

THE SENATE DEBATES

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

FIRST SESSION 1981 - 86

THE SENATE

Wednesday, 10th March, 1982.

The Senate met in the Senate Chamber, Public Buildings on Wednesday March 10, 1982, at 11.10 a.m. today.

PRESENT

His Honour Senator the Honourable Sir ARNOTT CATO, M.B., Ch.B., LL.D., (President); His Honour Senator J. C. W. WICKHAM, M.B.E., (Deputy President); Senator the Hon. N. A. BARROW, B.A., LL.B., (Minister of Information and Culture) (Leader of the Senate); Senator the Hon. O'BRIEN TROTMAN, (Minister of State in the Prime Minister's Office); Senator H. R. LINTON, LL.B.; Senator C. I. E. DEANE; Senator Mrs. E. M. LYNCH, B.A., G.C.M.; Senator C. A. GRIFFITH, (Parliamentary Secretary, Prime Minister's Office); Senator J. E. D. WILLIAMS; Senator D. A. C. SIMMONS, LL.M.; Senator Miss J. CLARKE; Senator StC. E. HOWELL; Senator Mrs. M. O. REECE; Senator E. E. GREAVES, B.A., M.Ed.; Senator W. W. HALL; Senator A. W. A. McCLEAN; Senator Mrs. G. G. READER, M.B.E.; Senator C. D. SEALE; Senator the Rev. Can. I. McK. JONES and Senator K. A. ROUSE.

Prayers were read by Dr. the Rev. Lionel Crawford.

Mr. PRESIDENT: I believe honourable Members will remember that a Message was read by the Deputy President in my absence concerning the appointment of Mr. Reece as a Senator. I am advised that Mr. Reece has taken the necessary Oaths, and I will ask the Clerk to ask Mr. Reece to come and take his seat.

Senator A. P. L. Reece accompanied by the Deputy Clerk entered the Chamber.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Reece, on behalf of honourable Members and on my own behalf I give you a cordial welcome to this body and I wish you a happy and successful term of office. I am advised that you have taken the necessary Oaths, and I now invite you to take your seat as a member of this body.

SENATOR A. P. L. REECE: Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. President, Members of the Upper Chamber, I deem it an honour and a privilege to have been called to act in the service of my country and in a Chamber of which we as a nation are proud. There is no other similar institution of which perfect freedom exists, perfect freedom of debate that is so seldom marred by lack of dignity or want of good taste, and as it is comprised of persons who represent national interests, it is itself representative of the best traditions of our national character and demeanour.

There is no doubt, Mr. President, that there are some who try to prepare a strong indictment of our existing parliamentary system. These theorists find it very easy to say that the Senate talks too much, does too little and is an anachronism that should be swept away. But apart from theory, Mr. President, it is my opinion that the mother of Parliament is still in enjoyment of a vigorous and useful vitality, and as a whole, still capable of transacting effectually the business of the country.

My experience as a Deputy Clerk of Parliament and of this Chamber has shown that there are hardly any periods of congestion or obstruction, and indeed the work is done and well done. After all that is the best thing one can say of any working Assembly.

Mr. President, it is therefore a pleasure to accept your very warm statement of welcome and I should like

to take this opportunity of telling you, Mr. President, how much I appreciate my elevation to this Upper Chamber, and I shall be endeavouring to maintain your high standards and will truly and honestly conduct myself in the office of a Senator of this island. I thank you.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Before I call on the Clerk to read the Orders of the day, I understand that congratulations and good wishes and many happy returns are in order for Senator Reader, and on your behalf and my own I extend to her many happy returns of the day.

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

The Annual Report of the Sanitation Service Authority for the period April, 1980 to March, 1981.

The Mortgage Insurance (Amendment) Regulations, 1982.

The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) Order, 1982.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

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

A Resolution to approve the guarantee by the Minister of Finance to the Central Bank of Barbados of the repayment of the principal sum not exceeding \$2.5 million and of interest thereon advanced to the Barbados Development Bank.

A Bill to amend the Police Act, Cap. 167.

A Bill to revise and consolidate the law relating to public parks, beaches and caves and related matters.

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

PUBLIC BUSINESS

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE USE OF US\$2.0 MILLION FROM THE OPEC FUND BY THE GOVERNMENT

The First Order of the Day was called - To move the passing of the Resolution to approve the use of the sum of US\$2.0 million from the OPEC Fund for the purpose of assisting in the provision of local cost funding of the Scotland District Development, the Community

Health Polyclinics, Spring Garden/St. Barnabas Roads and Heywoods Holiday Village.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. President, if you look at the Order Paper I think you will notice, Sir, that there has been adequate notice given to the Resolution but that on the Order Paper itself there are two Bills which are down for a First Reading and there is at least one other and this appears on what I shall refer to as the Supplementary Order Paper which was sent around, dated March 8. There are three other Bills. The point, Sir, is that there are a couple of these matters which have their own urgency and which was circulated in good time and I therefore believe that Members would not object to a motion to suspend Standing Order No. 45(2) in order to deal with these matters.

However especially at this time, Sir, when the debate on the Estimates is due to begin in the Other Place and because of the staffing structure for Parliament, it is not possible for both Chambers to be meeting at the same time. I believe we anticipate, Sir, that the Appropriation Bill will reach us in time for debate to start on Monday March 29 and assuming the debate ends on that date we should be in good time - which only really gives us three days in which we can get the business done.

Accordingly these other matters which we would wish to dispose of before - those that are substantial - at least the one I believe that would attract debate, is indeed a matter which is most urgent and it may well be that Members will prefer to clear the Order Paper and come back for the Estimates Debate although of course if Members so prefer, we can clear what we can and come back next week.

Accordingly, Sir, I wish to move the suspension of Standing Order 45 (2).

Mr. PRESIDENT: Just a minute. I think the proper course would be to give notice of the Bills and the other items and we will record them as having been read and then you can move the suspension of the Standing Order and test the feeling of the House as to whether they will be willing to go ahead.

My understanding is that the notice is in order, that it has already been recorded and what I will do now is to ask the Clerk to record the Bills of which the Minister has spoken - which the Minister has sent around in the Supplementary Notice and they be recorded as having been read a first time so that the Minister can now request the House to suspend the Standing Order, if it will, so that they can be dealt with.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDER

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: I beg to move the suspension of Standing Order 45 (2).

Mr. PRESIDENT: The Minister has moved the suspension of Standing Order 45 (2) so that these measures may be dealt with if the Senate so wishes.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: Mr. President, if I could just comment on this particular matter that is before the House. I just want to say that this puts me in some difficulty because I came here today having been circulated with an Order Paper with three items on it. I cannot recollect receiving the Supplementary Order Paper. As a matter of fact, this one which I have was delivered to my home on Saturday.

I would have assumed that if this is the Order Paper for Wednesday March 10, that it would contain the items which are going to be dealt with today so that I came here, as I said, prepared only to deal with three items because that is what is here.

I mean, it is rather of a shock now to hear that the Hon. Minister is proposing that we deal with some other matters and I certainly cannot support the suspension of the Standing Order.

Mr. PRESIDENT: I think the Hon. Minister is not intending to press anything. His is just making a suggestion because we have a schedule. We are testing the feelings of honourable Members. *(Aside)* Senator Barrow.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: The point is, Mr. President, whether or not honourable Members have come prepared to deal with the three items or with the extended Order Paper, it is still necessary to suspend the Standing Order. And what Senator Greaves just said is precisely the kind of information which would influence us over here in deciding if to press for only the three items or the three plus. If for example, as is the case, he has not got the additional items, he obviously has not had time to study them so even if there is a case where an honourable Senator may have got the additional items and not had time to study them clearly, we cannot proceed.

But the urgent matters or the most urgent of the matters, I am sure, are to found on the Order Paper itself and in fact, we welcome the fact that honourable Members are in fact prepared to deal with the three items on the Order Paper. I believe what it really means, Sir, is that next week, we will have to meet again to dispose of the other items.

I think the Estimates Debate begins on the 22nd — if the Clerks could be a little helpful, Sir — I believe the Estimates Debates begins on the 22nd. Sir, if they have not had notice, clearly it cannot begin before the 22nd.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Do I interpret the feeling of the Honourable House correctly that whereas we could proceed with the Orders that have been circulated for today, honourable Members would prefer to leave the other items until a subsequent meeting? *(Pause)* I think that is the feeling of the Honourable House.

The honourable Senators agree with the suspension of 45 (2). Let us proceed with the Order Paper.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. President, Sir, before the Clerk should call the item, I should wish to indicate that Senator Griffith is taking care of Order No. 1 and I may also add, Sir, that when we come to consider the Resolution to approve the guarantee by the Ministry of Finance to repay the principal sum not exceeding \$10 million to be borrowed by the Barbados Development Bank, he will also be taking care of that.

Senator Trotman will be taking care of Orders No. 2 and No. 3 and also when we come to do the Bill to amend the Occupational Training Act. And therefore, the other items are the items that should be put down in my name. Therefore, there are two to be taken by Senator Trotman and one to be taken by Senator Griffith.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE USE OF US\$2.0 MILLION FROM THE OPEC FUND BY THE GOVERNMENT

Order No. 1 was called — To move the passing of a Resolution to approve the use of the sum of US\$2.0 million from the OPEC Fund for the purpose of assisting in the provision of local cost funding of the Scotland District Development, the Community Health Polyclinics, Spring Garden/St. Barnabas Roads and Heywoods Holiday Village.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Griffith.

SENATOR C. A. GRIFFITH: Mr. President, the Government is seeking approval for the use of the sum of US\$2.0 million from OPEC Special Fund.

The member countries of OPEC — and I daresay, we are all familiar by now what OPEC is — it is the Organisation of Petroleum Exporting Countries — have agreed to this loan of US\$2.0 million to the Government of Barbados. It is a soft loan. The counterpart funds generated by the loan will be used in a specific area.

Now, as we all may know, whenever international agreements are consummated with financial institutions there is usually a requirement for a local cost component and the objective of the funds, therefore, is to finance the local cost component in specific areas — in the Scotland District Development, in the Community Health Polyclinics, the Spring Garden/ St. Barnabas road construction and the Heywoods Holiday Village.

The loan will be repayable in 14 consecutive half yearly instalments beginning in October, 1984 because there will be a grace period running up to that date. The interest on the loan is at eight percent and the service charge on the loan is at the rate of one half of one percent of the principle amount of the loan withdrawn and outstanding from time to time.

This is not the first time, Sir, that we have been the beneficiaries of what I consider soft loans from the OPEC fund. In 1979, we had one loan from OPEC. In 1980, we also had another loan from OPEC. I daresay that honourable Members will want to probably deal with the relationship of Barbados with OPEC countries. As we all know there has been considerable surplus wealth generated since 1973 by the increasing oil prices and the objective of the special fund set up by OPEC has been to try to alleviate some of the problems affecting developing countries by providing Balance of Payments support.

Now there may be a lot of complaints that this kind of situation is not really beneficial because countries like Barbados have been adversely affected by the increased oil prices as a result of the activity of the OPEC cartel. I believe, Sir, that every one of us is aware — and indeed have been made painfully aware — of the effects of the increased oil prices and we have been taking some serious steps to condition the economy of Barbados to deal with the adversities created by increased oil prices. This is not to say that because we are beneficiaries from loans from the OPEC Special Fund that we condone what has happened in terms of increased prices in crude oil.

As we may know it, Sir, there is a present world glut on oil and OPEC countries themselves are feeling the brunt of the world glut and considerable slackening of demand and in a few weeks — in a matter of days I daresay — there will be a meeting of the OPEC countries to look at their pricing policies, in an attempt to tighten up the world market in effect and to try to stabilise prices.

Mr. President, I beg to move that the Senate concur in this Resolution.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: Mr. President, I think that we are discussing a very important and serious

Resolution, important from the point of view of what it indicates as to what I consider to be a rather sad state in our financial affairs. It is no point in Senator Griffith, who introduced this Resolution, ranging far and wide about OPEC and oil prices. We know the kind of impact which the oil prices would have had on the economy. I think what is of particular importance to us in this country and what should be engaging the attention of the Senate — and indeed what Senator Griffith should be telling us, should be the true state of our economic affairs.

When we reach the point where we have to go to borrow money to assist, as it were, with matching funds — providing matching funds for a project, I think it is indicative of the state of the economy. In simple terms this is a situation where we have gone to the OPEC Fund to borrow money to assist us in putting money up front to match the money which has already been borrowed for the projects which are already named.

Now, if we look at the projects which we are looking at here, one is the Scotland District Development. This is not particularly new. Development has been going on in the Scotland area for a long time and Government is constantly borrowing money to keep this particular project going because of the many difficulties and problems which are experienced in a particular area.

I thought that the Minister would be giving us some indication as to the kind of progress which is taking place on a development such as this. After all, I believe that he owes it to this Honourable Chamber, if we are going to be called upon to provide this loan, to vote in support of this, that some kind of progress report, some kind of indication as to the difficulties and the problems which are being experienced, should be part of the presentation which we should be treated to. Maybe he is not in a position to do this and therefore he wisely decided to stay away from it.

The Community Health Polyclinics, as I am well aware, is a project which began somewhere in the mid-seventies. The first set of funds came through, I believe either in 1975 or 1976, from the European Development Fund. It is true that these clinics were not called polyclinics in those days, they were called multi-purpose clinics. I do not know if there is any difference between a multi-purpose clinic and a polyclinic, but my little understanding of the meaning of "poly" and "multi" is that one I suspect is of Greek origin and the other is of Latin origin, but they mean the same thing.

The point is that these are projects which have been on stream for a long time, and for which I would have thought at this point in time, that the requisite matching funds would have already been provided.

Then we come to the Spring Garden — St. Barnabas Road which is a new project for which I believe money has already been raised from one of the international agencies. My understanding of raising funds for projects such as these is that the Government has to give some indication to the loan agency of its ability to provide matching funds or to generate matching funds locally.

I would have thought that that matter would have been already cleared, but here we are in a situation now where we are putting up these projects to OPEC to get additional funds for a purpose for which it would seem ought to have already been covered.

Heywoods Holiday Village again is a development which has been on the cards for a long time, one about which there was much talk — Duffus investigation and what have you — presumably with a view to finding out all sorts of things. But again we were told that funds had already been provided for this, and again one would have been led to believe that in putting up this particular project, and in the approval which would have been given by the lending agency, that the Government would have displayed its ability to provide the counterpart funds locally.

To use a term which is not particularly used in this august Chamber, but which is used in the Lower House, we are being served up with some cold soup, this is cold soup being served up and warmed up again. I think we ought to be very concerned about this particular matter, and our concern must be, as I said, directed towards the general economic situation in this country.

It has been stated that, for example, in the Heywoods Holiday Village — and if this is what the funds are required for — that there has been a lot of overruns. My information is that the cost overrun on that particular project is in the region of \$30 million.

I do not know what is the situation relative to the Spring Garden — St. Barnabas Road, but certainly some indication ought to be given of this by the Minister. I would like to think that the Minister can give us some indication as to the progress of both roads, because here it is you have a situation where, for example, the Spring Garden Road was started without any clear indication as to how it would reach Black Rock.

I understand that this has recently been finalised, but it is a fact that at one stage the Government was thinking of abandoning the completion of that road, so that we are seeing situations where the Government is displaying lack of planning — total mismanagement — because when you have this kind of situation, and where there have been these cost overruns, where we have these kinds of difficulties, I think it is definitely

an indication of mismanagement of the affairs of this country.

The Minister who introduced this Resolution owes it to the House to explain thoroughly what is happening and not just coming and telling us about OPEC, and that the Barbados Labour Party Government is the only Government that has got money from OPEC. I am not saying he said that, I am just reading down the line, I am anticipating, I know how the argument goes, because it was not established in our time. You know how the argument goes, you understand, we could not get any money from OPEC because I do not know if the OPEC Fund would have been going in the kind of way at the time we were in power. Anyway, that is beside the point.

This goes back to the point which we have been making from this side — that is from this corner — ever since the Chamber opened — that is the lack of information which is presented to the Chamber. And I think it is a very sad commentary on the way in which Government Ministers in the Upper Chamber would want to conduct the affairs of this Chamber. I would hope that we would be able to benefit from proper information when the Minister gets up to reply.

Mr. President, this borrowing will further add to our National Debt. A recent search in the last Economic and Financial Statistics of the Central Bank — I think it is the January edition — reveals that in November 1981 our total National Debt stood at \$702.2 million. The Minister ought to give us some indication, if he knows, as to what is the National Debt at this point in time or at the end of February. This is the kind of information which I submit ought to be forthcoming on this particular matter, and at this time of economic crisis.

All the measures which we have to look at and which we can see coming up the road are matters of some serious and important financial implications. I will just conclude by saying that it is clear to us on our side that the economy is in a very very perilous state, and I would like the Minister to give some indication to the public about this, because I believe that if there is one way of getting public sympathy in a matter like this, it would be to reveal the true state of the economy particularly if you are going to expect support in difficult times which you have ahead.

SENATOR A. W. A. McCLEAN: Mr. President, I do agree that on occasions such as this it would be helpful if we had some additional information on the progress of the projects to which the proposal relates and on the general conditions of the economy and so on. That might perhaps enable us to make interventions which might be rather more constructive in terms of

providing suggestions for Government and so on, but I cannot agree that this Resolution in and of itself is indicative of anything that is particularly wrong with the Barbadian economy.

There is nothing wrong with seeking to borrow money which can be used for counterpart purposes. In the final analysis the resources at Government's disposal will be allocated over a range of things. It might be that for accounting purposes you relate the loan to a particular activity, but viewed from a higher and more general perspective, Government is engaged in raising funds in different ways to finance projects, and because of the conditionality attaching to the various types of loans, because of the types of use that you can make of different loan opportunities, you will find that Government would then organise its loans accordingly. So the fact that Government is in a position to borrow some money which can be used as counterpart funding should not be taken as indicating that Government could not have funded the thing otherwise than through this particular loan.

Again while I would be supportive of any effort to raise money of this order, first of all having regard to the rate of interest which is quite modest in terms of what prevails nowadays, and secondly that a small country such as Barbados will always be fairly hard-pressed to finance capital projects of any degree of ambition if one must conform to the levels of counterpart funding that the World Bank and such institutions expect you to contribute. Indeed, I probably suggested in an earlier intervention in this Chamber some time ago, one of the ways in which we have to influence international institutions is in the direction of reducing the amount of counterpart funds that small countries would have to contribute in relation to any capital projects. For those reasons I do not think that one can condemn the act of borrowing from the OPEC for this particular purpose.

This is not to gainsay that it might not be perceived – and indeed there might be problems in economic circumstances in Barbados at this point in time – because indeed the economy has gone into recession. And if we did have some of the information which Senator Greaves asked for, as I said, we might be rather more pointed in our comments.

From time to time, we have made comments in here as to what went wrong for our finances and what was wrong with the policy responses of Government, and it is perhaps appropriate at this stage once again to call attention to a particular aspect of Government policy that I believe went wrong as a response to the circumstances which confronted Government round about August/September.

I say it is desirable to repeat it, because I am not so sure that everyone has grasped the full significance of the point I was trying to make at the time, and indeed in some sections of the media it was suggested that I was engaging in partial analysis when I indicated that the Central Bank made an error in increasing interest rates in Barbados as part of the strategy for coping with the imminent Balance of Payments problem. People have identified reasons why the Central Bank could have pursued this policy, and those reasons although not articulated by the Central Bank seem to be a reasonable deduction from statements made by the Central Bank, and so I myself would like to point out the fallacies which some people hold in this particular area.

It was felt that one of the effects of increasing the interest rates in Barbados would have been to reduce the demand for loans, and hence the level of loans and the level of credit in the economy and the reduction in the level of credit would have led to a reduction in the level of imports and hence an improvement in our balance of payments position. This is not the case in the context of the Barbadian economy today.

Credit in Barbados at the moment is not constrained by the demand for credit. It is constrained by the availability of credit. In other words, there are people out there still willing to borrow money at the high interest rates, but who cannot get it to borrow. So the question of raising interest rates to contain the level of credit in the country does not speak to the point. We are not into that situation.

Indeed raising the rates do have an effect on demand which is already excessive, but the effect is an undesirable effect. What it does is to cause certain businesses to close their doors because it has moved them into a position of unviability from a financial point of view, and it has caused others to lay off workers in order to try to maintain their financial viability, and the credit which could have gone in part to supporting these businesses and supporting employment would go to an area which is perhaps less productive and make rather less a contribution to the development of the country.

So interest rates do not reduce the level of credit in the country. They have an impact on the allocation of that credit and an unfavourable impact because it is the businessman who has to make profits and so on that is usually that first person to be forced out. The people who are borrowing money for consumption purposes usually put a high value on acquiring a motor car, a fridge or a video-cassette and they want it at all cost no matter what the interest. But a fellow who is only borrowing money to make money quickly leaves the market when he is not in a position to borrow money to make money and that is the problem we have been confronted with.

People have made the point that we raise interest rates to stop money from flowing out to America and other high interest rate areas. We have exchange rate controls in place to deal with that and if there is a problem in that area, it has to be an illegal problem which we cannot reasonably cope with by raising interest rates. We have people circumventing the exchange rate system — which I am not so sure that that has not been to any significant extent.

They made points about the businessmen not repatriating their earnings from exports right away, to keep it up to six months and so on to make something abroad. Again that is not to the detriment of the Barbadian economy. That could only be a problem if you were in the hand-to-mouth position of Jamaica where we need every dollar we earn today to spend today. Barbados is not in that position and so we can afford a situation in which businessmen can spend a little longer bringing back their money especially if they are going to earn something on it because when the businessmen earn, the country earns.

If there are going to have portfolios which earn more than what say the Central Bank would have earned if the money was transferred to them directly, the country as a whole would stand to benefit and we are not in a hand-to-mouth position where we can say that that is posing a problem. So in these circumstances these types of arguments which I am inclined to have believed might have informed the decision of the Central Bank, or Government or whoever are decidedly misplaced.

The impact of the high interest rates, it is said, is to move certain businesses out of the market place for loans — cause them to close down, cut back on unemployment and so on, and on the other hand to increase prices because the interest rate is a cost to most businesses. The stores in town it influences the carrying cost of stores and their cost of inventory. It also influences their profit expectations and they raise their prices when interest rates go up.

We have done ourselves considerable harm by increasing the rates and part and parcel of this is that I think the Barbadian economy within the last two or three months of last year coming through to now is directly because of those high interest rates and can only be reversed by reversing those rates. It can only be reversed by reversing those rates. It cannot be reversed by introducing additional taxation in Barbados.

Already the tax structure in Barbados is one which only needs minor things like when new projects emerge and new situations which did not exist before — that you now have to bring into the tax nest. But we have Customs Duties and Consumption Taxes which for the

most part are *ad valorem* — they go up as the prices go up automatically.

We have an income tax structure which is related to nominal dollars. The dollars you get are progressive and in these circumstances most of the changes you get in taxation that should come from time to time, should be in the form of reducing income taxes, not increasing taxes on anything.

Moreover the level of taxation in the country is at a point that increases in it could be predominately counterproductive. By that I mean you increase the rate at which you collect tax from any activity but you cause that activity to shrink, you cause the tax base to grow smaller and you end up getting the same or sometimes even less than if the tax is lower. That happened to Barbados around 1974/75 and it will happen again in 1982 if we proceed along those lines and to see that there is some opportunity for Government to balance the Budget by increasing taxes. I thank you.

