disposed of.

The Ministry of Housing and Lands is the executing agent in the acquisition process and once the Ministry of Housing and Lands has acquired the property, the remainder of the land, that is, the land other than that on which the community centre will be built, as well as the building, or buildings thereon will have to be subject to discussions among all of the Ministries which may be competing for the use of the property. Then, ultimately it is the recommendation of the Ministry of Housing and Lands which is communicated to the Cabinet.

I believe it is premature for me to comment at this point since the Ministry of Housing and Lands has not yet completed the acquisition process and has not yet approached my Ministry for any proposals as to how the property could be used.

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

Mr. PRESIDENT: The Clerk will take the necessary steps to send the amended Resolution back to the Other Place.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT WESTBURY ROAD ST. MICHAEL

To move the passing of the Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Westbury Road, St. Michael for the construction of a drain.

SENATOR O'BRIEN TROTMAN: Mr. President, the construction of the drain has to do with the con-

struction of the Spring Garden Access Road Project. It has now been discovered that the designs for the Spring Garden Road made very minimal arrangements for flooding which is likely to occur because of the Indian River, I think it is called. The new designs, therefore, had to be done to accommodate probable flooding in the Spring Garden Access Road, and as a result it is necessary to acquire five properties for the purpose of providing adequate drainage to the Indian River.

As far as the Spring Garden Road itself is concerned, I am advised that the road from its junction with Fontabelle to where it comes out at Exmouth will be paved and ready by May, and the rest of the road will continue for another year or so under construction, but we should have total use of the road from Fontabelle to Exmouth by May this year.

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

The question was put to the Senate and agreed to.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT MASON HALL STREET, ST. MICHAEL

SENATOR O'BRIEN TROTMAN: Mr. President, first of all let me say that there are no plans for this particular acquisition ready, so I cannot circulate that.

The land is described in the Schedule, Sir, and the purpose as stated in the Resolution is to provide some playing area for the St. Mary's School which at present has really little or no playing area.

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

SENATOR H. F. G. ROCHEFORD: I was trying to find out from Senator Trotman, Sir, which one of the schools on Mason Hall Street is the Infant School, because they are both on Mason Hall Street. I want to know whether it is the one near to Baxters Road or the one near to St. Mary's Church.

SENATOR O'BRIEN TROTMAN: Mr. President, to be quite honest with you, I do not know Mason Hall Street that well. I will investigate the matter and report to the Senator.

SENATOR J. C. W. WICKHAM: For what it is worth — I would not like to presume to be answering on behalf of the Senator — but I am fairly sure that the Infants School is the school which both Senator Rocheford and myself shared the honour of having attended.

SENATOR W. O. FRANKLIN: Mr. President, I would like to enquire from the Senator about the policy

of acquisition for playing fields, because at Beulah in St. Philip there is a school there with absolutely no playing facilities, and there is a nice idle piece of land next to Beulah, by the Church, and it is a very ugly sight now because it is overgrown by trees and shrubs, and I would invite the Senator to enquire if the necessary acquisition of this parcel of land can be carried out. It would provide these facilities as well as remove what is now a hazard to traffic, because the grass there is quite high, and for the buses taking that turn the sight line is impaired by the growth on the parcel of land.

SENATOR THE HON. D. G. BLACKMAN: Mr. President, the policy of the Ministry of Community Services with respect to the location of playing fields is largely predicated upon information being brought to the attention of the Ministry in the appropriate way by persons interested in the development of sport and recreation in the area concerned.

The Minister of Community Services is not a magician, he cannot sit in his office and utter the words "ABRA CADABRA" and then locations where there is a demand for a playing field would invade his consciousness, and consequently we rely to a large extent upon parliamentarians, would-be parliamentarians, social workers and other people within the communities to bring these matters to our attention.

Within the particular electoral district for which Senator Franklin has expressed his concern, the Ministry of Community Services has been very active over the past few years in matters relating to sport. We have completed a pavilion at Chapel, and the present representative of the constituency about two years ago, took me to a place called Supers and identified an area. We were subsequently advised that this piece of land might better be used for agricultural purposes, and another piece of land in the Thicketts area was identified, and the Cabinet has just approved this area in Thicketts for acquisition.

Also, about 18 months ago it was brought to our attention that six acres of land at Bayleys, St. Philip — I believe also in the same electoral district — would be available, and this also is in the process of acquisition. Also, East Point — I believe that is in the same electoral district — there were requests made with respect to the development of a sports and recreation centre for the youth in East Point. A derelict building owned by Government was identified and we were told that the cost of renovating it for the use of the youth in the East Point district would be \$30,000.

The Ministry of Community Services has decided to release this money in three phases. During the current financial year they spent \$10 000; during the financial year which comes into being next week another \$10 000 will be allocated for them, and hopefully the year there-

after the third \$10 000. The youths are doing the work themselves on this particular building near the lighthouse and they have made great progress in the development of the area. All of these projects, the pavilion, the improvement of the playing field at Chapel as well as the Thicketts Land and the land at Bayleys together with the East Point community centre as well as the projected development of a building in the area for a skills training programme are needs which were brought to the attention of the Ministry of Community Services either by the representative or people who were concerned in the area. And now that Senator Franklin is aware of the procedure which we normally use, we look forward in the Ministry of Community Services to entertaining his requests as long as they are reasonable and can be fitted into our scheme of priorities. Thank you, Mr. President.

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

Mr. PRESIDENT: Just before the Clerk calls a new order of Business, there seems to be some question as to whether these Bills or some of them have been circulated to Senators. My understanding is that the Government is ready to deal with two Bills, the Offshore Banking Bill, the Shipping Bill is not to be dealt with, and the other one is the Administrative Appeals Tribunal Bill. Have members got and studied those two Bills?

SENATOR H. F. G. ROCHEFORD: I got my copies from among House of Assembly papers, not from amongst Senate papers. They have not been circulated as Senate Papers. I got them as papers that come to us in the course of receiving House of Assembly papers.

Mr. PRESIDENT: The whole point of course of that procedure is that it does give members a chance to know what is going on and if possible to start reading these Bills, but we have gone through this point before and members have declared that even though they are aware of the existence of the legislation, they do not

necessarily settle down to studying them until they get their own papers. In view of that fact, I think the Minister is prepared to let us adjourn and come back another time to deal with all the other matters. The Minister is not ready for the Shipping Bill.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. President, I understood from the Central Bank that they wanted to get the Offshore Banking Bill. They telephoned me during the week to ask about the chance of getting it and I told them they should be able to get it on Friday. At that time I was not in a position to know that the arrangements which would appear on the surface, simple arrangements for circulating papers to members, could have broken down, and that even if they had broken down that they would have been discovered only at the end of the third day of sitting, and I would really like to appeal to the Clerks to ensure that they set in train such procedures as would not frustrate members who really I am sure would have welcomed the opportunity to get through as much of the business as possible and not have to schedule a meeting for 8th April. In the circumstances, Sir, with the budget debate taking place next week, I can see no alternative but to adjourn until Wednesday, 8th April.

ADJOURNMENT

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. President, in moving the adjournment, I would like to urge very strongly on the Clerk's office that they try to get all of the relevant documentation to members and to get them to them as early as possible, please.

I therefore move that the Senate stand adjourned until Wednesday, 8th April, 1981, at 2.30 p.m.

The question was put to the Senate and agreed to, and Mr. President adjourned the Senate accordingly. 6.30 p.m.