SENATOR StC. E. HOWELL: Mr. President, I rise in support of the Resolution. As usual I am always grateful to Senator McClean for explaining a lot of these economic matters that I myself will like to explain but because of the lack of the necessary expertise would probably think of it but cannot put it over in that manner.

In matters such as these, Sir, it is obvious that honourable Senators from the other side would obviously put the case as they see it in supporting their own Party and it is certainly not the case for those on that side to put the case for the Government. It is to my mind unwise for a member of the Democratic Labour Party to say that the economy is being managed properly or effectively because to say so would mean that they would have no chance of returning to power. Therefore, it is left to us on this side to put our own case.

The problem in putting a case such as the one offered up by Senator Greaves is that having told us that the economy is being managed badly, hence we are bound to borrow overseas, no mention is made of the fact that the loan is in fact a soft loan — even if in fact the loan does not in effect qualify as what is normally classified as a soft loan. It is certainly at eight per cent a favourable loan in terms at current rates of interest on the world market. No mention is made either of what would happen if Government failed to take the initiative to receive loans at low interest rates in order to keep all people in this country at work.

Mr. President, it is clear that today it is common knowledge that there is a world recession. There is not only recession in Barbados, this is world wide. Unemployment continues to rise in the developed countries and in

Barbados it is prudent for the Government to take steps to continue a certain level of employment and to do everything in its power so that if there is any unemployment in Barbados, it does not fall to an unacceptable level.

The loan is to continue to finance and keep therefore in employment those workers in various capital projects. I think the Government should be congratulated now as in the past, in taking the initiative. And I think they must be congratulated further, that notwithstanding criticism in this country, that we are still observed in the eyes of the world financiers as a country which is doing sufficiently well and we can go to them and attract loans at relatively low interest rates and by so doing, we manage to keep our people employed.

There are people in the developed countries and even more so in the developing countries where unemployment is reaching unexpectedly high levels and any Government which takes it upon themselves to see to it that this does not happen in this country should, in my view, be congratulated.

Mr. President, I beg to support the Resolution.

SENATOR C. A. GRIFFITH: Mr. President, many a time and oft, the Government is subject to attacks about the management of the economy. We hear complaints that we do not provide enough information when we are presenting Resolutions or Bills in Parliament but I do not claim to have any special techniques for presenting Resolutions.

I indeed welcome debate whenever matters are presented in this Chamber and I welcome the type of debate which in effect would add some substance to what is being discussed and in effect encourage an alternative point of view. Such is the contribution that one would get from Senator McClean. Sometimes, it bothers me when in this august Chamber, we get contributions from the Opposition on questions of Government's management of this country.

Now, 1976 is not so far away that we should forget what happened at that time and what happened in 1976 was in effect a referendum on the policies of the Government of the day and I have said before, and I make bold to say again, that the present Government has always managed this country when there has been a certain difficulty in the world economy. We have never had it easy in the management of this country and we cannot ignore the impact that international recessionary trends would have on the management of the economy of a place as vulnerable as Barbados.

Yet, we hear every time there is an opportunity to comment on the management of the country, we hear phrases which are designed to garner headlines like, "total mismanagement and a lack of planning." I wonder at the objectivity of those kinds of statements because if you have anything to do with the running of a country, you would appreciate that there are times when the managers of the economy have to take certain steps which may not in the short run effectively assist the man in the street, as some of the Opposition people like to talk about, but in the long run are beneficial to the people of Barbados.

Right now in this country, we are not only trying to manage the country to prepare for tomorrow, but for the turn of the century. The type of short-sightedness which characterized the management of this country, under the management of the Democratic Labour Party Administration, is something that we have to deal with now. So, it is all very easy and political to get up and talk about the sad state of financial affairs. We all know that the country is going through a difficult period. The Rt. Hon. Prime Minister has said it, almost every Government spokesman has made that point before. So, there is nothing new for the Opposition to get up in here and talk about a sad state of affairs.

How long since borrowing money has been a very bad thing for countries? The wealthiest countries in the world borrow money. It is what you do with the money that you borrow that is important and this loan does not seem to have the kind of purpose that I have seen other loans obtained by the former Administration had. This is to satisfy a situation which, of course, is important to this country. And, when we go into the four projects that the Opposition has talked about, the Scotland District Development Programme, the Community Health Polyclinics, the Spring Garden Road, and Heywoods Holiday Village, I made the point before that whenever Government is negotiating loans from international institutions, particularly in projects of these sorts, there is a requirement for a local cost component.

I am not very happy — and I have said this time and again — at the attitude of international lending institutions when they seek to impose their will on countries, particularly countries that are vulnerable — countries that have to seek financial support from these institutions because all kinds of unnecessary conditions are imposed which in effect are an impediment to the successful completion of the project. The Heywoods Holiday Village Project is the kind of project I am talking about.

Now, this is a project that was started by the Democratic Labour Party Administration. There was no vision. Now we are saddled with cost overruns. We should look into what went on in the negotiating process with the World Bank when this project was negotiated. There

was no look at what was going to be happening in 1981 or beyond. Yet, you will hear some grim statements from the Opposition about the Heywoods Holiday Village Project and some other projects, "we are saddled with a white elephant with the Heywoods Project". The Government has admitted this. The cost overruns are substantial. I just had the figures here about the costs. I have no quarrel with the kind of figures that were put out by the Opposition. But they must remember that they negotiated the project. It was the Democratic Labour Party Administration that negotiated this project.

But when we talk about the Spring Garden Road and the St. Barnabas Road, this is where we have to have vision in planning. Now, there is no secret that there has been considerable increase not only in numbers of vehicles on the roads of Barbados, but in the size of vehicles on the roads of Barbados.

When we look around now, we find that we have what is considered in some big countries as a permanent rush hour. I am sure that once before where you could take 20 minutes to get from St. Peter into Bridgetown, it takes about 45 minutes and it is a singular cause of loss of man hours at work. When the roads in Barbados were built, they were not built to handle the kind of heavy duty traffic that we have on the roads today. So there is a need to deal with these kinds of problems.

The Spring Garden Road and the St. Barnabas Road will effectively alleviate some of the traffic problems that we are faced with in Barbados. And if you want to doubt this, even before the Spring Garden Road is finished right now, you find that people are using the road as far as it can take them. Experience has shown you can take five minutes to travel from some part of the Spring Garden Road to Bridgetown whereas before it took 20 minutes. But this is the kind of planning that we need in Barbados and we hear in the DLP Administration talk about the Spring Garden Road. There was talk about it like everything else. They talked about it but nothing was done so the Barbados Labour Party Administration implemented the project and we expect that the people of Barbados will be very happy with the road when it is completed.

The St. Barnabas Road presents a certain difficulty because there are telephone cables and so on that have to be dealt with. I am sure that a number of us have travelled on that St. Barnabas Road and parts of the Pine Road and we have seen what seems like utter confusion at this present time. But there are some aspects of the road that must be carefully gone into before we can lay the pavement. There is excavation of rock for telephone cables and they are placing curves on the road at the Haggatt Hall end. The progress has been a bit slow because there is a relocation of the said telephone cables and the removal of one property.

As far as the polyclinics are concerned, Mr. President, it has been established and it has been admitted by the Democratic Labour Party Administration that there has been a need for decentralization of the health care system in this country.

They used the term "multi-purpose clinics" but it was not something that was the object of careful planning by the Democratic Labour Party administration. The clinic at Warrens was at first supposed to be a crematorium and it was turned into a clinic as an afterthought. That was the Democratic Labour Party Administration.

So when I hear this talk about bad planning, the sad state of economy and all this, we have not hidden from the people of Barbados that we are having problems in the economy of this country. We may have more problems in the fight with BIGWU than with the economy of this country, and with Bobby Clarke and so on. I think that is what the DLP Administration that runs the union has to deal with, BIGWU and Bobby Clarke.

I must say it is a bit irresponsible for us to be fed a diet of attacks on the Government and statements that will garner headlines but in effect will do nothing else to contribute to a debate of this sort. This kind of measure demands intelligent debate, it demands dispassionate discussion on matters affecting the economy — such as the contribution made by Senator McClean — and it is a pity that people who in effect have lived in glass houses for a long time still find themselves wanting to throw stones at a Government which has always operated in effect, in a critical situation, and which has proven as the times pass that when the going is tough this Government can handle it.

Mr. President, I beg to move that the Senate concur in this Resolution.

The question was put to the Senate and agreed to.

THE NATIONAL INSURANCE AND SOCIAL SECURITY (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1982

SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: Mr. President, before proceeding with the Bill, I would like to draw attention to the fact that amendments were just circulated a couple of seconds ago. My understanding is that further amendments ought to have been made in the Other Place but somehow they were not made. It is our proposal therefore to make the amendments now and return the Bill as amended to the Other Place.

It seems to me that there were two amendments to be made to the National Insurance and Social Security Act: one to give effect to the Health Levy, which is the one circulated generally, and the other to give effect to

the Unemployment Benefit Scheme. It would appear as if somehow the file dealing with the Unemployment Benefit Scheme did not reach the Minister of Labour when he was introducing the Bill in the House and therefore he did not make the necessary amendments.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Just make the amendments without referring to what they should have done.

SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: When we are in Committee, therefore, Mr. President, I will make the necessary amendments. As far as the Health Levy is concerned, Sir, the Labour Party in 1976 took to the platform.....

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: Mr. President, just on a point of order. I think we are into a procedural problem here and I would just crave your indulgence again to draw to your attention that this amended document has been circulated seconds ago.

Mr. PRESIDENT: All right, you will have time to deal with that when you are making a speech. If you make a speech now you will not be able to make another one.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: I am not making a speech on it, I am talking about the procedure, nothing else. I started out by saying that we are dealing with a procedural matter, and I would like to suggest that this matter be postponed, because I do not really see how at this stage we could deal with this.

Mr. PRESIDENT: All right, just a minute, the Minister is indicating what he plans to do. When he moves these amendments the House can say that they have not had time to study them, and that is the time at which you can make your objection.

SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: Mr. President, it is not unknown that Bills have been amended in Committee, and therefore if Bills are amended in Committee the Senate does not normally have an opportunity to study the amendments made in Committee. But if there is a possible dispute over whether or not the Senator had ample time to study the amendments, I am prepared to take the third Item immediately and come back to Item No. 2 when he will have had another few minutes to read the amendments.

Mr. PRESIDENT: I would suggest that the Minister makes his Second Reading speech and explain the purpose and the import of the amendments, and Members can decide afterwards how much further they are prepared to go with it today.

SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: I was saying, Mr. President, that since 1976 we on this side

have been advocating the establishment of a National Health Scheme in Barbados. (SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: A free National Health Service). Free is not anywhere in the Manifesto, free is a thing introduced by that side into the whole debate — like free school meals and all these other things.

We propose to have a National Health Scheme. The scheme has got off the ground with the drug element being in force. At present, Sir, the drug scheme is being financed out of the Consolidated Fund I believe to the tune of some \$8 million per annum. It is quite clear that when the full scheme comes into force, when all of us will have the benefits of the scheme without having to pay doctors personally to the extent to which it is done now, that it would take a lot more than \$8 million to fund the scheme.

The Minister of Finance in his last Budgetary Proposals announced the Health Levy which would be used to finance the National Health Scheme. Contributions will be made under the National Insurance Act and the funds collected therefrom will be funded separately in order to make those funds available to the Ministry of Health for the running of the National Health Scheme. It is therefore necessary to authorise the National Insurance Board to collect the funds, because as the present National Insurance and Social Security Act is framed, it cannot collect funds other than for the purpose of National Insurance severance payments.

It is therefore proposed, Sir, to introduce what would now be sections 20A, 20B and 20C into the National Insurance Act to give authority to the National Insurance Board for the collection of the Health Levy which in fact had been paid since last year, and it is necessary to regularise the collection of those fees.

The rates under the Health Levy are set by Order and the Order will be made as soon as the necessary amendment to this Act is made. The other matter to which I referred earlier, the question of unemployment was also referred to by the Minister of Finance in his Budget of last year, and it is necessary to further amend the National Insurance and Social Security Act in Section 12 of the present Act. Opportunity is also taken to update the categories of persons who are exempted from the contributions under the scheme as stated in the original Act.

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

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: Mr. President, we are looking at a Bill that would amend the National Insurance and Social Security Act to make provision for the imposition and collection of a Health Service Contribution.

As you are aware, this has been a matter which has occasioned considerable debate in this country as to the legality of the collections which were made by the National Insurance Board for some time — I believe since October 5 or so last year. We have therefore to examine this particular Bill in that light and to make the general point which I will repeat in Committee about the tendency, particularly in some areas of legislation, to introduce Bills with retroactivity — particularly for the collection of money. We believe that this is bad legislation.

Certainly I will be taking a position on this at the appropriate time, but more specifically, there are a few points which I would want to make on this question of the Health Service Contribution. I know that Senator Griffith does not like to hear me talk about the state of the economy, and he will less like to hear me talk about the state of our health services which have fallen from the very high standard that used to be delivered under the Democratic Labour Party Administration.

There was recently a disclosure, Mr. President, about the situation at the QEH about the shortage of linen in the operating theatre. I believe that the air ought to be cleared on this, and I am giving the Government an opportunity to clear the air on this particular matter because it is a matter which has occasioned some considerable concern.

At the Casualty, there are tremendous hardships which are experienced by people who go to receive service in that particular area. On the question of drugs, I have no particular expertise in this particular area, but I am sure that everybody on that side and the public at large would have been impressed by the contributions which were made by the experts in the Lower House on this particular matter, and there seems to be some cause for considerable concern over the use of generic drugs and drugs which to all intents and purposes have not been fully tested as to side effects and what have you.

You are a medical man, Mr. President, and I know that this has nothing to do with you in your professional capacity, but doctors have been complaining about the side effects which some patients are getting from some of these generic drugs which have.... (*Asides*) That is a foolish point? Well tell the people who are getting these side effects that it is a foolish point. It is a fact that these are the kinds of concern which people are expressing in this particular area.

I believe that we ought to strive to ensure that the quality and the level of our health services are as good as we possibly can make them, because in the analysis this will have its reflection not only in the quality of life but also in the general capacity of our nation to produce, and it generally makes a very impor-

tant contribution towards the well-being of the society. So when we in the Opposition express our concerns about the number of matters which are going wrong in the area of health, I believe that the Government ought to sit up and take note and try to take the well reasoned and proper arguments which have been advanced in this particular area.

A number of people have been concerned for example when statements are made about the state of our health services and the Minister gets up and indicates that all is well in the health garden only to be confronted with a situation shortly after about difficulties in that particular area. So I just throw that out and I would hope that the Government would recognise our position as one which is seeking to assist with the improvement in the quality of service which is delivered in this particular area.

I want to respond to a statement which was made by Senator Trotman in his introduction to this Bill. Senator Trotman said that since 1976 this National Health Service was canvassed by the Barbados Labour Party and I said "free National Health Service" and then he said, it is a matter of record, that the Barbados Labour Party, his Administration never said anything about the free National Health Service and that is nowhere in the Barbados Labour Party Manifesto that there is any mention of a free National Health Service.

I ought to put the records straight on this particular matter because if Senator Trotman is one of the members of the hierarchy of the Barbados Labour Party — I think he was treasurer of the Barbados Labour Party in 1976 occupying a pivotal position — and does not even know what is contained in the manifesto, I really wonder what we can expect from a Senator who is so ill-informed. No wonder, Mr. President, that the Government is mismanaged in the way that it is.

I want to refer to Page 11 of the Manifesto of the Barbados Labour Party. It is a document of the House of Assembly and if needs be, it can be made a document of this Chamber. I could understand if Senator Trotman had looked at this and had missed it but the blindest person would have seen this mentioned on Page 11 because it is written in bold type to emphasise it — you talk about vote catching — "A BLP Government will establish a Free National Health Service" — a capital "F" for "Free"; a capital "N" for "National"; capital "H" for "Health" and a capital "S" for "Service" — all in heavy, heavy, black type, "for all Barbadians". In the Summary — "our Manifesto also emphasises a Free National Health Service".

All I am saying is that admit that you did not really mean a free National Health Service but it appeared to be vote catching.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: On a point of order, Mr. President. Is Senator Greaves suggesting that when people go to the doctor for their service they will have to pay because if I understand that to be the case, — that they would have to pay, then I would say that it is not free. If when you go to the doctor — regardless of how many visits — to the extent of your business that you do not have to pay, I would regard that as free.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: I am merely responding to Senator Trotman to point out that he is in a Party and he does not even know what was written in the Manifesto. But now we come on to the point raised by Senator Barrow, this question of this Free National Health Service.

The money which is being deducted from the wages and salaries of people is for the purpose of providing for this so-called free National Health Service and if people are called upon to pay money to support a particular service, then it is not free. It is as simple as that. We have a situation where a levy is being specifically extracted from the earnings of people for the purposes of supporting this so-called free National Health Service.

I believe the Government ought to hang its head in shame in having misled the people of this country into believing that they would get a Health Service which is free and then in addition to the taxes which they are paying, they have to pay a specific levy to satisfy a particular aim. The Government ought to hang its head in shame for having misled the people of this country. I think this is a very serious indictment.

Let me move on to a couple of other areas because I think the position of the Opposition on this particular Bill and the implications of it is well-known, and I do not think that I have to go too long on this particular area because we will be taking a position on particular sections of the Bill.

Now, I just want to say something on National Insurance. The National Insurance Scheme was established in this country to fulfil a number of things. I am not even going to put it on the record because I know it is well known and I think Barbadians now recognise and indeed recognised for a long time, that the world did not begin, as far as Barbados is concerned, in 1976 — as they would want us to believe.

I think it is a tribute to the foresight of the former Administration to have launched a scheme of this nature. I know that Richardson came here in 1954 and did a report nothing of which was done by the Barbados Labour Party Administration. Nothing was done and it was instituted by the Democratic Labour Party.

In the same way, Mr. President, that you talk about the Government not having foresight, the projects which we just talked about, without even reflecting on the vote which was just taken, all of them are keeping the Barbados Labour Party Administration going. Hardly any new projects have been instituted by the Barbados Labour Party yet you have the accusation about the Democratic Labour Party being a Party without any foresight but you cannot say that about the National Insurance capital and the Social Security legislation which is bringing a tremendous amount of economic security to a large number of people who are working in this country.

Just one matter which I want to raise in relation to the operation of that particular Department or Board as the case may be. Too many people are complaining about the length of time which they have to wait in order to get their payments out of the National Insurance Board office. We have a number of situations where people have been returning to work but have had to wait weeks after they returned to work in order to get what benefits that are due under the particular scheme.

Indeed, were it not for the foresight of the Barbados Workers Union to have negotiated the situation where employers — not all of them — continue to pay to the workers their full wages until they receive the contributions from the National Insurance, then the plight of many workers in this country when they take ill would be a very difficult one. And I would like to appeal for us to have a situation where there is a more ready response on the part of that Department to the applications which are filed for benefits. I would also warn that the Board ought to look very carefully at the situation and try not to get into the situation of Trinidad because their scheme is in a total mess and clearly because administratively, they were not able to handle the benefit applications which were coming up to the Board as expeditiously as they ought to.

I know that the Board has been held up as a model in the Caribbean, that is the way in which it operates. Indeed the number of people from other parts of the Caribbean who are setting up systems usually pattern their systems after the National Insurance Scheme here. I know that the International Labour Organisation which provides consultative services to the National Insurance Board regard the scheme here in Barbados, in the way how it is set up and how it is functioning, as an important one.

But nevertheless, in this particular area there is some considerable complaint which I would suggest, and would hope that some urgent attention be given to — and that is not any destructive criticism. As you are aware, my criticism or comments are always constructive, Mr. President. (Laughter)

Mr. PRESIDENT: Just a minute, just for the benefit of everybody, when you are making comparisons with other countries, it would be better not to name them — especially, countries with which Barbados has friendly terms. You can say another country rather than specify something about another country.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: I take your suggestion, Mr. President, I would just want to withdraw the reference to the name which I called and substitute it by, "a neighbouring country", if that would suffice it. But the point, of course, remains.

So that, what we have is that — and I believe that if we are not careful — if we continue to overburden the National Insurance Office with these collections without looking carefully at the systems operating there — that we are going to run into further trouble and we see a further deterioration in the service which is being offered. And, we consider that to burden the National Insurance Office with the collection of this Health Levy and with another levy which will be coming up at a later time in this discussion, will have the effect of creating further problems in that particular Department.

I believe that some sense of direction is needed in this matter and I believe that the Government ought to look at the matter again and see what can be done in this particular area even to the point of discontinuing the collection of the Levy, because this Levy imposes additional burdens on the working man and the working woman. I believe the amount of contributions which go towards the National Insurance, by way of Levies and National Insurance contributions, is somewhere in the vicinity of, I believe, five percent of a person's weekly earnings.

Overall, when you compare the amount of money which is contributed by the workers with that of employers, when it is all totalled up, you see that it is almost equal. And all we are saying is that this is yet another burden which has been placed around the necks of the poor people in this country and we are appealing to the Government to take steps, to stop and take stock of this particular situation, so as to relieve the poor and suffering people in Barbados.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Barrow.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. President, as I understood Senator Greaves, he need not explain the position of his Party on this subject.

I would like to submit to Senator Greaves that I for one do not know what his Party's position is and while I would not accuse him of now knowing, it would be better indeed, if he brought along somebody competent to explain his Party's position on this matter.

We are dealing, Sir, not with the usual kind of business which is beaten about on political platforms, but is something which in fact ought to be approached as far as possible in something of a non-partisan spirit. Are we in fact a poor community in which the evidence taken throughout the Caribbean relating to the situation in the Thirties and indeed Forties showed that we were not particularly different from other Caribbean countries in that the level of incomes, the level of unemployment, health conditions, housing conditions, were the burning issues — the principal problem of the unrest which struck the Caribbean during the late Thirties. So, if we are going to regard ourselves as being different from others, we can perhaps deny that that is the situation. If we start from there, we are going to understand why it is that certain kinds of political planning must be attracted to Barbados as indeed, the rest of the Caribbean.

We have to face the questions: How are we going to provide education for our children? How are we going to provide housing for our children? How are we going to provide proper health facilities for our children and for our people generally? If we start looking at these, then we will understand why it is that this Government seeks to provide for the better health of the people of this country by a system in which all contribute regardless of your economic station, regardless of your social position. You must be able to go to a doctor and get the medical treatment you require — go and pay regular visits to the doctor so that you can do what is good and preventive in relation to your health and not be overburdened by the high charges which many members of the medical profession inflict upon the poor and suffering people of this country.

There are people, Sir, who are members of the medical profession who talk about drugs — generic drugs and drugs by a patent name. They never talk about the fees they charge. I believe that the community would be well impressed if they understood that apart from Election time, the fees might not be so crippling. What we have to do is protect the country at large against crippling medical fees and to ensure that arrangements are made whereby persons can get their medicines without paying some of the prohibitive charges which they have had to pay.

I am not, Mr. President, going to suggest for one moment that we are going to come along and we are going to erect schemes and that you are not going to find any flaws. Everything has to be given a chance to work and for flaws to be straightened out. I would be surprised if there was not something critical that somebody could say about the Drug Service.

What is important is that we approached the Drug Service like any other service, honestly and conscientiously, and if there are problems, sought to have them

straightened out. But indeed, what has been happening is that the service is hardly allowed to operate without there being a whole lot of political propaganda being made to appear as though it represents some kind of fundamental reasoning of the medical or pharmaceutical professions, and as though it is indeed some vehicle for factual information.

All of the worst impressions one can get about the use of generic drugs have been bandied about from the Democratic Labour Party platform — and in Parliament of all places. Senator Greaves said he did not intend to repeat his Party's stand on the matter. I think that that is a very worthy statement because I know Senator Greaves, like me, does not know what his Party's position is. What we do know is that they have not offered to relieve the financial burden from the public and that is why they all keep zeroing in on the word, "free".

But let us be reasonable, Sir. Did the Barbados Labour Party say we were going to be able to create the money to pay for the service or that the service would have no cost and that the necessity for payment is going to disappear completely? If we are going to stop the poor man who cannot afford to pay from being exposed to crippling charges from the doctors, then what we have to do is to shift the burden of cost somewhere else. What we have done is to spread the cost. This is a very simple matter, Sir.

There is within this country free education, and those who have shouted loudest about free education — members of the Democratic Labour Party — when the Democratic Labour Party came to power in 1961 all the primary school education was already free. The education in the modern secondary schools — Parkinson, St. Leonard's, West St. Joseph and so on — was already free, and the cost of abolishing fees in the grammar schools was a cost to the Treasury of \$144 000. That was all.

But the important point is that they got credit, and they deserved credit for removing those fees. But it is not to be believed that they did anything more than remove the last vestiges of fee paying. Twenty four dollars a term at Lodge and Harrison College, \$21.60 at Queen's College and \$8.00 a term at the other schools could not support the school system. So it was not a big thing in absolute terms, but it was an important psychological point that they removed the last vestiges of fee paying.

They must be able to take the credit for that, but at the same time this does not mean that the cost of the school system disappeared, it did not mean that every year you did not have to come here with Estimates and find money to support the school system. So if they

gave people a free service it does not mean that it did not have to be paid for in some way.

Senator Greaves normally would not appear to be a person who fails to appreciate this point. As a matter of fact, in negotiations, if not he, some of his colleagues are sufficiently frank to say that they will insist on a certain level of settlement even if it has to be paid for in jobs. So he knows that everything has a cost. He knows that if you settle wages beyond a certain level it has a cost in jobs. He knows everything has a cost, so we are not here talking as though we can fool people.

What I like is when I look down and see the employers' representative of Banks and the Barbados Workers' Union representative sitting together — one recognising that he cannot pay more and the other one saying, well send off a few more people and pay a little more. They both know the facts, they both know what the costs are. (SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: Freest country in the world). Under the Barbados Labour Party, Sir, it is a fact — under the Barbados Labour Party we are the freest country in the world, we recognise that.

Sir, I want to go on and make the point that Senator Greaves is suffering from a serious misconception of what a Social Security system is all about. When he talks about Stockman and Richardson, he is also showing a serious misconception of what the factual situation was. If he is going to say that the reports are there and yet the Barbados Labour Party Administration as a result of whose efforts the reports on a Social Security system were done, the studies were made and the reports were submitted — if my dates are right, one report was done in 1954 and one was done in 1959 — they were both done before the change of the Government in 1961.

We agreed that this is so, and if Senator Greaves is going to suggest that it was possible for the Barbados Labour Party to have implemented these reports, he is in fact saying that the state of the work was such that they could have been brought in by 1961. I do not think it would be fair in all the circumstances for me to ask him why it took them until 1967 to bring the scheme in. (SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: To expand the scheme). If he says it was to expand the scheme, I would like to point out that for the first time, the scheme is being expanded — and now the scheme is being expanded he is quarrelling about it.

The point is, Sir, if we talk about a Social Security system, we cannot just stop at a nay-nay Funeral Benefit and a Sick Benefit, we have to look and see what are the things which within the scheme ought to be reasonably provided. Therefore, even if we approach the scheme by permitting of a limited Unemployment Benefit, at

least it is a great concession to the principle of Unemployment Insurance, and we hope that we will be able to extend and provide a more generous Unemployment Benefit without of course going as far as the dole, because we do not want the disadvantages which a system like that usually brings with it. But I cannot think, Sir, of anything which is more appropriate to the Social Security Scheme — apart from pensions of course — which is a more appropriate area of advance than health, given particularly the peculiar facts of the kind of society we live in.

I believe, Sir, that Senator Greaves would be the first to admit that people who earn a certain amount of money and who are now paying on a rather increased level, so that the health benefit may be deducted, may perhaps pay more to the Health Levy than they would have been paying in medical bills. But the people who are down at the bottom in earnings, Mr. President, the people who if what I have been seeing on television is true earn sixty something dollars a month at Opelika..... (Mr. PRESIDENT: A week).....a week, Sir. Sixty something dollars is so little, Sir, that it does not really matter whether it is a month or a week. But those people at Opelika, or those who are complaining about facilities down at Mrs. Ram, that wicked woman.

Mr. President, I would like to help the Union on this, but the trouble is it seems as though the might of the Barbados Workers' Union has been in retreat against the attack from one Bobby Clarke and one Callie Mottley. I cannot understand it. This is Mr. Clarke against whom they passed the Public Order Act, who has taken an ally called one Callie Mottley. I did not even recognise the name, Sir, but they have the Workers' Union in trouble. I cannot follow this thing, Sir, and somebody called Ladipoo something or other.

That, Sir, is a very serious business. I hope that the ability of these jokers to get some kind of a hold is not a reflection that the Barbados Workers' Union is not doing its job. I hope that is not the conclusion we should draw. I would not like to draw that conclusion, Sir. The point is that there is nothing which we can recommend, and I think which reasonable people can recommend, as a justification in all circumstances for expansion of the scheme which is more meritorious than the inclusion of the health benefit.

I believe we must look at the Social Security Scheme against the background of the needs of our own community, against what it is we seek to do to make the lot of the people of this country easier.

I believe that when we have thought along those lines, Sir, the legislation before us will immediately and completely recommend itself. I cannot see, Sir, how we

can just stop with a scheme envisaged in the terms of Stockman or Richardson when we have our own experience to apply and to teach us into what areas we should expand this scheme. I believe, Sir, that today is an important day for us in that it recognises that we are prepared to give legislative reality to the need to provide proper health facilities and a proper health system for the people within the ambit of a Social Security system.

Mr. President, I have every pleasure in supporting this legislation, and I would just want to repeat before sitting down that we must neither be misled by having a focus put where it should not be, which is on the word "free", nor should we allow ourselves to think that the possession of a Health Service is essentially different from an educational system if we consider that the state has a right to provide free education and a free Health Service, because they both have to be paid for and the only justifiable way in which we are going to be able to pay for it — in fact the only way, is if we look to the community and apply a principle which is little different from that in which you pay for everything else, which is, you can afford to do your bit, do it, and let those who have the greatest need benefit. It sounds a little bit close to the language used in another publication, but the fact is that legislation of this sort is legislation reflecting the broad principles of what is best in socialist thought. Thank you, Sir.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. PRESIDENT: I think this is a convenient time to suspend the Sitting. The Sitting will be suspended for 45 minutes.

On Resumption:

Mr. PRESIDENT: This Sitting is resumed.

SENATOR A. W. A. McCLEAN: Mr. President, I am interested to find out why Government considers it either necessary or desirable to have a Health Service Contribution. Basically this contribution is nothing more than an earmarked tax, a tax on the same level as income tax except that this is earmarked for a specific purpose, and it is well established that the practice of having a large number or having any earmarked taxes is not at all to be desired. It removes some degree of flexibility in arranging your budget so to speak, and it can lead to areas of embarrassment.

Let us say for instance that the amount collected under this Health Service Contribution turned out to be rather more than would normally be required. You might find that this might lead to inappropriate expenditure as you try to spend it up for the purpose of health rather than just keeping it in reserve and bearing the

criticism that you are over-taxing the people for this specific purpose, and if it is not enough and you have to resort to the Consolidated Fund, you will come in for more criticism as to why this is necessary when you had this tax already and all that. It also puts a greater burden on the accounting system which Government is utilising, and even the firms would have to identify all those different reasons why they are taking all this money out of people's pay packet.

One would have hoped that the health services could have been financed in the way they have been customarily financed out of general revenue, that is, out of the Consolidated Fund. At the end of the day, Government still has to concern itself with what is the total level of taxes imposed on the people of different income levels — whether or not they earmark it Health Service Contributions, Transport Levies and so on.

It is in those terms that I, in my view, find it both unnecessary and undesirable to have an earmarked tax related to the health services. We have already seen that it has led to some confusion as to what constitutes a free service and what does not constitute a free service.

There is no real difference between the way in which the health services will be financed by virtue of this tax and the way in which education is now being financed. It can be financed out of tax revenues where there is no direct correspondence between one's contribution to financing the services and the benefits which people get out of them. The idea of a free service is only suggestive of the idea that you are not paying on the basis of receiving the service. But quite clearly to the extent that any service involving the use of human and non-human resources is a cost, and the cost must be borne by the agency providing that service, and it must be paid for in some way or the other — and it is usually paid for, whether you call it a free tax, out of some type of tax revenue whether it be by a specific earmarked levy or out of the Consolidated Fund — I would have thought that it would have led to greater flexibility and simplicity in the accounting system if we did not have such a levy and one should consider providing for the health services in the manner in which they are currently provided. I would be interested to know the source of this idea to have this levy, and I would really like to know why it was sought to be a desirable or necessary thing.

SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: Mr. President, Senator Greaves spoke and the first point he attempted to make was the question of the Bill being retroactive. This was almost a point except that even without the Bill which we are about to pass, I hope — which becomes effective from October 5 last year — the factual situation is that employers and employees

have been paying the contribution since October so we are not now passing a Bill which would ask people to look for retroactive payments.

The announcement was made before the payments became due. Employers understood that they had to make the deductions and the matter was handled in the identical way as all Budgetary matters are handled in that under the Provisional Collection of Taxes Act, a Minister may make his Budgetary Proposals which become effective immediately and then the legislation is passed subsequently. So it is not purely accurate to say this Bill is retroactive because the people involved knew that they had to make the deductions. The deductions are being made and there are no questions of retroactive payments.

We have heard a lot of talk in other places about the Drug Scheme and generic drugs and all of that, and brand name drugs. It seems to me, Sir, that being a layman, if you are going to argue that it is not the chemistry that is important but the label that is important, that any person can start making anything without regard to the chemistry involved as the name is one which will be sold easily, that the patient will get better. It becomes as ridiculous as that — that the name is important. It is the brand name that is important. It is what you called a product. You can call it the Senate Assembly Drug and it will get you better. It does not matter what the chemistry is. One would have thought that people who are ill would be concerned with chemistry but Senator Greaves and his other medical associates from his Party think that names are important and not the chemistry. (*Asides*). I am not going to talk or bother about any drugs, Sir, and I am not going to talk about any free Health Service.

The other points which seem to have come across both from Senator McClean and Senator Greaves is the burden on poor people. It seems to me that if the rate is a flat rate and all insurable earnings according to the level set by the National Insurance Scheme, that the persons who pay more National Insurance, and therefore one presumes the ones who earn more salaries, are the ones who will be hardest hit and not the poor people. We like to talk about the man in the street because it sounds good and the poor people because it sounds forceful, but in fact the people who are paying more are the people who are earning more and I would venture to guess, Sir, that the people who pay more are the people who are going to get less out of this scheme. It is one of those.....

SENATOR A. W. A. McCLEAN: On a point of explanation, Mr. President. I did not make any reference to putting a burden on anyone poor or rich. I was just speaking to the method of collecting and earmarking the revenues rather than the incidence of the revenue.

SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: Sorry, I came in when you were making your point but I did clearly hear when Senator Greaves was making a point about the poor people. I have it written down, "Burden on poor people." So the people in the lowest income groups are paying very little towards the scheme and there is no doubt that the people in the lowest income groups are the ones who will get the most benefit out of the scheme.

It takes about one trip to any Health Centre, one trip to the Hospital to see who are the people who benefit from the Health Scheme. They are the poorest groups (*Asides*). They have to spend long times because there are so many people from the group who have to benefit from the Hospital services. They are so many of them who have to go to the Health Centres and they are the ones who are paying less. So there is no burden on any poor people, no man in the street. If there were a burden, it would have to be on the people who are rich, the ones who you like to attack, Sir, so you cannot bat on two wickets.

The point raised by Senator McClean is a matter of opinion — whether one collects a specific fund to pay for a specific purpose or whether all of the money is put into the Consolidated Fund. It is a matter of choice. I do not believe that there is any particular rule which says that we have to collect taxes one way or another but there are two points which cannot be overlooked, Sir: (1) there can be no confusion as to whether or not the Health Fund has money to pay for the health services because it is separately accounted for and secondly, we have to admit that the people who pay more for the scheme will get less out of the scheme and the people who pay less will get more out the scheme. And we have no apologies for saying that, and that is our position, Sir.

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

On motion of Senator the Hon. O'B. TROTMAN, Mr. PRESIDENT left the Chair and the Senate resolved itself into Committee on the Bill, Senator J.C.W. WICKHAM in the Chair.

Clause 1 was called.

SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: It seems to me, Sir, that before we get to Clause 1, that the *Objects and Reasons* have to be sorted out. As I was saying earlier, Mr. Chairman, there are amendments which were circulated which were not in the Bill as printed. In view of those amendments, it has become necessary in our opinion, to amend the *Objects and Reasons* of the Bill as circulated. The *Objects and Reasons* as circulated say that, "This Bill would amend the National Insurance

and Social Security Act, Cap. 47 to make provision for the imposition and collection of a Health Service Contribution."

It is now our opinion, Sir, that it should be amended to read "This Bill would amend the National Insurance and Social Security Act, Cap. 47 to exempt certain persons from the requirement to be insured for sickness and unemployment benefits under the Act and to make provision for the imposition and collection of a Health Service Contribution."

Mr. CHAIRMAN: What is the text of the Bill that came from the Lower House?

SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: This Bill would amend the National Insurance and Social Security Act, Cap. 47, to make provision for the imposition and collection of a Health Service Contribution.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: So if you amend this to read as you say, this would have to go back to the Lower House?

SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: It is my understanding, Sir, that in any case we will have to go back to the Lower House with a Message.

Clause 1 was called.

SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 1 stands part. Senator Greaves.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: Sir, there is some confusion surrounding this Bill, I am not sure what has taken place as far as the *Objects* of the Bill are concerned. I want to get some clarification before we start off because it seems to me that to insert the amendment which the Hon. Minister is talking about would be to change the character of this Bill which is before us.

Now, I know that sometimes we do go through legislation in the Upper House and we look at it and sometimes we find that there is something wrong in it and we would change that and we would send it down to the Lower House. But this seems to me to be a rather odd way of doing it because we are inserting new information into this Bill and I am submitting that if we are going to be doing this — and I must confess that during the luncheon period, the President spoke to me and I agreed that we would let the thing go through — but now that the Hon. Minister is seeking to change what is described as the, *Objects and Reasons* of this particular Bill, I think that this is a new ball game that we are into and before we proceed on to that, I want to get some

clarification on this because there is some confusion and I believe that we might be acting *ultra vires*.

I must confess I do not have the benefit of..... (Aside: Legal mind).....Not legal mind, *May's Parliamentary Procedure* on this particular matter as to the power of the Upper House in a matter such as this. But it would seem to me that it is something that is rather odd and strange and may be *ultra vires*.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Senator Greaves, I am sure I welcome your raising the point because I would welcome discussion on it. But, however, the text of a new insertion of Clause 2 which was circulated and which was in fact debated in the Second Reading has not been passed in the Lower House and in any event, it has to go back with a message from this Senate notifying the Lower House of our agreement to the insertion of this text.

The insertion of this text therefore, alters the *Objects and Reasons* of the Bill and the proposal to amend the *Objects and Reasons* merely to make reference to the exemption which is contained in the new insertion would seem to me to be a reasonable one. I do not have the benefit of *May's Parliamentary Practise* either, but it would seem to me that common sense is not at a disadvantage in this respect. I would welcome further comment on the matter. Senator Greaves.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, whereas I take your point, I would still like to be guided by advice. Maybe, the Clerks should be consulted on this particular matter and by the procedure which might have been established in *May's Parliamentary Procedure* on this particular matter because it is a fundamental thing and I would like to know that we are following the correct procedure in this particular matter because we could very well be doing something which we do not have any power to do.

I know I cannot take note of what the Clerk has said because he has not advised me, but he has advised the Chair.

I would take issue with the suggestion which has been made that we could amend anything that we want to amend. I am contending, Sir, that this is the inclusion of new material and new information. It is not amending an error which appears in the document which has come from the Lower House, it is not taking, let us say, a legal point which can be disputed, but we are inserting new information and some new clauses and I must confess that I am not happy at all with the procedure.

I am just as it were now responding on a procedural matter because I will have to deal with some other aspects. But I just want to make my position clear on this procedural matter. I am not at all happy with it.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Senator Trotman.

SENATOR THE HON. O'BRIEN TROTMAN: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I would have supported Senator Greaves if it were not true that the Honourable Senate also has power, Sir, to initiate legislation. The point of a new clause is really no point because legislation can be initiated in either Honourable Chamber. (Aside)

I want to differ with the Lady Senator on the question of whether or not it is a money Bill. But I believe that the Honourable Chamber also has real power, Sir, to initiate legislation, and therefore, the question that the amendments were not passed in the Lower House or did not start in the Lower House is really of no importance at all.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Senator McClean.

SENATOR A. W. A. McCLEAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I too agree that the amendment which is being proposed would substantially change the character of the Bill and this is reflected in the suggestion that we should also amend the *Objects and Reasons*. I do not know if we can amend *Objects and Reasons*. We can only take note of *Objects and Reasons*.

The other point is that we, on the basis of the First Reading addressed ourselves to the Bill with its *Objects and Reasons* and its particular scope and the amendment is in no way related to those matters. It is an entirely different matter. If this can be included as an amendment to this Bill, presumably anything can be included as an amendment thereto because there is no relationship between anything that is in the Bill as considered in the Honourable House of Assembly and as was read a first time, and the particular amendment.

I see no particular problem in this proposed amendment coming as a separate Bill in itself. It could be initiated in this Honourable Chamber, it could be initiated anywhere. But I would prefer if we were guided by — even if they are not clearly reflected in the Standing Orders at the moment, that amendments should bear some relationship to the substantive matter under consideration.

You do not amend by bringing in new and extraneous matters, and I think that this is a new and extraneous matter as far as the scope of the initial Bill and the Bill, as it stands now before it, is amended. It does not bear on that point. It is true that it bears on the same Act, but it certainly does not bear on what is in here.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Senator Trotman.

SENATOR THE HON. O'BRIEN TROTMAN: I do not know, Sir, but I was very careful at the beginning of

this debate to point out that it was always intended to have the amendments in. I even explained how the amendments were left out. (Asides: Sloppiness) Not from this side. I do not want to identify whose sloppiness it was. It had nothing to do with us. But there was an error and it was intended, as I said earlier, that the amendment would have been made on the Floor of the Honourable House, when the Hon. Minister was doing the Second Reading. It was not then done and I said this at the beginning so that when the Second Reading was being done, honourable Senators should have been aware of the fact that the amendments were part of that. I said carefully, Sir, that I would make the amendments in Committee. So there can be no question of this being extraneous as to the Second Reading debate.

SENATOR A. W. A. McCLEAN: On a point of explanation, Mr. Chairman, extraneous not to the Second Reading speech but extraneous to the content of the Bill as it stands, and we were guided by the President at the time that we should not address this — when we get to the Committee stage we could amend it, but speak to the Bill as it stands now. At least my remarks were directed to the Bill as it stands. My first response to the amendments came at the time when the President suggested we should make it.

If there is some pressing reason why the Government side would like to press it upon us, I myself would not want to stand in the way. But I feel it would be rather tidier and avoiding the possibility of some type of dangerous precedent, that Government may find it embarrassing later on if we should adopt certain guidelines as to how far and wide we can range when we want to amend things.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: It does not seem to me that the Objects and Reasons as they stand now do not reflect the nature of this Bill even with the amendment in. The Bill would amend the National Insurance and Social Security Act to make provision for the imposition and collection of a Health Service Contribution. That seems to me to do no violence to a Bill which includes this amendment which is now before us. It is not inaccurate.

I am certainly at the mercy of the interpreters of the law, but my argument is whether in fact an amendment to the Objects and Reasons is absolutely necessary. If we read the Objects and Reasons, "This Bill would amend the National Insurance and Social Security Act, Cap. 47, to make provision for the imposition and collection of a Health Service Contribution." Does the inclusion of this new Section 2 change the accuracy of that statement?

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that I was not in here when the argument started, because coming in halfway I am at a loss to find out what precisely is the problem. (SENATOR A. W. A. McCLEAN: Would you like me to repeat what I said?) It might help if the Senator repeated it.

The legislation before us is a Bill to amend the National Insurance Act. The amendment before us also has to do with the amendment of the National Insurance Act. Nothing in the amendment affects the desired objective of collections for health benefits. I am therefore at a loss to understand what is wrong with the amendment.

If I may make the point, Sir, an amendment, as I understand it within the Standing Orders of this Honourable Chamber, is relevant in so far as it relates to the subject matter of the legislation. The main legislation is the National Insurance Act. The Bill before the house is an amendment to that legislation and it is the norm that if you wish to amend legislation you take the opportunity when you are moving an amending Statute to include a number or as many things as are relevant to your amendment of the original Statute.

If, therefore, it is desired not only to have an amendment relating to health benefits, but also an amendment relating to contribution towards Unemployment Insurance, it is appropriate that they all be brought in the same amending legislation, and it is done all the time, so I cannot follow. As long as the amendment relates to subject matter within the ambit of the National Insurance Act, I do not indeed see what the conflict can be. Otherwise, what we are saying is that we should bring legislation to amend the Act in one particular, but not another.

SENATOR A. W. A. McCLEAN: Mr. Chairman, if I could perhaps clarify my position for the benefit of the Leader of the Senate, what we have before us is a Bill which proposes to amend the National Insurance and Social Security Act. This is a proposal in the first instance to amend this Bill and then indirectly the National Insurance and Social Security Act. What I am saying is not that this is not pertinent to the National Insurance and Social Security Act, but it is not pertinent to this amendment, to this Bill.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, this is getting deeper and deeper, and this is one of the things which I do not like about rushed legislation. Now, I must confess that in looking at this I did not even read it as carefully as I ought to. It came, and my immediate reaction was how could this be brought at this eleventh hour

and expect us to digest it in terms of having it incorporated into this amendment.

But I continue to make the fundamental point that this is new matter and new matter which ought to be brought before this Chamber in a proper manner. And indeed I would go so far as to say that we have coming up, I believe — I do not think that we have passed the legislation yet, I am not too sure, I missed a couple of meetings — legislation to do with Unemployment Benefits, and this particular amendment has to do not with the Health Service as this amendment to the National Insurance legislation is seeking to deal with, but with another levy which has been imposed. It appears to me that the Government is trying probably to partially sidestep debate on the question of the Unemployment Levy.

Why would the Government in this particular amendment which is seeking to make provision for the imposition and collection of a Health Service Contribution seek to include exemption for persons from unemployment. For example, the exclusion was set on the grounds of people not contributing to the National Health Service — judges and secondary school teachers and all employees other than temporary or casual employees of the National Housing Corporation, any other Board specified in the Schedule to the Statutory Boards Pension Act. Maybe I can understand that.

This is a very serious matter. I am making a serious point and you think that this is a joke, but you see, this has to do with the Unemployment Benefit which would arise out of the Unemployment Levy — another bit of taxation by way of levy which has been imposed on people. It is seeking to exclude certain categories of persons from benefiting from this, presumably because they are employed and it is assumed that the chances of their becoming unemployed would be minimal. After all a judge would hardly become unemployed, so we could understand this particular exemption, but in the context of an Unemployment Levy and Unemployment Benefits and what have you.

What we are therefore saying is that if you are seeking to merge this, we do not see the reason for this. This is a separate and distinct piece of legislation, and the more I talk and look at this, the more I am convinced. I must confess, Mr. Chairman, that I was not as convinced when I first got up as I am convinced now that this is a separate and distinct piece of legislation, and therefore I am not going to support a situation where these two amendments should be taken at this time unless proper analysis was given to this as you give notice in other Bills.

It is true that the Senate can originate legislation, but not like this. You should originate it in a proper way, because I think this demonstrates sloppiness on the part of the Government and on the Leader of the Senate and the Minister under whose name this particular Bill falls. This is sloppy procedure and we cannot support this.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I have spent a long time trying to understand what the point was and now I understand it. Senator Greaves did fortunately make a speech in favour of the substance of the amendment. I think he says he agrees that these people should be exempt. Maybe he agrees that they should be exempt, but the point is that he is on a procedural point and I would like to just strip bare the procedural point for what it is worth, because if you amend an Act six times, whether it is done formally at the end of the year by yourself or by someone who helps you to amend your laws, you would have taken your original Acts and written in the amendments. If you get new pages you will remove the old pages and put in the new pages. In short, something similar to what happens occasionally with all amendments to the same Bill reaching Parliament, in which case the Clerks very kindly for us would consolidate the two amendments into a simple amending Bill.

Now this is why while I was seeking to explain the position a little earlier, I said the former Member for St. Lucy, because I was going to say that Senator Greaves in that capacity was well aware of the fact. In this new capacity he is not aware of the fact that you can consolidate two amendments to the same Bill which is all that is being done here.

Senator Trotman in introducing it pointed out that indeed when the Bill went to the Other Place, this other amendment should have been brought in with the Bill. The files indicate quite clearly that while the public officers had the Bill, they did not get the Bill to the Minister, so the Minister put it through the House without the benefit of the amending Bill which should have gone through at the same time.

We could either just leave it as it is and go through with the Bill as it passed the House, or we can do what would be eminently reasonable and amend the present Bill to include this other amendment and let it then go back to the House so that when it leaves the House again, it would be finished — the legislation would have been complete.

In other words, there is not anything strange in any of this. As long as it is the parent Act that is being amended, if it is to be amended in two different particulars — and what we have before us is one amending Bill relating to one particular — then all we do is to bring into the ambit of this Bill the other particular. This happens all the time. This is nothing new and my friend Senator Greaves knows that very well.

What happened I think, Sir, is that as he read the Bill and made the objection, he caught Senator McClean in full flight and brought him down with him. And having discovered he had company, he then decided he would have to make a point — but what indeed was always a non-point.

I think it is Senator McClean who would not have been aware that this sort of legislation is the everyday diet of Parliament. You have a statute to amend, you have a Bill before you to amend it, instead of bringing two Bills, you consolidate them into one Bill and amend the main statute. If we do not agree that it should be amended in that particular, then what we do is vote against it, but we cannot argue that procedurally it is wrong, because it is okay procedurally. There is nothing new in it.

What I would like to urge, Sir, is that honourable Members address their minds to the points made by Senator Greaves — I nearly said the honourable Member for St. Lucy — at the time when he was speaking when he said that maybe he would agree when he was talking about the subject matter of the amendment that was circulated here. If we all agree with it, then there is no reason why it should not form part of this amending Bill, otherwise what we will do is to amend now in one particular and then have a new amending Bill when it can all be dealt with at the same time.

SENATOR StC. E. HOWELL: Mr. Chairman, while I sympathise with Senator Greaves here — I must say that looking at the amendment it appears at first sight to be a little confusing — I think that Senator Barrow is quite correct when he said that in fact there is nothing new about this. The whole matter, as I understand it, is that there may be some difference if one looks at the amendment as something new or something different. I say it may appear to be of some substance. *(Asides)* You cannot have it both ways. You said it was new, now you are saying it is different. The whole problem, Mr. Chairman, is that even if it is something different, it does not really matter.

My understanding is that a measure, whether it is introduced in the Lower House or the Upper Chamber, can be amended at any stage in either of these Houses. I think procedurally that is correct. That is my understanding. If that is accepted, Sir, that brings us into the

realm of the canons of construction applied in statutory interpretation.

I say that, Sir, to point out that even if we did accept that this is something new — and I do not suggest that it is something new, Sir — and even if we went further to suggest that it is something different, again it does not matter. There is ample authority and precedence for this in this country and under the Westminster principle, as I understand it. To quote, Sir, one example: if one looks at the Law of Property Act 1925 in England, Sir, it is known as the piece of legislation where one follows all the Laws of England slump somewhere in about 200 Sections.

The Law of Property Act there deals with real property, Sir — lands, building, and so forth — and in there you can find very pertinent sections dealing with the Laws of Agency, a highly complicated commercial piece of legislation. You will find also sections dealing with very relevant sections in the relation to the sale of goods. This is the point. You see if he understood this, he would not be confused.

What I am saying, Mr. Chairman, is that this is not new. Bills can be amended and subsequently becomes legislation whereby very important Acts which appear to be entirely different are found there. It is a question of precedence. We have it both in this country and under the Westminster model in England. I see no difficulty really. It is not anything that is new or different. Any amendment in any event will have to be new because it is always something in addition. If it is in addition, it is new in the narrower sense but it does not necessarily mean it is different. But what I am saying, Sir, is that even if it is different it does not really matter because we are permitted to do that in this Chamber, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Senator Howell. Mr. Greaves again?

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, the intervention of the last speaker has provoked me to get up again. I know it really should not happen because I should not really be provoked by the honourable Senator but I really cannot understand how — well, maybe it is a question of principle and what one understands by a principle and certainly my understanding of that is — I am being heckled in a loud aside by the Leader of the House. I am being heckled.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please, please. Senator Greaves?

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: Right, Sir. Thank you. He has discovered a method to throw me off and the whole day he has been talking about some "Callie". I do not know who "Callie" he is talking about. *(Laughter)*.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am trying to follow your argument, Sir.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: Yes, Sir. I just want to repeat that this is new substance which is being sought to be inserted here and I am going to fight this right down, because this is something.....

SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: This is a point of order now. This is a real point of order. He is insisting that it is new matter. When I started the debate on the Bill I drew attention to the new provisions. It cannot therefore be new.

The point I am making, Sir, is this: we sought to amend the main Act, and in starting the debate, I said that in addition to the amendments which were circulated with the Order Paper, there were other amendments which would be made in Committee.

As I understand it, Sir, in the Second Reading speech a Member is free to make any wide ranging speech under the National Insurance Scheme and Senator Greaves did that when he spoke about delays in National Insurance. He spoke about everything to do with National Insurance. He was free then to deal with the question of the Unemployment Benefit. He did not and he is now seeking to make a debate on Unemployment Benefits.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Greaves for better or for worst I am responsible for ruling on this matter at this stage and I need the help of the Senators in their speeches to help me do so. If extraneous matter is brought in and words thrown across the Table, it makes it very difficult for me to do so and therefore I am much more likely to err. But I would not want to do that either and therefore I plea with you to keep your remarks at a point because I will have very shortly to say what has to be done.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: Yes, Sir, I quite appreciate the comments which you have made but Senator Trotman said just now that I had an opportunity to speak on this when I spoke on the Second Reading and indeed when he introduced this Bill, he indicated that some amendments or some new matter was to be introduced.

If you were to check the record of the debate on this particular matter, you will see that even before the Second Reading speech began, I raised an objection to the discussion of this particular matter at this particular point in time because I indicated that as Senator Trotman pointed out, the matter had only been circulated a couple of seconds before he got up to introduce this Bill and the presiding officer at the time indicated that I should be careful because I might have been making a speech on the Second Reading and might not have had an opportunity subsequently to speak on that matter.

At that point I said that I was dealing not with the substance of the Bill but with the procedure. So from the very outset I was questioning the procedure which was being followed on this.

Then it was suggested that any comments which any Senators had to make on this particular matter could be made at the Committee stage and this is for the record and I remember very clearly what happens so I do not understand how Senator Trotman can now come and by some — that may sound unparliamentary if I were to say sleight-of-hand — some technique.....

SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: Mr. Chairman, he has to withdraw. He has to withdraw. I heard it.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: I said it would have been unparliamentary if I said a sleight-of-hand, but I am not going to say that.

SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: I heard it. He has to withdraw. I am really insisting, Sir. He has to withdraw. Everybody knows that he cannot say that, Sir.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: I said I knew it was unparliamentary to say a sleight-of-hand approach.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Senator Greaves, will you please continue. I do not regard it as addressing those remarks to you, Senator Trotman.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: The point is that my position was clear from the very beginning. Honourable Senators can vote how they like on this matter but I do not intend to vote for it because I disagree with the procedure which is involved.

SENATOR A. W. A. McCLEAN: Mr. Chairman, in order to further clarify my position I would like to direct attention to Standing Order 50, paragraph 3(a) which reads "An amendment must be relevant to the subject matter of the Bill, and to the subject matter of the clause to which it relates."

It is a question of interpretation whether the subject matter of this Bill is as stated in the *Objects and Reasons* or whether it is something else. If the subject matter of the Bill relates to the *Objects and Reasons* as specifically identified here, it seems as though the question of the Health Service Contribution is central to the point of relevance.

If the Health Service Contribution is not central to the point of relevance and it is just a Bill relating to the National Insurance and Social Security Act, well then we can go ahead and amend the National Insurance

and Social Security Act in any respect, by way of amendment to this Bill. But it is my interpretation that that would be a wrong way to view.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: What was the reference again?

SENATOR A. W. A. McCLEAN: Standing Order 50 on page 29, paragraph 3(a). It is my interpretation that the subject matter of this Bill is narrower than the National Insurance and Social Security Act and we are not here reviewing the National Insurance and Social Security Act. We are here addressing the point of the Health Service Contribution and it so happens that, in order to address that point, one has to make some appropriate amendment to the National Insurance and Social Security Act.

But the subject matter of this Bill basically relates to the Health Service Contribution and it is because of that that I believe that the proposal for the amendment although pertinent to the National Insurance and Social Security Act is not pertinent to this Bill and therefore, should not arise by way of amendment to this Bill.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Senator Trotman.

SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: Only to point out, Mr. Chairman, Sir, that Senator McClean is batting well, Sir, but on the wrong wicket.

The question he has raised, of Standing Order 50, 3(a) has to deal with the amendment of a Clause in Committee. What we are doing is introducing a new Clause. If we want to amend the Clause as circulated, then that applies.

I just want to point out that you are batting well but you are in the wrong ball game. (*Aside*) Because if you read the entire of 49 and 50 and not merely 50 3(a), that becomes quite clear. You cannot lift the 50 3(a) out of the entire Standing Orders and use it like that. (*Aside*) I beg your pardon, we are not amending the Clause.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Clerk, please. Senator Simmons.

SENATOR D. A. C. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I must apologise for my late arrival at Senate today. I had to go to the hospital first after coming from court. A family matter, Sir.

As I understand what is before the Committee, an attempt is being made to amend Cap. 47 of the Laws of Barbados. This document, Sir, was circulated with the Papers over the weekend. It is my further understanding that today, another document purporting to further this Act, Sir, is before the Committee. I do not

see, except honourable Members are complaining on grounds of short notice, that there is anything of substance to complain about.

Let us just do it step by step, Sir. Cap. 47 is entitled, "National Insurance and Social Security Act". That Act is not being repealed. Parts of that Act are now sought to be amended by the Bill that was circulated. Now, it is instructive, Sir, to look in the Bill that is circulated, at a new Clause 20 (a), to see that Clause 20 (a) speaks of persons to whom Sections 12, 13, 13 (a) and 14 relate. The amendment that was circulated today also purports to amend Section 12 — this long one here, Sir. So, the Honourable Senate would already have had notice that under this one — the one circulated in Clause 20 (a), Section 12 would be affected because it refers specially to Section 12.

All that is being done, as I understand, Sir, is that in this proposed amendment, we are asked now to add, as an amendment to Section 12, what appears on this document. It is undoubted that the Honourable Senate has the power to amend. It is relevant. I do not accept Senator McClean's contention, because we are not repealing the National Insurance and Social Security Act so any legislation which is intended to be inserted into the parent Act, the principal Act, as a new Section or sub-Section is relevant to that principal Act. It does not have to be relevant *in minutiae* to this. It has to be relevant to the principal Act, because we are amending the principal Act.

And in my submission, the amendment that is proposed deals with persons who shall be insured under this Act — meaning the National Insurance and Social Security Act — for Sickness Benefit which is covered by this principal Act. So on grounds of relevance, there can be no substantial arguments because this is relevant to the main Act. All we are doing is to add, obviously, there was a lacuna, *casus omissus*, when this Bill was circulated, I presume, and the new, proposed amendment was not at hand when this was circulated. It would seem so to me, Sir, otherwise, it could have been in there.

But the Honourable Senate has the power clearly, so long as notice has been properly given to further amend. And indeed, the honourable Senator Greaves, Sir, would be familiar when we were in the Other Place with amendments being brought to Bills the same day when we were in the Other Place. I would like to predict, Sir, most likely during debate for the Estimates, amendments will be brought in here, Sir, things which may have escaped the notice of Honourable Members in the Other Place. That is a Bill and you would have amendments circulating on the Appropriation Bill, Sir, during the discussion on the Heads. The Honourable Senate and the Honourable House has that power, Sir. Both have that power.

So, in my submission, Sir, I think we have made heavy weather of what really is a very simple matter: (a) the Honourable Senate has the power to amend, (b) the amendment is relevant to the principal Act. (c) Section 12 is the section that is to be amended and we are aware that from the Bill that was circulated, Section 12 was one of those sections affected. What is the problem, Sir?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Senator Simmons. I have to rule now guided by the expressions of opinion in the Senate and by the fact that when the Bill which is before us was being debated in its Second Reading every Member of the Senate had this before him, and I therefore rule that it would be in order to include the amendment in this aspect of the debate.

Clause 1 was called and passed.

Clause 2 was called.

SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: Clause 2, Sir, is the section which seeks to repeal Section 12 of the principal Act by amending subsection (2) of Section 12. That will be found on the set of amendments which were circulated today.

The new section seeks to exclude from the Unemployment Benefit Scheme certain categories of persons as set out in subsection (b) and subsection (c) of the new section.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: It is proposed that Clause 2 stand part. Clause 2 is now therefore the text of the document which was circulated before the day began.

SENATOR D. A. C. SIMMONS: Sir, on the new circulated document, I picked up a typographical error. On the first page, 2(b) repealing subsection (3) thereof. One of the f's.

SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: I am sorry, I had that corrected.

The question that Clause 2 stand part was put to the Senate and agreed, the Senate dividing as follows:

AYES: Senator the Hon. N. A. BARROW, Senator the Hon. O'B. TROTMAN, Senator Miss J. CLARKE, Senator StC. E. HOWELL, Senator J. E. D. WILLIAMS, Senator D. A. C. SIMMONS, Senator Mrs. M. O. REECE, Senator A. P. L. REECE, Senator Mrs. G. G. READER, Senator Mrs. E. M. LYNCH, Senator the Rev. Canon I. McK. JONES, Senator C. D. SEALE and Senator C.I.E. DEANE - 13.

NOES: Senator E. E. GREAVES and Senator W. W. HALL - 2.

ABSTENTION: Senator A. W. A. McCLEAN.

Clause 3 was called.

SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: In moving that Clause 3 stand part, Sir, I want to make it clear that Clause 3 of the amending Bill would read as on the cyclo-styled sheet, which is as follows:

"The principal Act is amended by inserting therein the following after Part II as Part IIA."

(SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: Go ahead, I will vote against it anyway). This is the problem, Sir, he will vote against it without understanding it, and that is a terrible thing. But for the others who want to vote with understanding I will explain, Sir.

The question that Clause 3 stand part was put to the Senate and agreed to, the Senate dividing as follows:

AYES: Senator the Hon. N. A. BARROW, Senator the Hon. O'B. TROTMAN, Senator Miss J. CLARKE, Senator StC. E. HOWELL, Senator J. E. D. WILLIAMS, Senator D. A. C. SIMMONS, Senator Mrs. M. O. REECE, Senator A. P. L. REECE, Senator C. I. E. DEANE, Senator C. D. SEALE, Senator the Rev. Canon I. McK. JONES, Senator A. W. A. McCLEAN, Senator Mrs. E.M. LYNCH and Senator Mrs. G. G. READER - 14.

NOES: Senator W. W. HALL and Senator E. E. GREAVES - 2.

SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the Senate do now resume and the Bill as amended be reported.

The question was put to the Senate and agreed to, and Mr. CHAIRMAN left the Chair and Mr. PRESIDENT resumed the Chair.

SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: Mr. President, I beg to report the passing of one Bill in Committee with amendments.

The amendments are as were circulated earlier today amending Section 2. Section 3 would be the one circulated earlier on the Order Paper. There is a new Section 2 to the amending Bill. Part 2 (a) becomes Section 3 of the amending Bill.

I beg to move that the Bill as amended be read a third time.

The question was put to the Senate and agreed to.

On the motion of Senator the Hon. O'B. Trotman the Bill was passed, with Senator E. E. Greaves and Senator W. W. Hall recording their dissent.

Mr. PRESIDENT: The Clerk will take the usual steps to send a Message to the Other Place.

THE TRANSPORT LEVY ACT, 1982

The next Order of the Day was called — to move the Second Reading of a Bill to provide for the imposition and collection of a levy on incomes to be used for the improvement of transport and roads.

SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: Mr. President, in what is now known as the mini-Budget of last year, the Minister of Finance proposed that a Transport Levy be charged on all insurable earnings by people who work in this country as well as employers to assist in the construction of roads and the purchase of motor buses for the use of the travelling public in this country. It is considered that our roads which generally had been built in the good old days of horse-drawn vehicles and which generally were constructed by placing of a small film of stone and asphalt over what were dirt tracks can no longer maintain the heavy flow of traffic, not only heavy in terms of the number of vehicles, but heavy in terms of the tonnage which now use our roads.

It is quite clear to us that the roads as then constructed were not designed to handle container vehicles, they were not designed to handle low-loaders with caterpillars on them, and that kind of traffic is destroying the main highways of this country. The Ministry of Transport and Works is constantly fighting with repair jobs repairing potholes as they appear, and it is quite clear that we have to have a new road system which will manage the heavier traffic in this country.

Earlier today, we spoke of the Spring Garden Road and the St. Barnabas Road and we shall have to construct more modern highways if we are to meet the demands of industrialisation. I am told, for example, that we shall soon be having in St. Thomas a plant dealing with the construction of steel items that will have to be taken to the Harbour on trucks. Now if we have to use the conventional roads which we have at present, the roads would not be able to take that. It is therefore necessary that the entire upgrading of the present road system as well as new roads be financed in a special kind of way.

We can argue, Sir, that when we pay our Income Tax and our Customs Duty as the case may be, that some of that money goes to the Ministry of Transport and Works for the maintenance and construction of roads. However the matter is so urgent that it is considered necessary to have a special levy to generate immediate funds specially designed to upgrade the roads as well as to upgrade and expand the fleet of the Transport Board.

The Transport Board now service the entire country. The Board has taken over the last two conces-

sionaires and in taking over those concessions, the Board took over some vehicles which were not quite satisfactory — but the Board has to use them. The Board has been purchasing new vehicles and has purchased more vehicles in the last five years than in any other five year period in the history of the Board, and it is still necessary to buy even more vehicles. It is therefore necessary for us to ask the people who use the bus service and the employers who benefit from their workers using the bus service to contribute to a Transport Levy.

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

SENATOR C. D. SEALE: Mr. President, I rise to support this Bill, but I must confess I have some reservations. I am of the opinion that if the Transport Board was efficiently run there would be no need for a subsidy, far less a levy. It does not take an Einstein to note when passing the Roebuck Street headquarters or the Mangrove depot, the areas that I know, that the management of that Board is in disarray. Any company or Board that presents an untidy and unkempt appearance outside, means that its inside is exhibiting the same poor and inefficient atmosphere.

Sir, if there is no pride in your job, there is no motivation, and Sir, I believe that one of the first things that the Transport Board or the Transport Minister has to do in this country, is to introduce to the employees of the Transport Board a sense of pride. Sir, there is a problem in Barbados in which we tend — the Government that is — to employ persons on university qualifications rather than on practical experience. It is my opinion that if the Transport Board needs some new managers, transport or otherwise, they could find them within the organisation without necessarily having to go outside.

Sir, I believe that there are a number of people working in Transport for many years who could tell the Board what to do without having to have somebody come from somewhere. Sir, if I was the Transport Minister and I appointed a new Board, one of the first things that I would say to that new Board is that for the first three or four weeks you travel on the buses, travel and find out the problems, travel at various times and on various routes because you cannot sit in judgment and carry out judgment unless you know what is going on.

It is my opinion, for instance, that the buses that we presently use in Barbados are unsuitable. They certainly appear to be very hot and I think, Sir, that we have to look for designs suitable to Barbados and not designs suitable to cold countries. Also, anybody in the distribution trade would know, Sir, that you must use various types of vehicles or various sizes of vehicles rather than one standing type.

We must have small buses. Whether we like to call them mini-buses or not, we must have small vehicles. The Transport Board must not get into the situation whereby it has only one size and type of vehicle. It must have all various types, Sir, so I feel that one of the examinations we must do is to look at the type of bus. I was rather pleased the other day when I noticed that the Transport Minister went to the United States because going to Miami, for instance, I see a different type of bus operating there than I see operating in England and I see a different type bus in Miami than I see operating in Germany because the buses in Miami are travelling in 90 degree heat and I think that we here in Barbados should pattern some of our buses on the use of hot countries.

Another thing, Sir. The Transport Board has been plagued, for instance, with failure of the collection of fares. Whether we call it stealing or not, apparently it does not get all of the revenue that it should get, Sir, and I believe that the Transport Board should now take the area of collection of money away from the buses and institute a ticket system. You could have a situation in which you would have to say, a couple of hundred agents around in the country who the Transport Board would sell their tickets to them, give them a permission and these agents in turn would sell them to the travelling public. In this way, the Transport Board would be collecting its fares before one travels and not when they are travelling, Sir.

In another way, Sir, you would know that they would be collecting fares that are not even used because people would put their tickets in their pockets and then the wives would wash their clothes and out go the tickets and the Transport Board would have had that fare.

Also, Sir, it would get quite a bit of cash flow because just imagine you started a system and you appointed, Sir, say, 500 agents and you used a quantity discount and say, you became an agent and had to buy 1 000 tickets and you bought these tickets for \$540 000 to sell at 60 cents Sir, you will find that right away, that with 500 agents you would have something like \$270 000 coming into the Transport Board on the first morning and this money and this cash flow would keep coming in all the time and then we would not have this problem of fares not being collected because there would be no money there. We can have little kiosks at the depots where tickets will be sold until the last bus leaves.

Also of importance, Sir, is that I have seen them on certain routes that there are many tourists travelling on these buses and imagine, Sir, they come in here and are travelling at our subsidised rates. We are here paying a Transport Levy to let tourists travel on our buses at 60 cents, Sir. I think now that if we had a ticket system and we sold tickets to the buses at the hotels but those tickets, for argument sake, were at \$1, the tourist would

use them and we certainly would collect more revenue, and it would be a very diplomatic way because the tourist would have to get his tickets from the hotels really to travel, and I think that would be quite easy.

It is evident, therefore, that throughout this whole country that our Transport Board needs reorganising. I am aware, Sir, that the Minister has just taken some strong action. I do not know if I should say out of evil cometh good, but let us hope that the new Board, whenever it is appointed, Sir, gets down to its task because \$15 million in subsidy is much too great for a small island like this and we cannot afford that. In fact, it is my opinion, that we can make that Transport Board efficiently run, and pay for itself without any subsidy and without any rise in bus fares. I thank you.

SENATOR J. E. D. WILLIAMS: The first point I would like to make on this Bill is that there is a notion in this country by some people — and it is a feeling held by the Opposition as well — that the society at large should not be called upon to make a contribution towards its own development. All we have to do is to sit back and wait for a Minister of Finance to come with gifts but any time that you are called upon to make that sacrifice towards your own development, you would say no.

I somehow like this Bill in that it calls upon each and every working individual, whether he drives his car or whether he uses the public transport, to make a contribution either in the form of money towards the Transport Board to buy more buses or in road repair. It is expected that the Transport Levy would raise within the vicinity of \$6 million and it is anticipated that some \$4 million will be allocated to new buses.

It is a fact that the buses which the Democratic Labour Party saw fit to buy — and I refer to the Seddon buses — were not appropriate to Barbados. They were problematic from the beginning and it is necessary to phase out those buses. They have created a lot of difficulties and headaches for the Transport Board and the Minister in his wisdom has seen it fit to go to the United States — and Senator Seale referred to the purchasing of buses which would be more adequate towards our needs in Barbados.

We are looking at smaller buses, buses that can be used on very short routes, where you can redeploy the larger buses on the longer routes and I want to reassure Senator Seale that it is indeed something that we are looking at. We do recognise that you should not have a bus leaving and going just two or three miles with just a few people. Those larger buses with wider bodies can be used on very long distances.

I am sure some people would find it strange to believe that even at this present time there is no preventative maintenance programme at the Transport Board for all the time it was in existence. Any company that has equipment would normally keep a record or a history of the number of hours that that particular piece of equipment, even if it is a bus, has done and then at some specific point in time would take that piece of equipment out of service and would routine it. We do it in other countries and it is something that ought to be at the Transport Board.

There is a saying, "a stitch in time saves nine". The practice is that you run buses and you run them downhill and when they break down, then and only then, do you find it necessary to carry out maintenance on those buses. I know that the Hon. Minister is seriously looking at this problem. He is seriously looking at setting up some kind of a preventative maintenance programme and it is anticipated that through such a programme, a lot of money which is now spent in spare parts in as much, like I said, buses are overworked before they are routined — those kinds of monies would be saved.

Part of the Bill refers to road repairs. I had the fortune of running for an election and going through certain tenancies in the parish of St. John and some neighbouring parishes of St. Philip and, Mr. President, those tenantry roads — I really cannot call them roads, they are tracks — are deplorable and however I look at this Bill, I see those roads before my eyes. I am hoping that at some point in time, that Government having dealt with its priorities, would be able to channel its thoughts towards the repairing of roads within those tenancies.

It is that kind of thinking that we had in mind when we came up with this Levy. The Opposition would want to tell you that you are just extracting more money from people. We are asking people to be part and parcel of our own development. We have to make our own contribution. We just cannot sit back and expect Government to do everything. You only have to travel through the region, you do not have to go too far outside the region to realize that we have some of the best roads in the Caribbean, some of the best services.

A lot of talk has been made about utilities and I do not want to take up that, Sir, but, just to say that we have some of the best utilities in this country. What we are asking in this Bill, is for people to make that kind of contribution for their own development — for the upkeep of our roads and the provision of buses.

You talk about bus fares. I recognise that Senator Seale, he made a comment that — it was something to do with revenue from bus fares and the buses being run efficiently. Let me say this, Mr. President, the revenue that we collect from bus fares is not even enough to pay

wages. Right now, we lose in the vicinity of \$16 million, and in truth and in fact, there would have to be a sizeable increase in the cost of bus fare in order for the Transport Board to break even.

What we are asking is that in order to keep bus fares at a tolerable level, that all working people — and obviously the people who are going to be affected more are those people in the higher income bracket and this is expected — everybody is asked to make that kind of contribution to make sure that the Government would be able to keep bus fares at that level that the very poor man that I know the honourable Senator on the other side always refers to.....(Aside: Man in the street.)..... man in the street would be able to pay.

Mr. President, I have absolutely no difficulty in supporting this Bill.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Reader.

SENATOR MRS. G. G. READER: Mr. President, I would like to support this Bill, but I would like to make one or two comments. One is about the collection of fares. A friend of mine told me he was working late not long ago, and as he was sitting quietly in his office, there was a group of young men outside talking and that one young man said that he had no difficulty in making ends meet because he worked for the Transport Board as a conductor and he made on an average of \$2 000 a month. I do not know how true this is, but this is what he overheard these men talking about outside.

Now, I think that there should be some way of collecting fares which would be of less temptation to those who have to do so. I know that many years ago, when I lived in Montreal, they had a special box at the back of the buses that we dropped our fare into. In this way nobody can get into them until they got back to the depots, and then the money is removed.

I feel strongly that if we could get our roads repaired, it would be of great benefit to all Barbadians and all businesses in this island. We are asked to pay very high prices for vehicles, we are asked to pay very high prices for the parts for these vehicles and the roads do nothing to help us to keep our vehicles for longer and stop wasting Foreign Exchange. If our vehicles lasted us a little bit longer than they do, we could save an awful lot of Foreign Exchange which we need. But the state of the roads today is deplorable and if our roads are better than those in neighbouring territories, I hope they have all grown wings. (Laughter)

Mr. President, I speak with feeling. I drive all day long and yesterday, I had the pleasure of driving across the road through Lears. There were places where, if something were approaching you, you had to stop

because there was no way you could get across the canyon in front of you.

Another thing I would like to say is that I wish the Transport Board would give some of their drivers lessons in driving. The other morning, I was driving to work and a bus came straight at me. I had to take to the gutter and I had to go into a deep ditch — it was so deep that it took eight men to lift the van back out of the ditch and the van that was driving behind said, "Mistress, he wanted to kill you, you know". He said, "I was driving behind him and I could have overtaken him easily on the wrong side." Well I was in such a state, I did not even get his number or anything, I was just shaking. But, it is a horrible thing to see a bus coming at you when you are in a small van.

Now, I do not see why our tourists should be made to pay more for bus tickets. We are not made to pay more when we travel on buses overseas. But I do feel that selling of tickets in hotels would ease matters quite a bit and it would be one means of protecting the revenue. I also feel that if we had buses of different sizes — it is not a matter of the length of the route but the time of day. Early in the morning and late in the day — during the rush hours — we would have to use the larger vehicles, but during the day when you have ten, or 12 people travelling, why not use the smaller vehicle and save on oil?

Mr. President, on the whole this is one tax that I think that most employees and most businesses will pay without hesitation, because we realise when you are running a fleet of vehicles how much it could save you if our roads and our transportation were in better order. Thank you, Mr. President.

SENATOR A. W. A. McCLEAN: Mr. President, if there is any particular merit in this Bill, I think it relates to the fact that now there is explicit recognition that part of the cost of the public transport system should be financed other than by bus fares. We know in the past we have had Government making subsidies to buy new buses and so on, but basically one got the impression that this was done after the fact rather than something which was planned for. It was done out of necessity and it was not seen as the normal and desirable thing to do. I do believe that any public transport system which is based on the fare system should be self-financing on the basis that the collection of fares is going to be inefficient from a social point of view.

I do agree that the Transport Board is inefficient in the sense that they are not minimising the cost of providing the quality of the service which they are now providing, and the service they are providing is a high priced service because of the built in inefficiencies in the system, and I will probably speak about some of those in a

minute. But over and above this, I cannot agree with Senator Seale that this is to suggest that we should move to a situation where we should try to improve the efficiency of the Transport Board to a point where there would be no need for any subsidy.

Anywhere where you have a system operating on the basis of people paying for it, you will find that the cost is going to be somewhat restrictive in terms of the use which people will make of it, and you will find that it is in the interest of the country to have not only an efficient transport system in terms of not wasting money, but you should also have a system which does not put any restraint on the way in which people want to order their lives in terms of work and pleasure.

A public transport system must be seen as nothing more or less than the extension of the road system. Even today in some countries, there are certain roads which are toll roads where you have to pay money to drive on them. But long ago people recognised that that is an inefficient way of providing roads and now roads are financed out of tax revenues, and in Barbados out of general revenue up to now. But the public transport system is just an extension of the roadway, it is a means of allowing you to move along the roads with greater facility than walking, and it should be seen as such.

It is wrong to believe that the person who derives the benefit from the public transport system is the person who gets in the bus and goes from home to work. The entire community benefits when you have a good transport system and people can get to any point in the country at any time they want to. It means that businesses and everything can organise themselves without relating to transport as a constraint, and that is what cannot be done now.

The biggest losers in the country because of the inefficiency of the transport system today would be the Government and the employers, because of loss of work hours. The workers get roughly the same thing in certain places when they come in late. In some places they might get a reduction in pay, but in many areas of employment, especially in the Public Service, they get the same thing if they come in an hour late as when they come in an hour early. So the loss is largely in terms of productivity within the country, which in the first instance is a cost to businesses, to Government, and beyond that to the entire community.

So, we have a generalised interest in an efficient public transport system and we should be willing to pay for it. We should not be expecting the full burden to be borne by those people who use it most, which by interpretation means the people in the lower income bracket.

I am glad to see that this Bill is going to give explicit recognition to the desirability of providing part of the cost of running the transport system out of tax revenue, but again just as in the case of the Health Service provision, I do not think it was necessary to provide this in terms of a separate tax which is earmarked for roads and buses.

We should reach the level of sophistication — we have already reached it in relation to roads, this is a point of retrogression as far as roads are concerned — that this is a proper charge on general revenue. There is no distinction between financing roads and financing a Police Force, financing health, financing education, all of these things are much of the same order in terms of the social significance, so there is no particular merit in having to earmark tax for repairing roads.

The point was made that the money was needed urgently and so on. If this was seen as an emergency levy, it could have been identified as such and the money could have been placed in the Consolidated Fund. There is no need to set up a Transport Levy Board which will have no real function, and there is no need to complicate the accounting processes with all these earmarked funds. So at that level, I do not think that the legislation was particularly to be desired.

Going beyond that, I do agree that the quality of our roads is assuming proportions of urgency not only from the point of view of upgrading our roads so they can become bigger and better to accommodate new demands on them, but the quality of the roads has deteriorated dramatically in the last few years. I do not know what it is that has led to it, but the materials used might have been part of the factor — the usage might have been part of the factor.

But one contributing factor would be the techniques of road repair, and I am certain that what the people do by way of patching these roads — somebody should recognise that that is a waste of time where people just throw a little something over there and the slightest shower is going to wash it away. The road works that we get nowadays by way of repair, literally last one or two days, no longer than that. You put it in in the morning and in the afternoon it is gone. Something is wrong there, and somebody must sit down and address the question of road maintenance in Barbados.

I have been talking about this to people who work in the Ministry of Transport and Works and they have ideas. They feel that what is necessary is instead of just filling in a hole which is about a foot wide and you have to patch it, you widen the area and put in a more substantial plug which would not be easily dug out as the car wheels go over it or a little bit of water comes

running down the road after a shower. Whatever is necessary, we need to sit down and ask ourselves what are reasonable techniques or appropriate techniques of road maintenance in Barbados at this point in time. The ones we are using are no better than a waste of time — they are worse than a waste of time because they are a waste of money. I would seriously hope that the Ministry would address this point with some considerable urgency.

The point was made about the collection of bus fares, and people perceive that there are problems here, that some of the money is sequestered, so to speak, and of course they blame the conductors — and presumably they are involved. But I would wish to suggest that given the type of staffing and the type of controls that exist within the Transport Board, the money could drop out at any point in the ball game before anybody recognised it, it does not have to drop out at the level of the conductors. So there is a very major problem there, and in my own view, the solution to this does not rest so much with selling tickets rather than collecting bus fares on the bus and so on. Ultimately I think it rests with doing away with that approach to financing the service.

There is no need really to collect bus fares from people who get on the buses to have an equitable system of financing bus fares. You can have a system of taxes which was designed to be fair. You can design it to have any type of incidence on whom you want it to have incidence on and finance the entire bus operation out of tax revenue. In doing that you will find that the cost of providing the service will reduce, because a lot of the cost of providing the service is bound up with the system of collecting and accounting for bus fares, and this would become entirely superfluous under a different and cheaper arrangement. I would think that eventually that is the direction in which modern transport systems will go all over the world, and there is nothing wrong with Barbados being in the vanguard of such development.

Beyond that, I think that the Bill is not in itself objectionable and I will support it, but as I say, I would hope that the time will not be too far distant when it will be perceived that it is unnecessary to have these earmarked taxes. It is unnecessary and eventually the Government will discover that it is going to pose problems for them. I thank you, Mr. President.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: Mr. President, listening to the contributions which have been made by those Senators who have spoken already on this debate and particularly those who have spoken from a perspective of the Government identifying themselves as, for example, "we do this" and "we do that", I was

not aware until I heard one Senator spoke that he was part and parcel of the Government's nomination in the Senate, but out of his mouth here this evening I heard the Honourable Senator identifying himself – not Senator McClean, but Senator Seale – as “we”, identifying himself with the Government. But that is just a passing point which I think ought to go down on the record.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Just a minute. I have listened to the Senator's speech and I certainly got the impression when he spoke of the Government he spoke of our Government in the sense that all of us were part of the Government. He certainly did not represent to me that he was a Government member. We are part of the Government – you understand that I hope – the Queen, the Parliament and the Government of this country. You belong to Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition. The Government in that sense is what the honourable member was saying, not that he was a Government nominee – which he is not.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: Interpretation and interpretation. Let me just go on, Mr. President. To hear the debate as it has gone at least on this Bill so far, particularly from those Senators who have spoken – Senator Trotman and Senator Williams – one would get the impression that the Barbados Labour Party Administration has only just taken over the administration of the Government of this country. They are not at all recognising the fact that they have been in control of this country for almost six years now. They are not at all recognising the fact that ever since they took over the Government, the public transportation system in this country has been sliding downhill and continues to slide downhill.

People all over the country have been complaining about the service which is being delivered in this particular area. This Bill seeks to raise money to assist the Transport Board and to repair roads by the imposition of a levy. Now a levy is another form of taxation – one from which people who would normally be able to escape in a normal situation of tax cannot escape. And even to further compound the impact of this particular levy, the Commissioner of Inland Revenue, who falls under the general administration of the Minister of Finance and Planning, has issued instructions to all taxpayers that they cannot make any claim in their Income Tax returns for the amount of money which they have paid as the Transport Levy. So, we have to see it pure and simply as a tax – and as a debilitating one at that – on people whom we believe ought not to be faced with this kind of imposition.

Senator Trotman in introducing this Bill made the point that the roads have deteriorated because of the flow of heavy traffic. He identified container traffic,

low-loaders and a whole range of other heavy duty equipment which travel on the roads, and he says that these have been destroying the main highways – and presumably it is for this reason that this transport levy is being imposed.

So, a person who does not have this heavy equipment, who is not a shareholder in a company which owns this heavy equipment which admittedly is destroying our roads is called upon to pay for this. You might find a situation where a person might not even be using the bus service because of the proximity in which they live to their work, but nevertheless what this imposition is telling us is that he has to pay to work on the road. This is as starkly as I can put it. They have to pay to walk the road, and this is in addition to taxes, Mr. President, which are imposed and which go into the Consolidated Fund from which the money ought to be taken and used for road repairs, road extensions and generally speaking for the improvement of our transport system.

What is happening is that people are being made to pay twice. I heard Senator Reader indicating that people would gladly pay this. I am saying that the broad mass of people in Barbados are objecting very much to this imposition. This is a dangerous precedence and one which we in the Opposition believes ought not to have been imposed.

Senator Trotman talked about the Transport Board. Government nationalised the transport service in this country. According to him they have taken over all of the routes and they have bought new buses in the last five years. More buses have been bought than any other previous time. That might very well be true but what I submit is that one of the major problems in dealing with the Transport Board, particularly in the last five years, has been a lack of proper management and an appreciation for the vital role which transport plays in our economic, cultural and educational life in this country.

I go further. The other major point which seems to have escaped the Government has to do with the fact that the Transport Board is being run down by a Government allowing the mini-bus service to operate in which it operates. Let me explain this. The Government has nationalised transport and almost within a matter of a year of nationalising the transport, we see another transport system rise up in this country – the mini-bus which is better organised than the Transport Board, and which, Mr. President, is operating on the short routes. They have run the Transport Board buses literally off the road and they have taken over the short routes completely.

They are the people who are making the money in this and I really wonder why is it that the Government

cannot see this. Are they too blind that they cannot see that the mini-buses are boring holes in the finances of the Transport Board or is it that there is some other fact which they do not want to face up to? This is a very, very serious point.

If you go into the Fairchild Street bus stand or into the Lower Green or any of the major areas like just below the National Insurance Building, out here in Roebuck Street all of the places where people congregate, you find that the mini-buses are operating and they are not running from Bridgetown to St. Lucy, they are not running from Bridgetown to St. Joseph, not from Bridgetown to St. Andrew. Sir, do you know where they are running? From Bridgetown to the Pine, from Bridgetown to Silver Hill, from Bridgetown to Gall Hill, from Bridgetown to Thorpes. (Asides) They do not get down to Josey Hill — it is too far — I am coming to that — and I am submitting, Mr. President, that this is one of the major reasons why in the last five years or so the Transport Board has found itself in such a predicament.

You would hardly find Transport Board buses running on these routes. If you go up in the Pine, Gall Hill or Silver Hill occasionally you would find a Transport Board bus but every five minutes you would find a mini-bus operating, and Mr. President, they are not small operators. This is no one man operation. This is big time operation and so you have nationalised the public transportation system at one level and you have allowed another private organisation or system to take over and run the Transport Board buses off the routes which are known as lucrative routes. The Transport Board buses are therefore left to run the long routes and to places where the mini-buses consider it to be uneconomic and I think this ought to be faced fairly and squarely.

I have no doubt that the mini-bus service is complementary or ought to be complementary to the Transport Board service but it should never be allowed to rival and destroy the Transport Board service as it has been allowed to do, and I think that this is yet another serious indictment on the part of the Government. The Government appears almost to be helpless in this situation.

Are they afraid of the mini-bus operators? I would not venture to ask the other question but I think that it is a matter, Mr. President, to which some attention ought to be paid and ought to be paid very, very quickly because I am suggesting that as a first step, the mini-bus service has to be rationalised or fully integrated into the Transport system and there should be no attempt at raising the bus fares. I heard a call being made for raising the bus fares.

The Prime Minister in the Lower House indicated that for the Transport Board to, as it were, break even,

that bus fares would have to go up to about \$1 or so per journey. I know that the Transport Board did a study and they have concluded that 90 cents per journey would allow them to break even but I am suggesting that all of these analyses are based on a complete lack of understanding of how the transport system operates because no matter how high you raise bus fares, with the present organisation of the Transport Board, with the rivalry that is presented to the Transport Board by the mini-bus services, the Transport Board will never break even. If you raised the bus fares to \$2 per journey it would never break even.

Do you know who will be the main beneficiaries? The mini-bus operators. They will be the people who will have the quick turn around and who will carry the passengers and who will rake off the cream as it were of these. So I am making the point that this has to be looked at very very seriously and one must make the further point that this whole question of the Transport Board making a profit or even breaking even, in my view, is a whole set of nonsense.

Public transport performs a very important social function and indeed an economic function. It is one major means which is used to get people backwards, to and from work and to move people and I do not believe that anywhere in the world where there is mass transportation that one could say that the operation realises a profit.

And the fact that I have said that the question of breaking even or making a profit is nonsense, does not mean that we ought not to strive to establish an efficient service, but we ought to in establishing an efficient service, make sure that we do not impose on the people who used the service burdens which they cannot bear and certainly it has to be recognised that transport performs a very important function and therefore ought to be subsidised.

So I certainly cannot go along with this question of making a profit or breaking even, because as you will see, in order to break even, the present tendency is to raise bus fares — raise bus fares and you will break even. And when we can hear comments being made about the World Bank suggesting that you are sinking money into the Transport Board — to the bottomless pit to quote the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister in the Lower House — “the bottomless pit of the Transport Board” — and therefore something will have to be done about it and all of this kind of thing and bus fares would have to go up; I am submitting is demonstrating a clear misunderstanding of what is involved in this.

I think that earlier in the day, Senator McClean made mention of the way in which these international

agencies sometimes behave and we have to be very careful sometimes about the kind of instructions which they would want to give us about how our society should operate, because I do not think that they take into consideration all of the social and economic and even political implications of certain decisions. They operate out of a text book and it does not seem as if they operate in a situation where people live and where people relate to one another. So, I would want to caution in that particular area.

But back to the Transport Board and the way in which the Board operates. It is an established fact that mismanagement has been one of the key factors in transport being what it is. I seem to recall — and if I am wrong, maybe I can be corrected — that some statement was made to the effect that an inventory which was taken recently showed that the Transport Board had something like over \$1 million in parts on the ground, in their Parts Department. When a corporation or any company for that matter can tie up that kind of money in parts, and parts which are not used, or parts which might be inappropriate — because it would seem as if this has been one of the problems then you can imagine how costly this will be because let us say, one had to borrow that kind of money from the bank at the current interest rates, you could imagine how much money in interest alone would have to be paid. So these are things which have to be pointed out and which must be faced fairly and squarely.

Sir, last week, the Lower House was treated to a disclosure which worries me and which I know worries a number of people in this country. It has been suggested that there might very well be infelicities — let me choose a word from the other side — at the very highest level at the Transport Board — at the very highest level. He has instituted an internal investigation into this and I am saying that this matter is of such serious public importance that we do not need an internal investigation, we need a public investigation, a public enquiry into what has been going on at the Transport Board. Oh yes, we need a public investigation because if from what has been said, the charges which have been levelled..... (Aside)..... We are dealing with the Transport Board.....charges levelled.....To show your level of understanding.... I am not responsible, I am sorry.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Order, order.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: Yes, Sir. The charges which have been levelled at certain persons in the Transport Board and indeed, in the very Government, then one has got to ask what is going on and the public ought to be treated to, at the very least, a public investigation into that aspect of the Transport Board. A lot will come out. (Aside) Ask Darcy Scott. (Aside)

Sir, I want to read a document which I will make a document of the Honourable House from Darcy Scott, Real Estate Consultant, Auctioneer and JP January 29, 1982:

"Mr. D. Blackman,
Minister of Transport and Works,
Pine,
St. Michael.

Dear Sir,

I am sure that you do not know what took place with the sale of the Transport buses. Some time ago, I received a letter from the Board instructing me to set up for sale 17 buses. Three or four weeks after, I received another letter which stated that five of the buses were withdrawn. I went ahead and advertised the sale and to my disappointment, the number of buses was reduced to seven. When I enquired I was told that certain Ministers had gone to the Transport Board and selected buses and they were just not there.

I appreciate the fact that the Government can save commission by not giving the Government Auctioneer a sale, but I object to being used in this way. I remember an occasion when the Transport Board gave me a sale and then sold most of the items and I refused to sell the remainder. It is because of the high regard I have for you that I went ahead with the sale.

Sincerely Yours,

DARCY A. SCOTT.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Just a minute, Senator Greaves.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: Yes, Sir.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Did I understand from you in your statement earlier on, that you knew that the Honourable Minister had instituted an enquiry into this matter? Did I understand you to say that?

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: No, I said that the Honourable Minister said that he has instituted an internal investigation. That is common knowledge, Sir. That is in the newspapers. That is what was said in the Lower House.

Mr. PRESIDENT: I was just wondering whether in the light of that, you might not consider it more proper to await that before you pursue this line of discussion. I am just appealing to your sense of rectitude, perhaps that if there is more to be said, a lot can be said after the enquiry. But if you said the Honourable Minister has decided to take this and look into

it, would it not be more proper to wait and see what happens?

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: This revelation would help him, I am sure, Mr. Chairman.

We have to look at this matter in its entirety. I am very concerned when over the years I have watched the deterioration in the service which is offered to the travelling public. Senator Simmons knows very well the amount of occasions when in the Lower House I drew this matter to the attention of the Lower Chamber, and I must say that on almost all of those occasions he was supportive of me.

SENATOR D. A. C. SIMMONS: On a point of order, Mr. President. I would not wish the understanding of the Honourable Senator to go into the records of this House without some protest from me. Understanding is always a very personal matter. His understanding is different from mine. I certainly never supported him in the Lower House in his castigation of the Transport Board. I may have had my own quarrels with the Transport Board in respect of the service in St. Philip, but I certainly never supported him.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: It is a matter of the record. Unfortunately I do not have the record at my disposal, but if.....

Mr. PRESIDENT: If you do not have the record I do not think you can refer to it. You said something and the Member denied it, I think we can leave that now.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: Yes, I will leave it but I will come back to it in the Estimates. I will get the record and I will return to it, but I will leave that for the time being.

All I am saying is that I have been harsh on the Transport Board for the kind of service which it has been delivering to the travelling public, and there has not been any improvement. I do not want to be parochial in this, but all over the country I could say there is mass dissatisfaction with the Transport Board. That is a matter of fact, and we are now being called upon to pass legislation which I doubt very much will make any difference to the Transport Board.

We are opposed to this method of attempting to finance or assist in financing the Transport Board, and also for repairing roads and what have you. We are saying that it is a double burden. People already pay taxes for the services of this country. When the Estimates are approved, the Estimates of Revenue and Expenditure are approved for the services of the island, and included in that is transport. If you look under the Ministry of Communications and Works, you will see a whole range of

projects about repairing roads, building roads and what have you; subsidies to the Transport Board and this kind of thing. So people's taxes go into this and on top of this now they are being asked to pay a Transport Levy. We cannot be supportive of this way.

To talk about the legislation, the Prime Minister himself in the Lower House on page 809 of the debate of Tuesday, February 23, 1982 admitted that the legislation is sloppy, this whole thing. But of course he said that the Press was not there at that time and that is why he could say that while there were alone. The Democratic Labour Party has been canvassing this particular matter based on the feedback that we have been getting from people who feel burdened by this particular bit of legislation, and I cannot see how we can be supportive of this.

Senator Seale talked about job pride and motivation. This is important in any job situation, and there is no doubt that there is need for the development of pride and for motivation on the part of people at the Transport Board, as indeed in a number of other areas of occupation in Barbados. But all of this has to do with the quality of management and the kind of leadership which is forthcoming.

If we accept the fact — as I believe we would have to accept this particular fact — that the management of the Transport Board in the last five years was the poorest management that the Board has ever had. Can you imagine an operation like the Transport Board employing over 1800 people — one of the biggest single employers in Barbados, operating a system covering the entire island — without a Personnel Manager? The Personnel Manager is acting as General Manager, and there is no Financial Controller. I would not even worry with the Traffic Manager.

Everything is so bad at the Transport Board in the management structure, and the Government in spite of the many pleas which have been made did absolutely nothing about it, and now we are suddenly being called upon to pay a Transport Levy which, I am submitting, was illegally extracted from people's pay. Up to now it is being extracted without the force of legislation.

In the Barbados Workers' Union we have made representation over and over again, and we have succeeded to some extent in improving the conditions of work at the Transport Board. The Government still continues to resist the provision of an adequate pension plan for the employees in spite of the many requests — we had made continuous requests on this particular score.

There are certain conditions at the Transport Board which have still got to be upgraded and which we recognise will contribute towards the question of motivation and involvement and job price which Senator Seale talked about. We cannot look at this matter in isolation because

after all this money, according to a section of the legislation, is being sought to defray the cost of improvement of public transport and the construction and maintenance of roads. So we have to lay a lot of stress on this particular area.

Certainly I have also been very critical of the condition of the roads in Barbados. They are appalling. I am charging, Sir, that the roads were allowed to deteriorate by the present Administration during the last five years without making any serious attempt to arrest the decay which we saw coming in. No serious attempt at all was made to upgrade the roads and to resurface and to try to provide a better quality of road in this country. Instead what we found was a lot of money being extracted in a whole set of areas, money which could have been better spent in a better delivery of service to the people of this country.

But having therefore allowed the roads to get to the state that they have got into, now the Government is saying that those of us who are paying taxes now have to pay an additional tax for which we can get no recognition from the Income Tax Commissioner in terms of getting that written off.

Mr. PRESIDENT: I am beginning to feel, Senator Greaves, that you will not speak when the Estimates come up.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: Well, Sir, that is another time. Unfortunately we cannot support this Bill because we are not satisfied with the reasons for which it was imposed. We are saying that it will impose serious hardships on people, and people are being called upon to pay for something which they are paying for already, and this is a very bad piece of legislation.

I think the Government has erred in the imposition of this particular levy, but we understand the Government was really scrambling. This is really scraping the bottom of the bucket. The Government was really scrambling at the time. There was no money to pay civil servants, no money around the place; so that is why we are now faced with this after a massive mismanagement of the financial affairs of this country by the Barbados Labour Party Administration during the last five years. This is what we have been placed in.

SENATOR StC. E. HOWELL: Mr. President, obviously all is not well with the transport system in this country. I do not think one needs to get up and speak in this Honourable Chamber for an hour and hurl mismanagement and everything else at this Government. What is true, however, Mr. President, is that having listened to Senator Greaves, notwithstanding that all is not well with our transport system in this country, it is also a fact at least as I understand it from listening to

people who come to this country, particularly those from the English speaking Caribbean countries, that we nevertheless do provide one of the best transport systems in the Caribbean — better than most — but that is a question of taking what people from other countries in the Caribbean have said for granted.

It is clearly a fact however that transportation in general is a problem not only in this country but in the entire world. It is a problem that continues to plague developed countries and have continued to do so for many years. Those of us, like myself, who have studied in England and lived there for some time, do not have to be in a discussion with anyone with any great amount of knowledge in transportation, but the average man in the street will tell you that since the War when nationalisation came into being, transportation has always been a problem for the people in England. That goes for the trains, the tube service and the buses. It never pays. Every time people are asked to pay higher fares, and there are levies and what have you.

What I find particularly comforting in this Bill is the fact — I think Senator McClean and Senator Williams made the point but Senator Greaves did not mention it — that the levy is spread right across the board. It is not a question that Government is imposing a levy whereby they are asking only those people who use the buses to pay for it. Those people who use cars and never get on the buses will have to pay for it. That I think goes a long way to show that Government is thinking in a humanitarian manner. In this society as it develops we are trying to level out the inequalities amongst our people. I think that is very good and some credit should be given for the levy because of that.

I really do not think there is a lot to be said about this Bill because it seems quite fair. As more people go to work, more transportation will be needed. We have the fuel prices, we have the increase in wages, we have people who are demanding a better quality of transportation, and it will have to be paid for.

The only question which as far as I can see necessarily falls to be determined, is whether the people who are crying out for more buses and cannot get them in time will be prepared to pay for them, or whether in the final analysis Government must come and by some method subsidise it and pay for it. But providing a better transportation system calls for more money and the money must come from somewhere. I think it is only fair that a levy of this nature should be introduced, and I think by and large it would be welcomed in this country even by those people who do not use the transportation system at all.

The only thing in this Bill that gives me a little cause for concern is Section 4. That section deals with the collection of this levy, and this Bill puts it on the employer to see to it that the levy is in fact collected. This would not pose any problem to large employers, but I honestly really do believe that it could pose some problem to small businessmen. I find in my own work that often one is making assessments of people who have been injured who happen to be employed by small businessmen, and when one writes the small businessmen and asks them what necessary deductions have been made such as Income Tax, insurance benefits and so forth, they say we want some help with the job, and we give a man a job. They do not make these things. I am afraid that that sort of section such as Section 4 may lead the small businessmen rather than giving a worker a job not to employ him at all for fear of falling afoul of Section 13 of this Act which impose the penalties.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am afraid that that sort of Section, the section such as Section 4 may lead the small businessman rather than to give a fellow worker a job not to employ him at all for fear of calling foul of Section 13 of this Act which imposes a penalty, offences such as I think it is \$2,500 or imprisonment of 12 months or both. These to my mind, Sir, are far too feeble. I think that the fine can be smaller than \$2,500. It is my own personal view and I see no cause at all for a term of imprisonment. I think that it could have although to a smaller section I think that could, in effect, have a deterrent effect.

By and large I do support the levy. I think it is a good thing. I think it is a step in the right direction. It would enable those responsible for the transport system of this country to get better rolling stock, to get more efficient stock, to be in a position to train the administrative staff better so that in the final analysis we can have a more efficient transport system in this country.

Mr. President, I beg to support this Bill.

SENATOR W. W. HALL: Mr. President, I have listened with rapt attention to the Senators on both sides of the House because I do not believe that this is a nebulous issue. I believe that Governments must come to terms with two impostors, that is, triumph and disaster. That is Kipling, in case you did not know but there is this common tendency in trying to shout from the highest hill and in disaster to be as quiet as a church mouse.

Senator Williams said that the levy is supposed to collect some \$6 million. I thought it was \$8 million but then Senator Williams should know. He seems to be very well informed this afternoon and as a consequence I shall not disagree. Even though you may collect \$6 million or

\$7 million and feel it is economically sound, I daresay it may well be politically disastrous.

I have listened to the Senators and I note with great interest that Senator McClean and Senator Seale said that there was gross inefficiency at the Transport Board. As a matter of fact, Senator Seale said that you should have a sense of pride but I think that you can only have a sense of pride in the work place if there is something to be proud of. So even though I agree with that, I believe further that you should have a sense of belonging and that is why, Sir, the people in high positions at the Transport Board should be properly trained.

Of course there can always go to BIMAP and they would probably scratch at the service. They would learn for a few weeks but in the long term view, people should be properly trained so that the Senators and in the Other Place would not be in a position to say well, I am sure there are people in Barbados who can do the job but the present crop is very inefficient.

I believe, Sir, that if one has to look at the hierarchical needs, one only has to read Maslow, as Senator Williams would tell you, and you will see that you do not need to have a Management Lecturer, Sir, that you must have goals and that they should be qualifiable and that you should have some measure of self-reliance and you should also be in a position where you can appraise your staff and counsel them when they go wrong.

Those things obviously have not happened but from this evening I hope that the Government will do something which will assure us that they will happen because we cannot come back in here year after year and tell us all and sundry that the management of an important Board like the Transport Board is inefficient. I do not think we can forever and ever accept that so if there are inefficient and they need training, it is the responsibility of the Government to train them. So I think that we will have to look at that further in the future.

What we have to ask ourselves, Sir, is why does the Transport Board fail to make money? Why is there a deficit of \$60 million, I think it is. A few years ago a former Chairman said that the conductors were stealing to the tune of \$30 000 a week. This afternoon I heard Senator Reader said that she heard that a conductor can gross as much as \$2 000 per week. That is \$104 000 a year for one man and I am saying that if that is true, then the problems at the Transport Board.....

Mr. PRESIDENT: I think she said a month.

SENATOR W. W. HALL: Well, Sir, I am sorry. If it is a month then simple arithmetic will say that it is \$24 000 a year and even then, Sir, that is quite a substantial sum.

I believe that when things are wrong at the top, when there is a sickness at the top of any business enterprise, then this sickness permeates throughout the work force and hence we get a lot of dissatisfaction around workmates. They become so disillusioned that they tend to become neurotic and bury themselves in trouble making. That is a fact. Any enlightened management team would know that and if they do not have an enlightened management team up there, the Government should not only sack the Board but it should sack the management too, and get a new Board and a new management if it is as pitiful as that, Sir. It is as simple as that.

I am just simply saying, Sir, that it is not easy to get up and say that the conductors have stolen \$30 000 a week and expect that you will get a work force that will be loyal to you and that they will go through thick and thin with you if there are going to be allegations when in truth and in fact, Sir, you may well find that this disappearance of money might not be as low as a conductor. There is no proof whatsoever, Sir. We do not know where it has gone.

I think that whoever is in charge will have to take the overall blame that they have not been able, so far, to find out the real source. So I feel, Sir, that we have to realise that the real trouble at the Transport Board has not only now begun. It did not begin as some people would try to make us believe that it began in January, 1982.

One has only got to look at the situation clearly and you will see that a few years ago there was big trouble. There was even industrial action taken. There were strikes or in fact there was a strike and we all know when there is some disharmony between the industrial relations in the workplace, you probably find that it has grave ramifications. It does. If the buses stop running for an hour there is utter confusion so you see, Sir, it is paramount that the Transport Board becomes efficient. It is very important that this is done.

I would say, Sir, that there was an allegation a few years ago that the Chairman was getting involved in the day to day disciplinary measures and if that is true, there is little wonder, therefore, that the present Minister had decided to bring over from the Labour Department a man well versed, well trained. I am sure that my great colleague here.....(Asides) Senator Greaves will tell you. I am saying, Sir, that the present Manager of the Transport Board is very knowledgeable in industrial relations. I said that. Senator — I do not know your name either.....(Asides)

Mr. PRESIDENT: Order, order.

SENATOR W. W. HALL: One of these days, I will call his name, Sir.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Address the Chair.

SENATOR W. W. HALL: I am very sorry, Sir. But what I am saying, Sir, the fact that he moved with the Minister from the Ministry of Labour where we have seen some social legislation in this country. (Aside) Sir, I am not speaking of energy, so Senator Griffith would not understand this. I am talking about management, I am talking about personnel management, I am talking about industrial relations, Sir, and I am quite convinced that the honourable Senator knows that if he becomes General Manager of my company, Sir, that he would have depended very heavily upon me on these matters. (Laughter) I am not going to let this intervention upset me, Sir. We know where we are going. I was just saying, Sir, that — they say you should not call names, I would have said, Mr. Codrington, Sir, but, the point is this — the present General Manager — well, he was that last night, I do not know if he is that this morning — but, the point is, the present General Manager is well versed in industrial relations and I said it was little wonder that the Minister sought to bring him over from the Labour Department and to tell you the truth, Sir, some doubting Thomases may well claim that they are like Gilbert and Roland, that if the present Minister goes to the Ministry of Education, then the present General Manager might have to go too, but I am not subscribing to that, Sir.

I am saying that it is because of the gross inefficiency and having scrutinized all areas, he thought that with all of these matters of discipline outstanding, it might be necessary not only to get a good personnel man, but to get a man who knows management procedures to such an extent that he would be able to kill about four birds with one stone. That is my contention, Sir. I know that the honourable Senators over there would not wish me to continue. I did say that I am only going to speak for ten minutes and I would stick to that, Sir.

I believe that the allegations of theft by the conductors would only tend, Sir, to lower their morale. This is what I believe, Sir, and hence, there would be no job satisfaction, Sir. You see, if a man feels that the Board Members and Government Ministers will accuse him constantly of stealing in his job and that man has done an honest job, he would not have any job satisfaction. That is the point. If there is no job satisfaction, and you happen to give that man \$50 a week more or even if he happens to steal it, you will still find, Sir, that he will have a lousy job. The job is not going to be better because he has a bit more cash in his pocket.

The need for security is not perhaps, the greatest need, but then again, Sir, I was not going to give you a lecture in management. I am only just saying that that need is not the one that is the greatest and, therefore, you cannot assume that because someone can make an extra few dollars a week that that is the greatest thing in

the world, Sir. I think job satisfaction is important and it behoves the Government to make sure that the Transport Board comprises of men of expertise in all of these management matters which will give the workers a chance to be motivated.

You know, Sir, when I was a boy, I used to go to school in the bus. I thank God for that. All of us who went to school in a school bus will know this. The honourable Senators over there were just like me, Sir, it is only nowadays that they drive big, left hand cars but they went to school in a school bus and indeed, most of them walked like you, Sir, Senator Linton very far. I am saying, Sir, that they must be motivated. I will tell you why, Sir. When I was going to school in the school bus, I remember very well — 784, and every morning, you would see that only one man would drive that, a man called Grazettes and Carlton — I only remember him by Carlton was another great driver. I know Carlton with the cheeks, he would drive the other bus, Sir, and do you know, Sir, that these men used to handle those machines with so much pride that the honourable Senator talked about. You would believe that they were Mercedes. You understand, Sir. *(Laughter)*

To be honest with you, Sir, I personally feel that when you take a driver and make him drive six buses in one day, as is happening or has happened in the recent past, it cannot make him a motivated man. You cannot tell a driver to go to Speightstown and get out of his bus and wait until another one comes from Pie Corner and then drive that up to St. Augustine and then come back down and get another bus, Sir.

You know, you have driven — I have seen you in that same car, Sir, it is beautiful, Sir, I must admit..... *(Laughter)*.....but I would say to you, Sir, you get the feel of it and you love it. But if you have to drive six cars in a day it would not matter. So, you see, the sense of pride that Senator Seale talked about, you can only have that if there is something to be proud about. I only said that to make a point, Sir, I was not really saying that Senator Seale was wrong.

I am only saying too that if you have a Minister who is — shall I say, Sir, there is some sort of altercation with the Board and Board members over the fact that he believes there should be some reorganization, if the papers have quoted him right. I would only say that his exposition in the Honourable House the other day — I would not bore you with it, Sir, because I know that the Hansard Reports have not been out yet and you have not had the opportunity to read that prose as so beautifully expounded by the Honourable Minister. But, I am sure that most of you know what he is capable of.

I still think it is a sad commentary though that you have a boxing match between the Minister and the Chairman of the Board and it ends by the Minister saying, "that if necessary, he would blow the lid from the whole stinking business". Now, Sir, I do not know if that is unparliamentary, but I am quoting what he said. I can only hope that common sense would prevail and in the interim, that the Government sees it fit to look closely at that investigation that the honourable Senator Greaves was talking about. I can only hope that if it comes about or does not come about, that the Government should look very seriously at getting to grips with the situation at the Transport Board, making very sure that they have people with management expertise there, even if they have to second Senator Griffith. Even if they have to do that, Sir, although there is not much about energy up there. *(Aside)* It is such an easy job, Sir, that six months would be enough to put it right. That is a fact. There is no mystery. There is no mystery about the Transport Board and losing money. I will tell you why. Messrs. Tudor, Birch, Dowding, Massiah, Mrs. Rock — these are the concessionaires, Sir, that I knew as a little boy running buses. *(Aside)* Yes, Senator Trotman too, Sir, he used the bus. *(Aside: Not Senator Trotman, just Mr. Trotman.)* I am very sorry, Trotman from — Sir, he does not lose me, because if he is referring to Trotman from Two Mile Hill with X339 and those sorts of buses, — I used to live in the Ivy, so I am aware of this, Sir, so he has not got one on me. Those are the people, Sir, not particularly endowed with any fantastic skills like the Personnel Management Controller, Financial Controller or Marketing Expert.

Somehow, Sir, with the same common sense that the Deputy President alluded to earlier on today, they seem to have done very well, and it is a mystery now that we seem to have this perpetual loss when it comes to running the Transport Board. I cannot understand it, because it seems to me that the people who operate mini-buses do very well. I see their growth every day, they do better and better, they live in the areas that end with Parks and Heights, and when you live in those areas you are doing well, so they have done very well in a relatively short time. *(Aside)*. Sir, I live in Barclays Terrace, not Barclays Park, and I certainly do not own any mini-buses or large buses. It seems to me that they do very well, Sir, and I am a bit worried that the Transport Board has not been able to make money.

This barefoot tax, as it is commonly called, is a serious thing. Is it fair, I ask you, Sir, a reasonable man, that all and sundry must pay the barefoot tax when you have the heavy duty vehicles on the road morning, noon and night destroying the roads, and I do not know if they are paying any more tax. At peak hours, Sir, I know..... *(A VOICE: Banks trucks)*. They are not heavy duty trucks. The people of this country are good people and they deserve to have alcoholic beverages delivered to

them, so Banks trucks are not in that category. I am sorry, Sir, the honourable Senator provoked me.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Do let us have a little order.

SENATOR W. W. HALL: What I want to say is that there is a loophole, there is no law prohibiting it, but if there is no law at the present time, the Government must seek to institute some law which will make it impossible — unless they want to run the risk of prosecution — for them to travel on the road at peak hours like that. These tractor-like monstrosities, Sir, that when they kill you they make a mess of you, cut off your head clean, should never be allowed to run on the roads at peak hours and whenever they like. I say that at the risk of the ramifications of upsetting the whole situation in my family, because I know that some of the people that own these things probably employ my son, but that is all right, Sir.

I believe that as far as this levy is concerned, the Government must understand that they have a duty to involve the people. I know that Senator Trotman earlier in the day said he was not going to talk on any matters relating to health, and I know why, Sir. As was indicated before — and I do not even want to say that he did not know what was in the Manifesto so he does not want to talk, that he is probably going to read it tonight and then come back next Wednesday and be an expert on it — but I do not mind that, I want him to get up and ventilate on these matters. I want him to tell us exactly what is the situation, what he is going to do to remedy the situation at the Transport Board, yes, what remedial action is the Government taking in these very serious matters at the Transport Board, and of course there will be the question of retroactivity that we will not entertain. As a matter of fact, the Opposition will not entertain that.

I hope, Sir, that the honourable Senator will ventilate on these matters and let us have chapter and verse of what the Government intends to do with this serious situation at the Transport Board. In conclusion I want you to understand that Income Tax, Health Tax, Transport Levy, compounded by the fact that you have an impending wage restraint is a burden on the small man. Even though they seem to pay little regard to that chap, I want the honourable Senator to get up this afternoon and let us know what measures the Government is taking in matters relating to the Transport Board and this levy.

SENATOR C. I. E. DEANE: Mr. President, after those very able contributions, I feel very reluctant to have anything at all to say, but there are one or two points I should like to make.

First of all, Sir, I should say that I support this Bill out and out. The whole road system in Barbados

has gone through an evolution, because in the old days if you remember, Sir, there were about 15 factories operating in the island when the Barbados Sugar Factories came into being, and each plantation sent canes a very short distance to the factory which it supplied. But now, there are only four factories operating — there are going to be six I am told — and these tractors and trailers have to go very long distances and we all know that the sustained effort on the roads does not add to the lasting of those roads.

As I said just now, very short distances were covered in the old days, now very long sustained heavy machinery go on those roads, and the whole technique, I think, of road building will have to be changed.

One honourable Senator very wisely mentioned the question of technique. You can quite understand, Sir, that with very heavy rains and heavy traffic there will be pot holes all over the road. Moreover, a very illustrious visitor to Barbados once said that he did not know any place in this world that was as well equipped with roads as Barbados, notwithstanding the pot holes.

One honourable Senator mentioned cart tracks and things like that, but if you will consider for one moment the number of cart tracks in Barbados that have been made into suitable roads, you cannot do all at one time, that is impossible. The Government needs a lot of money (a) for transportation, and (b) for the repair of roads. My understanding is that the Transport Board is in deficit of \$15 million.

Now if this tax or levy can make \$6 million, at any rate it would be \$9 million down which the Barbados consumer should be saving from electrical prices alone if you use crude oil. I know this is Senator Griffith's line and I do not intend to trespass too deeply on it. I think it was an unwise statement, but nonetheless that is his business, not mine.

Now with regard to this tax, Mr. President, it hits both ways. You have the fellow driving his car, and if the road was repaired, his springs would last longer or the wear and tear of the car would be less, so he is eligible or liable to contribute to this tax.

In the old days you will remember that whereas about 20 000 people were employed in the country districts, now there are only 7 000. I refer to agricultural workers especially, and most of these 13 000 now have jobs in town and they go to their jobs by Transport Board buses or mini-buses as the case may be, and therefore they also are liable for tax.

Now I cannot see by that argument that it is any barefoot tax, because those people who walked next door

to their work before, go either by Transport Board bus or mini-bus to work. Very often they need the transportation, and I do think that it is completely unfair to say that the Government must find everything.

It is perfectly true that a rose by any other name will smell as sweet, but one Senator said — a very wise Senator — that it should go on to the general taxation. I cannot agree because some people by the new system of taxation would get away altogether because they do not pay Income Tax at all. They would get away altogether, but they are just as liable as the fellow who drives his Mercedes Benz.

Mind you the tax is imposed according to your earnings. So if we might presume that the fellow who used to work in the country before now works in town, if his earnings are smaller than the fellow that drives the Mercedes Benz, then the whole tax as far as I know is five and a half contributions by the employee and five and a half contributions by the employer. Five and a half per cent of \$5 000 a month is a lot more than five and a half per cent of \$1,200 a month.

I heard mentioned this evening the question of a pension plan at the Transport Board. I do not know how pertinent this is, but my understanding is that there is one that was dealt with seriously quite recently and this is the question of the integration of National Insurance for tax and to have the whole thing integrated. My understanding is that the Government plans to pay all pensions. I suppose it will take time as all these things take time. They are new issues and all of them take time.

With regard to the Transport Board Buses and the mini-buses, I quite agree that some rationalisation or organisation should be made. The mini-buses choose their routes. I have seen a huge crowd at a bus stop, a Transport Board bus comes along and they wave him along. Maybe according to Senator Seale, the minibus is much cooler, it could easily be, but a mini-bus comes right behind and stops and picks up the whole lot. The other morning I saw a mini-bus so crowded that any policeman would feel justified in stopping it and checking the number of people in it, and the Transport Board bus which was travelling behind had two people in it. Now just imagine, Mr. President, what the Transport Board loses on each exercise like that. Unless, as some other Senator said this evening, there is some organisation or rationalisation of the mini-buses, things will get worse.

A remark was made that the Transport Board had been going downhill for six years. That may be true, but what is also true is that it has been going downhill for much longer than six years. Now I do not know about the law. An honourable Member on that side can straighten me on this, but my understanding was that if anything become *sub judice*, it should not be discussed by

other bodies especially in public, and if an investigation has been ordered in public or otherwise, I do not think — and this is for you to rule upon with respect — that it is in order to discuss it anywhere else during the investigation. I remember well that at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital there was an investigation ordered, but no investigation took place. It was just that “there will be no investigation” and that was the end.

Now there is one thing that I should like to ask, Mr. President, and it is this: Senator Hall mentioned just now “tractor — like monstrosities.” I should imagine that they are the construction people and I hope not the tractors and trailer people. He has confirmed that it is the construction people.

Moreover, Mr. President with regard to the question of the reduction in sugar factories, God only knows what the economy of this island would be if 15 sugar factories had to produce the necessary overheads that were saved. That is one reason, if I may digress for a moment, for the construction of the new factory at Portvale, because everybody sees the sugar industry is in a bad way, but it would be in a much worse way if Vaucluse and Porters were not shut down. They were operating at a tremendous loss. Portvale is not ready but I hope it will soon be.

With regard to the weight of traffic, that was inevitable; it was bound to come. I remember on one occasion one of the workers at the plantation in which I am involved came in one morning to say that his son had been taking home his sister the night before, a motor car had met them and he rode his bicycle into a hole which he could not see because of the car's lights and they both fell and were damaged and so was the bicycle. I rang the Minister of Transport and by that afternoon that hole was fixed. So that is one good thing. I know that there is something radically wrong with the Transport Board. The Government appreciates that and hence this Bill for one thing.

I am not saying that they are first class but there is good among all of them. Mr. President, with those few remarks which I have made with some reluctance after listening to my learned friends, I would like to tell you, Sir, that I support this Bill most heartedly. It is one where everybody is involved in this. Thank you, Sir.

SENATOR THE REV. CAN. I. McK. JONES: Mr. President, I suppose everybody has gotten a bit tired now hearing all these various submissions but it would seem to me that much of the talk has been away from what we are here to discuss, and that is a Bill to provide for the charge of a Transport Levy on the income of employers and employed persons and for related matters. It seems to me that we spent more time on related matters than on the levy.

However, I have heard so many statements that I find difficult to reconcile. For example, I heard that you need an efficient service and an efficient service does not have to break even or make money. Now I really do not see how you can have an efficient service that does not break even and make money. It is a public function that the bus service does.

Then we hear that the levy will be a tremendous burden on the poor people or the man in the street. I do not know why it is that some people believe that this man of the street must have not a care or a worry in this world. Everything must be done for the man on the street and that is why the man of the street does not do anything for himself.

I would like them to see how many men of the street are at the cinemas at the various nights, how many daughters and sons of the men of the street are all on roller skates and moving all about the place. Skates cost more than \$100 a piece and some of the men on the streets ride around on motor cycles and so on and I do not know of any other country in the world where the money that you pay for transport is lower than here in Barbados. I do not know of it. I am not saying that there may not be some place where you can drive, say as we can drive from Oistins to St. Peter for 60 cents, but if you can beat that I would like to know where you can get that.

I know that when I was in England just two years ago, driving a matter of three miles costed almost a pound and a half — a lot of money, and driving in the United States of America costed the same thing. It is quite expensive and there are no stages. As soon as you get in you pay. You can drop off at the first or the last stop.

I think we over act when we talk about this bare-foot man and all this kind of thing. Now, I feel, Mr. President, that this levy is one of the best pieces of enlightened social legislation that they have had in this country and I feel that because nowadays we have got to be so divisive in our thinking — as some Senators say, we like to live in the Terraces and the Gardens and so on — this particular levy make us realise that we are all in the same thing together and I would say that it is a practical reminder that we are really our brother's keepers. We have been losing this idea but it means now that everybody is contributing to everybody else, some more than others. Those of us who are a little better off than others will be contributing a little more, but everybody — the one foot man, whoever he is — everybody will be contributing something and I think that is a very good thing for us at this moment.

Then they talked about the bus fares must not be raised. Now it stands to reason: you cannot run buses in any country without money and if the bus fares are

not to be raised and the transport system has to be viable and be sustained, then the money must come from somewhere else and the only and the best place it can come from, is where the Government is trying to get it from — and that is from the levy, from every person who is working or not working and living in this country, and on that, Mr. President, I am happy to support this Bill.

SENATOR C. A. GRIFFITH: Mr. President, of course on a Bill such as this there is ample opportunity for significant contributions to be made all over and I dare say that some of the contributions I heard this evening were erudite. But this Bill in effect seeks to give support in more areas than just the Transport Board but because the Transport Board itself has been a political football over the years, we find that a great deal of emphasis has been put on the management.

Now we know that it has been in the news recently and I just wanted to get it out in the open first of all, this whole question about a public enquiry. Now as Senator Deane has said — and he has referred to other talked about public enquiries that were promised and then we found that Ministers were moved because they talked about enquiries — but what had in this situation, Sir, is a case where a Minister, because of a complaint made to him, has come out and taken the public into his confidence and he will make an enquiry to find out what is going on. It is not for any of us, whether we are Opposition, or Government or private citizen having no political interest, to prejudge what the results of the enquiry will be. This is the problem we are having.

We are having people in the Opposition who of course are basking in the fact that the Minister has called for a public enquiry. He has not found anybody guilty and I am satisfied that whatever comes out of the enquiry will be made available to the public. This is very important, but here we have two people in the Opposition, Mr. President, talking on this Bill at cross purposes and I do not doubt that this is the kind of situation that will befall the Opposition simply because we have one Member who has to wear two hats — and we cannot determine when he is speaking for one organisation or when he is speaking for the other.

But we know that in 1977 — that is why I say about the lack of objectivity especially when you are the spokesman for one or two organisations which in effect are in opposition to the Government of the day — in April 1977, a general strike was called at the Transport Board in this country and when we looked at the reasons for the general strike — do not forget that we had an Election six months prior to the general strike at the Transport Board and I daresay a strike which failed miserably — but six months prior to the general strike there was an Election in this country and the General Secretary of the Barbados Workers Union lost his seat.

When we looked at some of the reasons for the general strike we found that in the past there were agreements for two tier settlements in the Transport Board, and the emphasis was on a one tier settlement and because the Barbados Labour Party Government wanted to maintain the same kind of agreements that were in operation before, a general strike was called — clearly a case of political interference in the affairs of the Transport Board. Call it what you will, but you have the same union member who is also wearing the DLP hat getting in this Chamber talking about the mini-buses and how well they operate privately.

You hear his colleague talking about the private concessionaires and how they are making profits but it is the Barbados Labour Party Government which nationalised the transport system, so what are you telling me? You are telling me that the Democratic Labour Party is standing by and saying that it is better to have a private organisation which is making money because we all agree that private business are better institutions if you want to operate on a profit making business than any Government institution.

Yet still we find that the Democratic Labour Party is the Party in Government that nationalised the transportation system in this country. Now we hear praises for the institution of private operations. This is what I cannot understand.

I do not need to go into lectures about management with Senator Hall. He has learned his at the work place and he must not make the mistake of confusing some of the concepts of management. He talks about job satisfaction and so on, as though the accusation of missing money has something to do with job satisfaction. That is what I am saying. It is important to understand the concepts of managerial terms, so do not let us get into this question about management. Job satisfaction really refers to the intrinsic satisfaction an individual derives from doing a certain job. It has nothing to do with whether somebody accuses you of stealing money or not. But the thing is that when you start to talk about money, you must understand.

But, by and large, some of the problems you would have, Mr. President with quasi Government institutions like the Transport Board and so on, all over the world, where institutions may be set up as corporations but are still getting Budgetary support from tax funds, you find problems — I have worked with one of these institutions before in North America — because there will always be need for political pressures to be put on the corporation and as long as you are spending tax dollars, there will always be that pressure put on the system and that is why the Transport Board will have the kind of problems it has.

Now again, the Opposition has said in this Honourable Chamber that the Government has done nothing about the Transport Board. That is the Leader of the Opposition in this Honourable Chamber, the Leader who is also the spokesman for the Barbados Workers' Union. But then, we come back and hear now his colleague saying that we have just appointed a man who understands management and a man who will do something for the Transport Board. We have been accused by one member of the Opposition of doing nothing and we have been praised by the other member for doing something about the Transport Board. And I believe the confusion which ranges between the two people who are colleagues is only a reflection of the confusion which ranges in the Opposition Party. That is all it is.

But, Mr. President, when we look at the whole structure of the tax levy and the reasons behind the imposition of the levy in this country, we have to understand that there is a genuine attempt by this Government to deal with the problems as they affect the transportation system in this country and not only the Transport Board. It is not as narrow as that.

We have all agreed that the road system in this country cannot stand the heavy traffic that runs on the roads of Barbados. The road system in this country was not designed to accommodate the significant number of cars on the roads and the significant number of heavy duty vehicles. I mean, that is an established fact.

The road system in this country was also not designed to deal with the changing weather patterns because when you have extremes of heat and you have extremes of heavy rainfall, then you will find that there are damaged roads. We have been grappling with this problem since 1976. And again, when you make attempts to correct these kinds of problems, what are you dealing with? You are dealing with a poor quality asphalt. This has been one of the problems — a poor quality asphalt to deal with a road system that has been badly destroyed because of increased usage.

Indeed, I have been in consultation with a Caribbean Government, a friendly Caribbean Government, trying to get something worked out for improved quality asphalt for roads in the West Indies — not only Barbados — and this Caribbean Government is working closely on research with a member of the EEC countries to look at the improved quality of asphalt. So, attempts have been made to deal with the problems of the road.

But there is a price to pay for all of this. I cannot understand, we want good roads, we want a better transport system, we want everything — but nobody must pay for it. Where does it come from? And anytime you have to introduce a levy which is considered progressive —

because this is progressive — the more money you make the more money you pay — anytime you have to introduce a levy that is progressive, you hear these complaints from people who do not understand anything about management, but every other word is, "mismanagement", "gross mismanagement", "bad management". That is all you ever hear and it is only because they probably can spell management that you get this kind of repetitious nonsense all the time — "bad management from the Government", you know.

I know that serious efforts have been made in the past to deal with the problems of the Transport Board. We have made serious attempts and we are still making efforts to deal with some of the roads in this country which are really, really in a serious condition. Now the Minister of Transport has stated that he has already decided on priorities for the use of the funds that will be generated by the levy. He is talking about fixing roads that have never been fixed before. He is talking about investing in road repair. These are the kinds of things that the Hon. Minister of Transport has promised as far as the use of funds occasioned by the levy is concerned. So, it is not to say that we are not making a serious effort to deal with these problems, but there is another problem we have in this country that we have to deal with and it is the question of the use of the roads.

As I said before in an earlier debate, Mr. President, in this country while you may not stop to notice it, there is a general increase in traffic flow, and whereas probably ten years ago you could have a rush hour which lasted for an hour, you have all day rush hours in Barbados now — it is a fact of life — all day — and what has happened with the increased traffic of Barbados is that you still find problems occasionally because people are behaving as though we have a traffic system of 15 or 20 years ago.

On mornings, you find that there is still oblique parking on the roads which cause blockages in the traffic flow. You find that people are parking on approach roads to Bridgetown. This causes blockage in the traffic flow. You find that the Sanitation Department is instituting collection at rush hour on mornings on approach roads to Bridgetown. All of these things are an impediment to the traffic flow and in addition to that what they do cause is increased consumptions of gasoline, and for that matter, it is one of the areas that we have been looking at in our conservation programme.

Right now, I believe that we have to seriously look at the whole question of requiring in the driver education programme of this country, an understanding of expressways because you may find — as I have seen in the past — that people are parking on the Spring Garden expressway at night. An expressway is not some place to be parked on. People are doing this already. An expressway is designed for traffic flow. So what is happening in

this country, is that while Barbadians are consuming more and enjoying a better standard of living, there are certain disciplines that still have to be inculcated in the behavioural patterns of the people in this country. Anybody who drives, anybody who walks the street, can tell that we are still behaving as though we have 50 percent less traffic to deal with, Mr. President, and I think these are the kinds of problems that we have to address.

A service transportation study was done as part of a conservation programme and one of the recommendations was that there should be an urban traffic scheme. In this traffic scheme, of course, it is designed to alleviate congestion in central Bridgetown. I could quote, Mr. President, if I may from some of the recommendations.

The idea is to have two urban arteries. One is called the Inner Bridgetown Bypass, which covers Jemmotts Lane, Martindales Road, Halls Road, Country Road, Passage Road, Westbury Road to President Kennedy Drive. The other one is called the Outer City Bypass, which touches on the Garrison Road, Culloden Road, Pine Road, Bridge Road, Lower Bank Hall Cross Road, linking Highway 1 to 7 so that the flow of traffic can be rationalised in Bridgetown. It also calls for the provision of 350 parking lots off the street in addition to the existing parking lots, and it calls for the change of the traffic flow pattern within central Bridgetown.

This scheme had been made available to the Inter-American Development Bank, and the IADB has expressed an interest in financing this type of scheme if we can get it off the ground and if Barbados applies to them for a loan. But what it will do in effect is to make a very effective contribution to easing some of the problems and removing some of the headaches we have.

While on the subject of parking, we have a number of parking lots in Bridgetown where real estate is at premium price, and the charges for those parking lots do not face reality at all. It is arrant nonsense for people to be paying \$10 a month for parking space in central Bridgetown, and if you go tomorrow and increase the parking rates fourfold, I am sure there will be a human cry about this kind of thing — and it is on prime real estate land in the city of Bridgetown. I believe — and I am not speaking for the Minister of Finance — but as a matter of fact I can say now that as part of the Conservation programme, I am making a recommendation to the Ministry of Finance that the parking fees in Bridgetown should be increased substantially.

One of the recommendations I am also going to make — and I believe this should be looked at in the medium term — is the whole question of car park spaces outside the city. We should try to find some low cost

way of bringing the people into the city of Bridgetown. All of these things will effectively deal with the question of pollution, and although we do not have it in Barbados, we must admit that increased traffic will cause destruction of the environment. This is an established fact, there have been tests and experiments done. The City of New York and the City of Los Angeles are prime examples, as well as the City of London, of the kind of pollution that you are faced with whenever you get increased traffic in your urban centres.

There are all kinds of problems you are grappling with in a society which has advanced far beyond anyone's capacity to understand it, and that is little Barbados. Yet we find that people want to dwell on the Transport Board and the problems it has had since it was a public corporation. We did not make it a public corporation, it was made so by the Democratic Labour Party Administration, which we found, and we find here now that there is praise for a private system.

We know the mini-buses need to be regularised in their patterns of behaviour. The mini-buses must be dealt with. Let us face it, the mini-buses now can use short routes, which is true; and they can make profits, which is true. But there should be some system devised, and I believe that the new Road Traffic Act will speak to a system to deal with the mini-buses, because in effect what will happen is that we will have to find a way of stopping the mini-buses from stopping any place and causing traffic congestion. Something must be done about that. I can agree that there are problems with the mini-buses.

Mr. President, I could go on and on and on, but I just wanted to get a few points across. There is no point trying to continue flogging the Opposition on these matters. I think it is important that we realise that we are dealing with a very difficult job when we are talking about a public transportation system, and as Senator Howell said I do not know of one in the world where there are no problems. I can think of many where there are significant problems and they always talk about how do you deal with the question of subsidising transport fares, because if you are a Government bent on operating under socialist democratic principles, you can never talk about making people pay for the cost of the transport system. It does not work any place at all. I agree with that.

In New York I keep hearing the Mayor talking and promising people that he will not increase the transit fares, yet he finds himself having to inch them up all the time. We in Barbados are not going to make that attempt. What we will have to do is to control the cost of the operation of the system, but I do not think the Government could ever seriously consider instituting the type of bus fare that would make the transport system cost effective — not by increased fares, it cannot work.

Yet still we hear accusations about the Prime Minister making statements about an increased bus fare.

The Prime Minister said, and I have to state this for the record, that if we had to try and find a way to make the bus fares pay for the transport system, the fares would go to a dollar. We have to give it serious consideration if we are going to make the system cost effective. The Democratic Labour Party did it by carrying up the fare one time, brought it back down and carried it back up again. In 1975, I think it was, the bus fare was 65 cents, today it is 60 cents, so I do not understand where the criticism could come from. The people in the Democratic Labour Party do not do their homework, and they come in here and talk a lot of foolishness and criticise.

We had a five percent sales tax in this country and nobody talked about going to the Treasury for a refund, yet still we hear some statement today that you cannot claim the levy back from the Income Tax. If it is a levy, you want to claim it back from the Income Tax? I do not understand what kind of brainless statement that is. It is the usual opportunistic, piggy bagging of these issues that we get from the Opposition all the time. They expect to drop them in here for public consumption and then go off feeling that they have achieved something. What we need is a meaningful contribution to this kind of debate.

I heard talk about a barefoot tax and all kinds of foolish statements that only encourage people to be irresponsible. Everybody benefits by a good road system, even the barefoot man. No doubt that if we are to take advantage of any opportunity to provide foreign investment on the Caribbean Basin Initiative that we are better placed than most countries in the Caribbean Basin area because of a better infrastructure, and a better infrastructure means that we have better roads. There is no gainsaying this, this is a fact of life. You travel through the Caribbean and you will see. We have better roads than a lot of the other people in the Caribbean, which means that we are better placed to take advantage of any foreign investment initiative than most of the countries in the Caribbean. Perhaps that is why we probably will not get aid — because we seem to be better off. But it is the attitudes and values of the people that we must be trying to encourage to be more positive and stop listening to this nonsense about barefoot tax and all kinds of foolishness, glib Opposition statements that are meaningless.

You had a transport system running for years and years and years and failed miserably with it. Now we have a Government that is grappling with it because we have the courage to grapple with it.

Mr. President, I just wanted to get some of this steam out of my system, because sitting down here all day listening to a bunch of self-serving statements just to get headlines in the Press.....that is all I can say it is. But what we have to tell the people who make that attempt to get self-serving statements, remember one thing, that was done from 1976 to 1981 and it caused people to get hurt in St. Lucy.

I believe that the junior Senator on the Opposition benches should realise that the major spokesman for the Barbados Workers' Union in this Honourable Chamber has suffered and he should change that tactic. (SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: Why don't you run.) I will be coming, don't worry. Mr. President, all I can say is that I have to support the Government on this Resolution.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: Mr. President.....

Mr. PRESIDENT: What are you rising on?

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: On a point of order.

Mr. PRESIDENT: I have always asked you not to read the Rules to me. Assume that I know them. If necessary I will refer to them.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: Mr. President, I was listening to Senator Griffith very carefully and he suggested that statements which I make in here are self-serving and are designed to catch headlines. I submit that this ought to be withdrawn because it is imputing improper motives to me.

Mr. PRESIDENT: I had spoken, I think, at the last meeting over which I presided, about a similar statement. And I had suggested that perhaps it was not the nicest statement to use, and the Minister said he would not pursue it.

SENATOR C. A. GRIFFITH: Mr. President, I withdraw the statement. What I will say is that the statement made serves the interest of the Opposition.

Mr. President, I think I have let go enough and I believe that most honourable Senators will see the wisdom in supporting this Resolution.

SENATOR D. A. C. SIMMONS: Mr. President, having regard to the time, this has been a long day for most Senators and I am not going to be excessively long on this Bill. I have a few things to say about the transport system and a few matters to clarify.

Mr. President, if this Bill means now that a new thrust is being shown in the area of public transport in Barbados by the Government, then I am indeed happy because I believe this Bill is three years too late.

There has been much talk today of the problems at the Transport Board. The only thing I will agree with Senator Greaves on, is that from 1979 he had been calling for debates on the Transport Board, and in fact had moved a Private Members' Bill in December 1979, but in December 1979 as shown in the Hansard Report for that time, I had said then — and nobody paid any attention of course — that the transport system in this country was in a terrible state and I had welcomed the appointment of the recently dismissed Chairman, a man who at the time of the appointment — and I have no reason to believe that he has changed during his tenure of office — did precisely what Senator Seale was saying should be done.

Soon after Mr. Yearwood had been appointed and for weeks after, he used to find himself on evenings in the bus stand over here, and the other one lower down, checking out for himself what was happening with the transport system in this country. At the time I did not think that he should have exerted himself quite as much as he was doing as Chairman, but he was fact-finding, but no one in this country wishes to face one of the ills that plagued the Transport Board since 1976.

I said it in 1979 and I am going to repeat it now: the new Transport Board, the one that came in after the buses from the Lucases, Mrs. Rock and those people which were taken over in 1977 has been plagued with political sabotage. There were employees of the Transport Board — there probably still are, because I do not take as much interest now in the operations of the Transport Board as I did then — but certainly up to 1981 there were workers and managers of the Transport Board who for the sake of trying to advance the cause of the Democratic Labour Party prior to the election of 1981, were doing their utmost to frustrate the decisions of senior management of the Transport Board, and were so short-sighted that they did not understand that at the same time they were causing grave hardship to the travelling public.

In the debate in 1979 I remember referring to one of these people about whom I had made complaints, about whom the Transport Board was doing nothing, and ultimately found out that what I was saying was the truth. Senator Greaves, when I mentioned his name, shouted across from the other side of the House of Assembly and gave me the gentleman's correct name. I knew him as Brugga Tom. Supervisors of depots in the east of this island and in the north of this island were so arranging the daily operations of the buses as to cause the Barbados Labour Party MPs for those areas to suffer public abuse, and by extension the Barbados Labour Party and the Government to suffer abuse. People travelling from the north where people have to go through St. Peter represented by a Labour Party person, St. James represented by a Labour Party person, St.

Philip North represented by a Labour Party person and St. George were made to suffer. This matter was gone into very thoroughly, but my colleagues in the Government of 1976 to 1981 refused to accept that there was this kind of political sabotage. That was the biggest problem affecting the Transport Board.

The second biggest problem affecting the Transport Board was the lack of any clear policy and planning. It did not occur to those who were the designers of policy at the Transport Board that if you took over the private buses of Mrs. Rock and the others, and at the same time you did not increase your rolling stock but extended your routes, that you would not be able to provide an adequate service. This was said to the Government but nothing was done. Thirty buses were included in an Estimates in one year and were cut out. I really believe — and I say it quite sincerely even though I am supporting this Resolution — my Party and the Government that was the Government in the period 1976–81 paid insufficient attention and planning to the public transportation system of this country. It may have been a mistake. If we are trying to correct it now, all well and good, but I think they should have done something two years ago, at least in 1979.

No one in the Ministry of Communications and Works in that period seemed to appreciate as I said here on page 3059 in December 1979 that at that time the Transport Board did not have a Deputy General Manager, did not have a Personnel Manager, did not have a Financial Controller, but was employing 1 700 people, had 282 buses servicing the whole island with late night buses after 11 o'clock.

The Manager would be required daily to, as they put it, try cases. A conductor comes to work with a grease mark on his shirt and the Manager of the Transport Board is hearing that and trying that — a waste of time. He is not applying his time to looking at cost centres, doing planning for the Transport Board, looking at new routes, looking at different equipment, looking at preventive maintenance — nothing so. He is dealing with a driver who quarrels with a conductor or who quarrels with a passenger or has dirt on his clothes. Well, he has no deputy, he has no Personnel Officer, and none of any standing certainly in 1979.

In the depots at Mangrove and at Speightstown in St. Peter, Sir, the quality of Management in those depots was very shoddy. I am not going into all of the ramifications now. Perhaps during the Estimates I can list a lot more of the particulars of the operations of the depots. We had heard for a long time of Government wanting to move the workshop from Weymouth. Up to now it has not been moved. It is about time.

The system of the Transport Board for the ordering of parts, for the ordering of tyres, has never existed in a satisfactory way. I remember once being involved in a matter concerning the importation of tyres and the Transport Board found itself in a position of having to pay out something like \$54 000 for tyres which were imported unknown to anybody and without any system. Now how do you expect something to function efficiently at the level of finance if there is no proper system set up — none.

The greatest problem for the travelling public of course, was in the morning and in the afternoon and the peak periods between 7 a.m. to 9 o'clock and between 3.30 p.m. and 6 o'clock in the afternoon, the periods of the day when the school children were mixing with the travelling public and clustering up the bus stand and clustering up the buses. They were never able to sort out that problem. I do not believe it has been sorted out. My boy goes to the Lodge School but he did not reach home until 8 o'clock last night and his complaint was that he had no bus. Ever since he finished his athletics at 5.30 p.m. he had no bus to get him home so I am not satisfied, from an objective point of view, that there has been any appreciable change.

We have examined a few of the faults but one must not be negative. Assuming that there are these problems, is this levy going to ameliorate the problems which we have identified because it will only be worth supporting if we can have an assurance that things will improve. It does not provide for a Transport Board but I see it provides, Sir, in Clause 8, for the creation of another board. I do not know how many Boards there are in Barbados but you have another one coming — the Transport Levy Board — and this is being created, if I read it properly, for the purpose of supervising and giving advice generally to the Minister respecting the administration of the fund — not the administration of public transport — the administration of the fund.

In my submission, Mr. President, the functions set out in Clause 8 of this Bill for the Transport Levy Board are very, very narrow indeed. I do not know. If \$6 million is paid into a fund, is it asking too much for the Minister, a Transport Board, his Permanent Secretary and so on to devise a scheme to disburse the fund? Why do you want a new Board anyhow when they have a Board to advise him how to administer the fund.

I agree with the principle that the levy should be across the board as was said by one Senator and all working people, self-employed as well, but I trust that in all of this, after the contributions have been going into Government, that there will be a scheme which Government would publish or the country will know about as to how the priorities for development in terms of

public transport including road development, particularly road development, is going to work, Sir.

An honourable Senator — Senator Williams — seems to be calling for some of these funds to be put into the repair of tenantry roads — I may be under a misconception — as I understand it, he was talking about tenantry roads in plantations in St. John and St. Philip. If these are plantation tenantry roads, then the Tenancies Development Act of 1981, I think it was, provides that the Ministry of Housing and Lands would be charged with the responsibility for the repair of plantation tenantry roads and a special fund — I believe IADB or the World Bank or something — certainly foreign funds would be provided for execution of road repairs under that Act. I do not believe that it is intended — it is not said — but I do not believe that it is intended that the general domestic levy arising out of this piece of legislation should be used towards the repair and development of tenantry roads. I think that is specially provided for, but clearly, the main highways of this country should attract, in terms of planning, a high degree of attention from the Ministry.

(Asides) I know it runs from Highway 1. I never learnt my roads in Barbados by the highway numbers. The road from Eagle Hall to St. Peter, Highway 1, that is one highway that is in need of widening. If you travel on that highway and it attracts a lot of traffic on any morning — I have done it several times going to Court at Holetown — and you get behind some of the same Transport buses anywhere in Black Rock, you cannot pass until you get into Holetown. *(Asides)*

Do not tell me about the Spring Garden Road. Is that opened yet? I heard the Spring Garden Road will ease that, Sir, but pending the full public use of the Spring Garden Road, I still believe that if Highway 1 is going to be maintained, that some effort should be made to widen that. *(Asides)*. Why? All right, we will see how it works out, Sir. The Spring Garden Road is apparently in operation. I do not travel that part of the island, Sir, but Senator Trotman gives me the impression that it is in operation, Sir, and that all of these problems are easy. I have to go to Holetown on Monday, Sir. I will check it out and by the time of the Estimates I will be in a position to continue or to retract what I am saying.

Members and particularly Senator Deane and Senator Hall, have made the point that the influx of heavy duty vehicles and a new type of truck has, in fact, been causing undue wear and tear on the roads of Barbados. Senator Hall wanted to know if the owners of these heavy duty vehicles, the construction companies and so on, will be paying the same thing as the barefoot man.

As I understand it, it is the insurable earnings of the employee first of all that are to be levied against. But secondly, clearly, Sir, the Road Tax which you pay every year is a differential tax. I pay so much, for a Mini, Senator Griffith will pay a lot more than that for his Mercedes and C.O. Williams Construction will pay a lot more in respect of their heavy vehicles. So, I think that the law and the practice as of now imposes a differential in the Road Tax to allow those heavy duty vehicles to pay more for the use of the roads. That is what it amounts to.

Senator Howell, Sir, did query Section 13 and his contention is that the fine of \$2 500 or imprisonment or both is too severe a penalty. He had missed out one word, Sir, or he failed to observe one word. It says: "anybody who is guilty of an offence is liable". This is the maximum. The penalty of \$5 or \$500 can be imposed depending on the circumstances.

Mr. President, I would be grateful if Senator Trotman for my own political education could clarify in his reply, the question of the nationalisation of the Transport Board. I want to be fair, Sir, I want to be fair that it was the Democratic Labour Party that misled the travelling public of this country in 1976, that somehow or other the transport system, the buses could exist on a fare in that year of 25 cents whereas, the previous year it was at 65 cents.

You see, this is a question of political courage and also a question of political deceit that in an attempt to win an election, the population was being fed as a political gimmick, a diet of 25 cents, Sir, to travel on the buses in 1976 whereas in fact, they knew before that they had to pay 65 cents. Obviously, perhaps from the results, the country and the travelling ate the diet and then vomited it out in the results of 17-7 or 18-6 — we beat them so badly, Sir, I cannot remember.

But, I also want to be fair, Sir. It has always been my understanding that it was the Barbados Labour Party Government of 1955 that first nationalised the transport system, the Transport Board, or created a Transport Board. I think that is right and thereafter, I certainly know that in 1977, the Barbados Labour Party Administration of 1976-81 bought out the buses from Mrs. Rock and the Lucases and the Trotmans and all of them, and put them all under the Transport Board. If that was nationalisation, then it was the Barbados Labour Party.

I do not believe Senator Griffith is right and I do not believe he was fair in accusing the Democratic Labour Party of nationalising the system, Sir. The Democratic Labour Party really did nothing to enhance the system of public transport in Barbados during their regime.

But, it is not fair to saddle them with a fact that is not historically true, Sir.

Mr. President, we are going to have more buses, better buses, closer attention being paid to road repairs and so on. I think that as persons in public life, it is our responsibility — I was not in here for everybody's speech — but I think we have a duty to make an appeal to the workers of the Ministry of Transport and Works — formerly MCW — to give the country and those of us who work, and themselves who are going to be paying the levy, a square day's work for a square day's wage.

We complain about the roads. There are problems recognised and acknowledged problems with the quality of bitumen which we have been importing from Trinidad. I gather that efforts are being made to get a better quality. We complain about pot holes and we all seem to be afraid to say that one of the problems in terms of roads, highways, public transport in this country is the attitude of workers to the work.

After 10 o'clock in the morning — I know the Minister might have a view about the heat and the sun — the Hon. Minister of Transport and Works — but there are systems that we can set up to deal with that — but after 10 o'clock in the morning, MCW workers do not push themselves. Sir, there was a road built in my former constituency connecting Bayfield to Blades Hill, it took over two years. There was a corner in Wellhouse being widened, it took two years, Sir to widen a corner.

And I have received personal abuse because I dared on my way from District C to visit these areas and on two occasions spoke to the workers and said it is not fair, you are taking too long on the Blades Hill Road and you are denying the people in Thickets from getting attention to their road. In Wellhouse, nobody was there one day when I passed, all were in a shop — Miss Garnes' shop — drinking and I went and asked if they had had lunch already and they said yes and I was abused behind my back. I did not care. I thought I was doing what was right to draw it to their attention that they were earning taxpayers' money, they were supposed to be fulfilling a function of repairing the roads in the interest of the taxpayers of this country and the general public and they were not in my view fulfilling that obligation. I think that we have to be candid with the people who are supposed to work and who receive taxpayers' money.

Everybody will speak and I support any measure that would advance the position of the man at the bottom, the workers. I do not know, everybody is a worker but some people, politicians especially, speak of the workers and the masses and so on. Whoever, I want to pull up the fellow at the bottom, Sir, but at the same time, he must have a sense of responsibility to the com-

munity. Senator Hall said the Government has a duty to the people. I want to say also, the people have a duty to their Government and their country. I want to add that. And I think that we must make statements, Sir, and not be afraid to be criticised because if what I say is published, tomorrow morning MCW workers will be cursing me behind my back. I do not mind.

But the supervisors at MCW are the ones in whom proper management systems must be inculcated — I mean management at that level, Sir. There is no point finding five or six workers downing their hoes and shovels and you cannot find the supervisor in the area at all.

This was shown on television in 1977 when Minister Brathwaite and myself did a tour in St. Philip and we could not find the workers working at 3 o'clock the afternoon in Parish Land or in Golden Grove. They had gone by the side of the road and were sitting down in the khus khus grass, and when you asked for the supervisor he was in a house down the road. I do not know what he was doing down there, he said he was going for water.

I do not see any of this in the Saturday column of Mr. Frank Walcott, nor do I hear BIGWU talking about these things. They were to ask for better wages and better conditions. I want to see them also publish that we will not be supporting you if you are proved not to be producing or to be shirking. I want to see that published, Sir. (Aside). Well, if we are not going to see it, we must talk about it. That is where inefficiency and wastage of vital funds that could be channelled in other directions take place in Barbados, and I make no apologies for what I have to say.

Mr. President, I am going to support this Bill and I hope that perhaps some kind of White Paper will come down from the Ministry of Transport at some time after this fund gets going and the Ministry and the operators of the fund and so on clarify their thoughts. I think the country deserves to have a kind of White Paper or plan saying how it is proposed that these funds should be utilised.

I am not getting myself involved in the current problems at the Transport Board, whatever it is that led to the Minister's decision to fire the Board. There is no problem now though, the Board has been fired.

Senator Hall was coming close to a point which he never developed, and I think I support him, if I was reading him correctly. It is a pity that there has been a lot of public mud on both sides reproduced in the Press. If it was correct that the Chairman disagreed with the Minister on a matter of principle, I think he should have

said so and finish it there. When I had a similar problem I had nothing to say to the Press other than that there was a disagreement on a matter of principle, and I thought the proper thing to do was to resign, and I left it there. But to be washing dirty linen, muck, in public, I do not know if that is sufficiently healthy at our level of development in this country.

I wish the operators of this levy fund well, Sir, and I hope that as much information from time to time will be given to the public in pursuance of the Government's policy of open Government.

SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: Mr. President, the few half points raised by the members of the Opposition have been so well answered by my supporters on this side, that really I do not think there is much for me to say in terms of a reply. Nevertheless, Sir, I just want to make one or two quick comments before we move to Committee stage.

More than one Senator suggested either that the income of the Transport Board was not what it should be because of money falling out somewhere, or that the conductors were not as efficient as they should be, and I just want to say that my own personal view on this matter is that whenever there is trouble, trouble falls down, and since the Transport Board's conductors are the smallest people in the business it must fall on them. I am saying this because I want it recorded as my own view.

My own personal view is that all Transport Board buses in Barbados should be fitted with turnstiles, the Government should buy a stock of tokens which people could buy from depots, and then there would not be a question as to whether the conductors are efficient or honest. The conductors would not feel hurt as to whether people are accusing them rightfully or wrongfully. (SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: They will get hurt, no jobs). How would they get hurt? They would not be part of the business. I do not in my own opinion see that the installation of turnstiles has anything to do with the firing of conductors. There would still be work for them on the buses. Those people who know about buses know that one needs to have law and order and discipline on the buses, and somebody has to do it, and I still believe that we have to have two man buses in Barbados whether or not we have turnstiles, because turnstiles in my opinion would simply take the whole question of integrity and efficiency of conductors out of debate. I do not think it is fair to have said constantly, without any evidence, that conductors are inefficient or otherwise.

Senator Hall came through very fast, Sir, not bowling very well, and he talked about a barefoot tax which I read about in the newspaper some time. I do not live in any place finishing with "Park" or "Terrace"

or "Crescent" or any of these things, I live in a fishing village, and it is always assumed that fishermen are the poorest category of workers. I do not see barefoot people in Silver Sands, so if the people in Maxwell Terrace or Barclays Park walk barefooted, it is purely a matter of choice. I do not normally see the people in Barclays Park or the people in Maxwell Terrace walking, Mr. President, so if Senator Hall is prepared to tell us that the people in those areas walk barefooted, that must be a matter of choice, because they cannot be considered to be of the lower income group. So I do not know where this barefoot talk comes from, because there are no barefoot people in Barbados now, all that has gone out, finished with.

The question of the tax falling on the smaller man is the only good point, or serious point, raised by the Opposition benches, and I want to repeat what I said earlier. The Opposition would have us believe that Barbados is somehow divided into two groups, one group being called the small man, or the man in the street, and the rich people. If that were true, Sir, it would seem to me that the people who are now seeking representation by BIGWU, who claim they are only being paid \$60 a week or something, according to the levy if they are getting \$60 a week they would be paying something like 60 cents a week, whereas the people who are insured for \$500 a week, it seems to me, are paying a lot more than that. The people who are being insured for \$500 a week do not use the Transport Board services, and therefore one has to assume that the better off people in Barbados are being called upon to subsidise the transport system for the less fortunate people in this country. And they feel free in spite of that to walk around and talk about a barefoot tax, and about poor people being taxed, and a lot of foolishness on platforms every night.

The only good thing that gives us courage is the fact that when you read the reports, they hold meetings and when we check they only have 25 and 50 people at meetings. They are now reduced to the same numbers as whatever Fly gets, and they do not get the message that people are not interested in listening to the foolishness that they are talking on platforms every night.

Senator Simmons questioned the necessity of having a Board to account for the funds. The practice has been so far in this country that wherever separate levies are collected in Barbados, they have to be accounted for by a separate authority, for example the Sugar Levy, and therefore to be consistent with the practice as established in this country, if we are going to collect a separate Transport Levy, that levy has to be separately accounted for by a separate body. The Act in Section 8, I think, from memory, provides for the establishment of a Board in order to assure the people of Barbados that the levy which is collected

under the Act is properly accounted for. We have to make sure that the levy is not lost somewhere in the Consolidated Fund and we are not sure who paid what for what.

Senator Simmons also found it necessary to take a little swing at the MCW workers. It is not uncommon to hear people saying that MCW workers do not work, MCW workers do not produce. Mr. President, I hold no brief for MCW workers, but I want to say that I have had to do with the Public Service for my entire working career and MCW workers, the ones who are highly visible because they work by the side of the road take the brunt of public attack, but they are not the worse offenders.

They are less paid workers and they cost less to the Government than a lot of other workers, and if you want to understand what I am saying, Sir, Senator Simmons would say that at 3 o'clock five road menders were in a rumshop or something like that, and I am suggesting that it costs less to have five MCW road menders in a rumshop at 3 o'clock than it takes for one economist to be at Queens College collecting his wife or his child.

If you want to see inefficiency, it is not the MCW workers. People like to talk about MCW road menders and carpenters because they cannot defend themselves. Nobody wants to talk about the economists, the Permanent Secretaries, the Heads of Departments who go to work at 10 o'clock, leave at 11 o'clock, come back at 3 o'clock and leave at 3.30 p.m. That is where the drain on the economy is.

Nobody wants to talk about them because they can defend themselves. They have heavy lobbies, and for every MCW worker who is leaning on a hoe there are three A.As and two economists who are somewhere watching cricket, and it takes a lot more to keep them watching cricket than it takes a woman who is carrying water to a gang to take a little time off.

I am holding no lobby for MCW workers, but I only want to put the whole thing in its true perspective, because if you are going to say that workers in the Government Service do not work, none of them work (*Asides.*) The last time I saw you at cricket was a Saturday. I just want to make that point because people like to dig at people who cannot defend themselves like the Sanitation workers and that kind of person, and the trade unionists have not got the courage to defend the low and the poor. They can join with the people who attack people who cannot defend themselves (*Asides.*) You can say in Committee what you want to say, Senator Greaves, but if the poor people did not have people to defend them before, it is my understanding that

Salankey and BIGWU and those people are on the scene and they might get a chance to get some representation.

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

The question that the Senate resolve itself into Committee on the Bill was put to the Senate and agreed to, and Mr. PRESIDENT left the Chair and the Senate went into Committee on the Bill, Senator J. C. WICKHAM in the Chair.

Clauses 1 and 2 were called and passed.

Clause 3 was called.

SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: I beg to move that Clause 3 stand part.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative, the Senate dividing as follows:

AYES: SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW; SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN; SENATOR C. A. GRIFFITH; SENATOR MISS J. CLARKE; SENATOR St. C. E. HOWELL; SENATOR D. A. C. SIMMONS; SENATOR MRS. M. O. REECE; SENATOR A. P. L. REECE; SENATOR C. I. E. DEANE; SENATOR D. SEALE; SENATOR MRS. E. M. LYNCH; SENATOR MRS. G. G. READER — 12.

NOES: SENATOR W. W. HALL and SENATOR E. E. GREAVES — 2.

Clause 4 was called and passed with Senator Greaves and Senator Hall recording their dissent.

Clause 5 was called and passed with Senator Greaves and Senator Hall recording their dissent.

Clauses 6 to 14 inclusive were called and passed with Senator Greaves and Senator Hall recording their dissent.

The Schedule was called.

SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: Mr. Chairman, Sir, when the Minister of Finance introduced the proposals for the Transport Levy, he gave Parliament an assurance, Sir, that the levy would be managed by a Board. The Schedule provides for the appointment of five persons to serve on a Board. The Minister of Finance at that time, Sir, also gave to the Other Place the assurance that one member of the Board would be nominated by the Barbados Workers' Union and the others would be appointed by the Minister.

I beg to move that the Schedule be the Schedule to the Bill.

The question was put to the Senate and agreed to with Senator Greaves and Senator Hall recording their dissent.

SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the Senate do now resume and the Bill be reported.

The question was put to the Senate and agreed to and Mr. PRESIDENT resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motion of SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN the Bill was read a third time and

passed with Senator Greaves and Senator Hall recording their dissent.

ADJOURNMENT

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. President, I beg to move that the Senate do now adjourn until Wednesday, March 17, 1982 at 11 o'clock a.m.

The question was put to the Senate and agreed to and Mr. PRESIDENT adjourned the Senate accordingly. 7.00 p.m.